



## **Rethinking Indigenous Autonomism in Latin America**

### **Author**

Gaitan-Barrera, Alejandra

### **Published**

2015

### **Thesis Type**

Thesis (PhD Doctorate)

### **School**

Griffith Business School

### **DOI**

[10.25904/1912/2784](https://doi.org/10.25904/1912/2784)

### **Downloaded from**

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/366022>

### **Griffith Research Online**

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

# **Rethinking Indigenous Autonomism in Latin America**

By

Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera  
Master of Arts (International Relations)  
Bachelor of Arts (International Relations)

School of Government and International Relations  
Griffith Business School  
Griffith University

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

March 2015

## **Abstract**

This thesis contributes to a broader scholarly understanding of how indigenous movements in Latin America articulate autonomy. One of the central objectives of this research is to address a simple, yet often either assumed or unheeded, question: what does the indigenous subject want? What are the distinct meanings behind the political projects put forward by indigenous movements in the region? How do they envision their liberation from the current systems of oppression? And, most importantly, how do they define concepts such as “self-determination” and “autonomy”? These questions are central to understanding the nuanced transformative processes that indigenous peoples in Latin America have set into motion. In this sense, this thesis will demonstrate that far from homogenous, each movement, according to its own lived experiences of colonization and settlement, national building processes, local history, as well as cultural and political imaginaries and collective memories, conceives autonomy in a different way. Out of these distinct articulations of autonomy, this thesis argues there are two movements at the forefront of an unheeded and overlooked autonomist project: the Council of Miskitu Elders in Mosquitia (Nicaragua) and the Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee in Wallmapu (Chile).

Furthermore, this thesis aims to fill in a theoretical gap in literature, namely, how does liberal multiculturalism, as a Western political engineering project, affects the lives of indigenous peoples and how does it understand and address these “unconventional” indigenous autonomist demands? Can it achieve more than mere rhetorical processes of national reconciliation and political inclusion? Does it allow the revitalization of indigenous forms of government? And, does it permit a theoretical space that allows for self-invention, a process crucial in the path

towards decolonization? These questions are particularly significant if as scholars we wish to make sense of the ways in which native societies, dominated at home and abroad, are reacting to the imposition or vertical implementation of these liberal multicultural models and regimes of autonomy. Liberal multicultural theory claims to have granted freedom and autonomy to the indigenous subject via conferring on it a differentiated form of citizenship. Within political theory, Will Kymlicka's approach to federacy, Arend Lijphart's consociationalism and Rainer Baubock's pluralistic federation are some of the most influential approaches in this realm of studies. However, this thesis argues that these approaches, drawing from a Western-centric and liberal theory of minority rights, while heeding to the demands of certain indigenous peoples and nations, they prevent others from seizing tangible local forms of autonomy and from following their own paths towards decolonization.

### **Statement of Originality**

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Date

Signature



<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER I: INDIGENOUS AUTONOMIES IN LATIN AMERICA .....</b>	<b>23</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	23
CONTEMPORARY INDIGENOUS DEMANDS IN LATIN AMERICA.....	28
TAXONOMY OF INDIGENOUS AUTONOMY IN LATIN AMERICA.....	48
CONCLUSION .....	49
<b>CHAPTER II: INDIGENOUS AUTONOMY AND MULTICULTURALISM.....</b>	<b>52</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	52
INDIGENOUS AUTONOMY IN CONTEMPORARY INSTITUTIONAL ENGINEERING.....	55
INDIGENOUS AUTONOMY AND “NEOLIBERAL MULTICULTURALISM” IN LATIN AMERICA.....	71
INCLUSION OR AUTONOMY: TYPOLOGIES OF INDIGENOUS DEMANDS .....	86
CONCLUSION .....	94
<b>CHAPTER III: MISKITU AUTONOMY IN NICARAGUA.....</b>	<b>98</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	98
A GENEALOGY OF AUTONOMY IN MOSQUITIA.....	99
CONSEJO DE ANCIANOS DE LA NACIÓN COMUNITARIA MOSKITIA.....	119
CONCLUSION .....	141
<b>CHAPTER IV: MAPUCHE AUTONOMY IN CHILE.....</b>	<b>145</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	145
A GENEALOGY OF MAPUCHE AUTONOMY .....	147
COORDINADORA DE COMUNIDADES EN CONFLICTO ARAUCO-MALLECO (CAM).....	160
CONCLUSION .....	181
<b>CHAPTER V: REVINDICATIVE AUTONOMISM.....</b>	<b>185</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	185
REVINDICATIVE AUTONOMISM: A SUBTRACTIVE DEFINITION.....	187
THE CENTRALITY OF TERRITORY.....	203
REVINDICATIVE AUTONOMISM: BETWEEN SEPARATISM AND SECESSIONISM .....	211
CONCLUSION .....	217
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>221</b>
<b>APPENDIX I: LIST OF INDIGENOUS MOVEMENTS .....</b>	<b>241</b>
<b>APPENDIX II: ETHICAL CLEARANCE .....</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>246</b>





## Acknowledgments

There are many people I would like to acknowledge and to whom I extend gratitude for the support they have offered during my doctoral candidature. First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Gideon Baker, for his excellent intellectual guidance and support throughout this journey. Since the inception of this research project, he has provided not only insightful and challenging feedback but has also been a constant source of encouragement. I would also like to thank Dr. Wesley Widmaier for his wise advise as associate supervisor. From early on, he introduced me to a wide array of Latin American literary sources from which this thesis has benefited immensely. I thank him for his time and readiness to support at any stage of this doctoral candidature.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the School of Government and International Relations, the Graduate Research School, the International Experience Incentive Scheme Office and the Centre for Government and Public Policy, all at Griffith University, as well as the Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACYT) in Mexico for the generous material support they provided for the conduction of my field research in Mosquitia and Wallmapu.

This thesis would certainly have not been possible without the trust that indigenous organizations, communities and families deposited on me. My gratitude goes to the Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia, in particular I would like to thank Oscar Hodgson, legal advisor to this organization and Héctor Williams, *Wihta Tara*, for kindly introducing me and addressing my queries regarding their autonomist political project and aspirations as well as their willingness to cooperate in this

project. I would also like to thank Guacolda Chicahual, spokeswoman for the Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco Malleco (CAM) for her persistent and tiring work in introducing me to Mapuche communities as well as arranging my visit to the security prison El Manzano in Concepcion in order to conduct a series of interviews with Mapuche political prisoners and *Weychafes* Héctor Llaitul and Ramón Llanquileo.

I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in a series of conferences and symposiums, such as those hosted by the International Political Science Association, the Australasian Association of Iberian and Latin American Studies and the Congreso de la Asociación Latinoamericana de Sociología. In these spaces, I had the opportunity to present several chapters and sections of this thesis, receiving insightful feedback from colleagues and associates—all of which improved this work considerably.

More than anybody else, I am indebted to my wonderful parents and my dear husband for without their emotional support I would have never been able to complete this project. Thank you José Francisco Gaitán Neme and Emma Margarita Barrera Jure for the innumerable sacrifices you made in life to ensure I had an excellent education. That is truly the foundation of this work. Thank you for your patience and unconditional love, this thesis is a testament to your faith and belief in me and I hope I have made you proud. Finally, I would like to express my eternal gratitude to my husband, Govand Khalid Azeez. Through you, as a Kurd of the Zagros Mountains in the Middle East, I have come to recognize and understand the deep suffering, pain and the suffocating objectification which power's ideological instruments impose on all indigenous nations and oppressed peoples around the world. Above everyone, you have played the greatest role in my intellectual journey. Your role as a Socratic gad fly, continuously

crumbling those ideological structures that stood beneath my feet has pushed me to overcome those endless cognitive and socio-cultural boundaries as well as opened new ways of thinking regarding alternative realities. To you, to your pain and to your people fighting today in Rojava and the rest of Kurdistan is whom I dedicate this thesis to.







## Introduction

"The district where the Spaniards have built is separate from that of the natives and divided from it by a stretch of water [...]"<sup>1</sup> narrated Hernando Cortés in his fourth letter from Mexico regarding the official establishment of European settlements around Lake Texcoco after the fall of Tenochtitlan. Today, almost five centuries later and with numerous nation-states replacing the colonial empires of Castile, the ubiquitous nature of racially segregated communities speaks of the continuity of colonial politics and its predominant narrative in Latin America. In Mexico, sheltered by its own proudly self-identified white European-descendant elite, the impoverished streets of the colonial city of Mérida in Yucatán are reminiscent of the sixteenth century *repartimiento*.<sup>2</sup> For at least five days a week, twenty days a month, very much like in the times of *repartimiento*, indigenous<sup>3</sup> women and men spend their time working as serfs for the white middle and upper classes for minimal fixed wages, backed by no rights at all. Meanwhile, in the southern hemisphere, in Temuco, Chile, under the veneer of "development with identity" the government proudly promotes "ethnic tourism" to the Mapuche regions. Fulfilling the fantasy of the national and foreign Western tourist, the tour folklorizes Mapuche culture and offers an "authentic Mapuche experience," including an optional overnight stay at a Mapuche *ruka*, where members of Mapuche communities are expected to engage in a display of authenticity: speaking

---

<sup>1</sup> Anthony Pagden, ed. *Hernan Cortes: Letters from Mexico* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), 323.

<sup>2</sup> *Repartimiento* was a system of forced labor that replaced the *encomienda*. It forced indigenous men and women to travel away from home to work in plantations and mines.

<sup>3</sup> As Jeff J. Corntassel and Taiaiake Alfred assert, "indigenousness is an identity constructed, shaped and lived in the politicized context of contemporary colonialism." This thesis adopts and uses the term "indigenous" to refer to the nations, peoples, communities, tribes and clans, which are the first inhabitants of the lands they inhabit and self-identify as such. Jeff J. Corntassel and Taiaiake Alfred, "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism," *Government and Opposition* 40, no. 4 (2005): 597.

Mapudungun, playing the *trutruka*, wearing traditional clothing, while serving the tourist Mapuche food and delicacies. In Central America, on the plains of the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua, the Miskitu, Rama and Mayagna peoples struggle to protect their languages and ways of life amidst the state-sponsored influx of Pacific-mestizo Nicaraguan settlers to their region.

Contrary to what the national bourgeoisies of Latin America regard as an uncontested “truth,” the colonial project in both of its dimensions, cultural and economic, outlived independence and only grew stronger in the so-called post-colonial era. The construction of nation-states in the early nineteenth century by politically independent European-descendant elites required a discourse of homogeneity—a homogeneity that certainly none of these societies possessed. The development of a mythical narrative of mestizaje was precisely the ideological tool that facilitated this project of national homogenization. Today, from Mexico and El Salvador to Bolivia and Brazil, that archaic and hegemonic identitarian claim “we are all mestizo” reverberates through the region with disastrous consequences for indigenous peoples and other minority ethnic groups. At the core of this project of national homogenization was Indigenismo, a political and religious project which roots back to the sixteenth century colonial rule in the Americas. The central objective of Indigenismo was to study and understand the indigenous subject, to borrow from Estelle Tarica, “from a perspective that [was] external and alien to indigenous peoples themselves.”<sup>4</sup> Indigenismo was embedded in a racialized and power-laden relation between those who were allowed to speak and those who were spoken about.<sup>5</sup> In this sense, Indigenismo was no more than a political tool of colonial power to subjugate and exploit indigenous peoples and nations. As aforementioned, however, this project did not come to

---

<sup>4</sup> Estelle Tarica, *The Inner Life of Mestizo Nationalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008). ix.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

an end with the wave of Criollo independentist insurrection that swept the region from 1804 onwards. To the contrary, Indigenismo was only reinvigorated, redesigned and reformed in this new period to suit the interests of the national elite.

Modern Indigenismo is exemplary of this continuity of colonial rule in Latin America. It is rooted in the early nineteenth century, particularly in the works of Mexican intellectual and education minister José Vasconcelos (1882-1959) and the Peruvian revolutionary leader and founder of the Peruvian Socialist Party, José Carlos Mariátegui (1894-1930). It is no coincidence that the re-emergence of a vibrant form of Indigenismo appeared in Mexico and Peru for these two places were precisely the centers of Spanish colonial power and spaces where Indigenismo worked at its best as an ideological force in subordinating indigenous nations and peoples. Whilst there are major theoretical and ideological discrepancies between Mexican and Peruvian Indigenismo, both were supposedly aimed at bringing to an end the marginalization and deprivation of indigenous peoples. On the one hand, Mexican Indigenismo, drawing heavily from Vasconcelos's *La Raza Cósmica* (1925) and Mexican anthropologist Manuel Gamio's so-called revaluation of native civilization, was premised on the desirability of a racial amalgamation of indigenous and Western cultures. At the state level, Indigenismo called for the top-down implementation of economic, political and educational reforms that sought to assimilate indigenous peoples into the broader national society. Concomitantly, the cultural<sup>6</sup> and political branches of Mexican Indigenismo embraced the folklorization of indigenous societies since proponents of this ideology believed it would preserve their traditions and enable a harmonious integration of Hispanic and

---

<sup>6</sup> Other influential cultural figures were Othón de Mendizábal, Alfonso Caso and Diego Rivera.

Indian identities, cultures and normative practices.<sup>7</sup> These theoretical tenets of Indigenismo were not only institutionalized in the post-revolutionary period in Mexico via the creation of the National Indigenista Institute (INI), but were also exported to the rest of Latin America as the creation of the Inter-American Indigenista Institute attests.

Peruvian Indigenismo, for its part, was born as a revolutionary endeavor led by Peruvian Marxists. Here, Mariátegui's work, despite being more attuned to the racially diverse reality and colonial history of Latin American societies, was bounded by a Eurocentric paternalist approach aimed at transforming indigenous "passive" communities into "progressive" revolutionary agents. Mariátegui contended that only by nurturing the revolutionary potential of the Indian could revolutionary proletarian parties, communes and soviets emerge in Latin America. This, in turn, required European socialist discourse and its associated idea of revolutionary proletariat to penetrate the indigenous masses in order to enable the prospect of a revolution in the region. Overall, Indigenismo, in either its institutionalized or revolutionary variant, spread to Guatemala and Bolivia in the 1950s and became entrenched in most Latin American states up until the incursion of neoliberalism from the 1970s onwards. Behind Indigenismo's veneer of progress, egalitarianism and liberatory rhetorics, lied a colonialist and assimilationist project. This project entailed the paternalistic imposition of Western ideas of unilinear history and progress, conceptual cultural categories and imported policies on indigenous communities. To borrow from Jean-Paul Sartre, "just like the southerner was competent to discuss slavery [...] because

---

<sup>7</sup> David A. Brading, "Manuel Gamio and Official Indigenismo," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 7, no. 1 (1988): 80.

he alone knows the Negro," so too under Indigenismo the European colonizer alone was qualified to speak of the colonized.<sup>8</sup>

During the 1960s and 1970s, however, Latin America experienced one of its greatest waves of indigenous political mobilization. The emergence of Katarismo and Indianismo in the Bolivian Andes in the 1960s, the formation of the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) in the 1980s, the armed struggle of the Zapatista movement in the 1990s, amongst many others, challenged the racially unitary configuration of the nation-state. In addition, this re-emergence signified the political mobilization of "Indians *qua* Indians,"<sup>9</sup> to borrow from Crawford Young, rather than Indians as peasants or proletariats. Far from being homogeneous, this collective and large-scale indigenous mobilization in the region struggled for a series of diverse rights such as political inclusion and representation, legal protection from the state, bicultural education, customary law, self-determination and autonomy.<sup>10</sup> This revival of indigenous mobilization, what Xavier Albó has termed the "return of the Indian,"<sup>11</sup> has been subject to extensive scholarly debate amongst the Latin Americanists. In particular, much debate has centered on explanatory questions, namely, how did indigenous subjects come to rise against historically entrenched neo-colonial forms of domination? How did they break free from Indigenismo and other institutionalized forms of oppression? And, why at that point in time?

Deborah Yashar postulates that a concatenation of events in the region during the 1970s and 1980s opened previously non-

---

<sup>8</sup> Jean Paul Sartre, "Introduction," in *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, ed. Albert Memmi (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991), xxi.

<sup>9</sup> Crawford Young, *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1976). 428.

<sup>10</sup> Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc, "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America," in *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, ed. Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc (Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012), 2-3.

<sup>11</sup> Xavier Albó, "El Retorno del Indio," *Revista Andina* 9, no. 2 (1991).

existent social spaces for indigenous mobilization. On the one hand, the incursion of neoliberalism and the processes of political liberalization that followed provided both greater incentives to organize against a new wave of land expropriation and privatization as well as a “political associational space”, which allowed freer forms of collective organization to develop under an increasingly democratic state. Aiding these factors Yashar contends was the pre-existence of cross-community networks providing crucial structures of support.<sup>12</sup> Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson, however, argue that an analysis of external political and economic factors, like those of Yashar and Donna Lee Van Cott, neglects the existence of earlier internal transformations within indigenous communities. In this sense, Warren and Jackson heed to an earlier wave of transnational organizing (in the 1960s and 1970s), when indigenous peoples utilized international conventions, forums, NGOs and human rights law as a means to push for greater political rights. This period, as a result, ignited a complex process of self-affirmation—a crucial one in making sense of political transformations in Latin America.<sup>13</sup> A third group of scholars, led by Allison Brysk and J. Montgomery Roper, moving away from analyses of internal self-affirmation and cultural revitalization, attribute greater significance to the construction of an “international indigenous movement” via building “transnational alliances, circulating information, engaging in political theater, seeking international leverage, and promoting substantive and strategic learning across borders.”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Deborah J. Yashar, *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005). ——, “Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America,” *World Politics* 52, no. 1 (1999).

<sup>13</sup> Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson, “Studying Indigenous Activism in Latin America,” in *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation and the State in Latin America*, ed. Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002).

<sup>14</sup> Alison Brysk, *From Tribal Village to Global Village, Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000). 55-56. Alison Brysk and Carol Wise, “Liberalization and Ethnic Conflict in Latin America,” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 32, no. 2 (1997); J. Montgomery Roper, Patrick Wilson, and Tom Perreault, “Introduction to Special Issue on Indigenous

In the late 1980s and early 1990, as the Latin American state surrendered to the global pressure for economic reforms and increased democratization, it touted its political openings, constitutional reforms and policy amendments to recognize—for the first time since the officialization of the discourse of Indigenismo—the existence of indigenous peoples in their national territory. In attempting to emulate the multicultural essence of Western societies, these reforms led to the legislation of a myriad of self-government and autonomous arrangements in the region. Cases such as the establishment of a unique territorial autonomy in the Eastern Coast of Nicaragua in 1987; the enactment of the Colombian *resguardos* following the constitutional reforms of 1991; the creation of three additional *comarcas* in Panama in 1996, 1997 and 2000; the implementation of the *territorios indígenas* in Venezuela in 1999; and the legislation of the *Territorio Indígena Originario Campesino* (Original Peasant Indigenous Territory, TIOC) by the Bolivian Constitution of 2009; are some of the examples that reflect this liberal endeavor by Latin American states to simultaneously, include and grant autonomy to indigenous peoples inhabiting “national” lands.

Nonetheless, despite the enactment of these multicultural regimes and pioneering autonomy arrangements, the great majority of indigenous peoples throughout the region remain devoid of agency, oppressed and vulnerable to the power of state and corporate structures. This context is best explained as one which develops in the midst of Karl Offen’s “territorial turn” and the paradox of Charles Hale’s “neoliberal multiculturalism.” On the one hand, Offen postulates the “territorial turn [...] involves some form of administrative devolution of territory to indigenous, and to a lesser extent, black peoples who have historically claimed

---

Transformational Movements in Contemporary Latin America,” *Latin American Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2003).

it."<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, Hale asserts that under neoliberal multiculturalism, the nation-state recognizes ethnic difference and reforms constitutions to reflect the multicultural and plurilingual character of its society as well as funds projects for demarcation and titling of indigenous lands.<sup>16</sup> Nonetheless, he warns of the concealed effects of neoliberal multiculturalism:

The recognition of cultural difference gives states and, equally important, civil society and transnational organizations, greater prerogative to shape the terms of political contestation, to distinguish between authentic and ersatz expressions of identity, between acceptable and disruptive cultural demands. Neoliberal multiculturalism thrives on the recognition of cultural difference, and by extension, on high-stakes distinctions between those cultural rights that deserve recognition and those that do not.<sup>17</sup>

It is precisely via “neoliberal multiculturalism” that the colonial project in Latin America is at work today. As Ranajit Guha argues, the local elite (in the case of Latin America, the dominant white Criollo-mestizo elite) after independence “continues [...] to operate vigorously [...] adjusting itself to the conditions [and] developing entirely new strains in both form and content.”<sup>18</sup> In

---

<sup>15</sup> Karl H Offen, “The Territorial Turn: Making Black Territories in Pacific Colombia,” *Journal of Latin American Geography* 2, no. 1 (2003): 43.

<sup>16</sup> Hale argues that the Latin American state strategically utilizes these institutional reforms to gain international recognition and therefore, become eligible for international credits, funds and aid programs. Charles R. Hale, “Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America,” *Polar* 28, no. 1 (2005).

<sup>17</sup> ———, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala* (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 2006). 35.

<sup>18</sup> Ranajit Guha, “On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India,” in *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asia History and Society*, ed. Ranajit Guha (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982), 4.

this context, adding to Hale's neoliberal multiculturalism, a great amount of scholarly work has been dedicated to the examination of multicultural policies in the region. Nancy Grey Postero reflects on the unresolved tensions of state-led multiculturalism in Bolivia and how this scheme has "reproduced the illness [it] claimed to cure."<sup>19</sup> For his part, José Antonio Lucero outlines the politics of *indianidad* and the paradox of indigenous rights within the framework of the World Bank's "ethno-development" programs in Ecuador.<sup>20</sup> In addition, Bret Gustafson's theorization of "liberal indigenism"<sup>21</sup> in Bolivia is also an important contribution to the literature on indigenous mobilization and the processual transformation towards multicultural states in the region.<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, research on indigenous mobilization and resistance in Latin America has also studied the 1990s transition and transformation of indigenous movements into well-established local, regional and national political actors. Here, Leon Zamosc sheds new light on the Ecuadorian Indian movement's contest for political power, what he refers to as the shift "from politics of influence to politics of power."<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Donna Lee Van Cott chronicles the dramatic change of Latin American

---

<sup>19</sup> Nancy Grey Postero, *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007). 124. Also see ——, "Articulations and Fragmentations: Indigenous Politics in Bolivia," in *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, ed. Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc (Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012).

<sup>20</sup> José Antonio Lucero, "The Paradoxes of Indigenous Politics," *Americas Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (2011). Also see ——, "Locating the 'Indian Problem': Community, Nationality and Contradiction in Ecuadorian Indigenous Politics," *Latin American Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2003).

<sup>21</sup> Bret Gustafson, "Paradoxes of liberal indigenism: Indigenous movements, state processes and intercultural reform in Bolivia," in *The Politics of Ethnicity: Indigenous Peoples in Latin American States*, ed. David Maybury-Lewis (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).

<sup>22</sup> Other investigations such as those of Willem Assies et.al and Rachel Sieder also contribute to this debate. Rachel Sieder, "Challenging Citizenship, Neo-liberalism and Democracy: Indigenous Movements and the State in Latin America," *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest* 4, no. 3 (2007); Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar, and André J Hoekema, *The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America* (Amsterdam: Thela Thesis, 2000).

<sup>23</sup> Leon Zamosc, "The Ecuadorian Indian Movement: From Politics of Influence to Politics of Power," in *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, ed. Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc (Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012).

indigenous movements “from outsiders to insiders,”<sup>24</sup> and reflects on the role of the political left as a central variable in calculating the political gains and electoral victories of indigenous political parties. The episodes and features of this institutionalization of the indigenous protest are the *cause célèbre* of recent writings in the field. Here, the cases of the Independent Social Alliance<sup>25</sup> (ASI) in Colombia, the Pachakutik Plurinational Unity Movement<sup>26</sup> (MUPP) in Ecuador, the Pachakuti Indigenous Movement<sup>27</sup> (MIP) in Bolivia and the United Movement of Indigenous Peoples<sup>28</sup> (MUPI) in Venezuela have been subject to particular attention by social scientists.

In addition to investigating this multi-layered interaction between indigenous peoples and the powerful structures of the nation-state and neoliberalism, as well as examining the insidious effects of rhetorical multiculturalism in the region, current work in the field has most recently focused on analyzing the features of indigenous movements. These works dwell on questions of leadership, authenticity and political representation. Here, the writings of Mayanist Victor Montejo, particularly his account of the divergent cultural and political agendas within Pan-Mayanism in Guatemala; Lucero’s unraveling of the multiple forms and tactics utilized by the Ecuadorian and Bolivian indigenous organizations; Amalia Pallares’s theorization of simultaneous *campesinista* and *Indianista* politics pursued by the Ecuadorian highlands indigenous peoples; as well as Jean Jackson’s investigation of the distinct ways indigenousness is performed by the Colombian indigenous movement; are foundational works in this area.

---

<sup>24</sup> Donna Lee Van-Cott, "Broadening Democracy: Latin America's Indigenous Peoples' Movements," *Current History* 2004. ———, *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007). ———, "Indigenous Movements Lose Momentum," *Current History* 2009.

<sup>25</sup> Alianza Social Independiente.

<sup>26</sup> Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik.

<sup>27</sup> Movimiento Indígena Pachakuti.

<sup>28</sup> Movimiento Unido de Pueblos Indígenas.

A recurrent theme of indigenous political mobilization in Latin America has been “autonomy.” However, despite its richness and diversity, current research has seldom, if at all, studied in a sustained fashion the autonomist demands put forward by indigenous movements in the region. To date, no explicit taxonomy of indigenous demands has been developed. As epitomized by the works of Yashar, Willem Assies, Richard Falk, Jean E. Jackson, Kay B. Warren, Sieder, Postero, Zamosc, Van Cott and Gustafson,<sup>29</sup> indigenous demands are at best, typologized in a reductionist fashion, at worst, lumped together under the monolithic notion of “self-determination and autonomy”—disregarding what these terms may mean in practice to each of their proponents. In addition, for the most part, these discussions have been limited to the realm of introductory chapters or reserved for a peripheral section or a side note.

Addressing this empirical gap is precisely one of the contributions of this thesis. One of its central objectives is to address a simple, yet often unheeded, question: what does the indigenous subject want? What are the distinct meanings behind the political projects put forward by indigenous movements in the

---

<sup>29</sup> See Deborah J. Yashar, "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America," in *Constructing Democratic Governance: Latin America and the Caribbean in the 1990s--Themes and Issues*, ed. Jorge I Domínguez and Abraham F Lowenthal (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996). Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema, "Diversity as a Challenge: A Note on the Dilemmas of Diversity," in *The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America*, ed. Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema (Amsterdam: Thela Thesis, 2000). Richard Falk, "The Right of Self-Determination under International Law: The Coherence of Doctrine versus the Incoherence of Experience," in *Self-Determination and Self-Administration: A Sourcebook*, ed. Wolfgang Danspeckgruber and Sir Arthur Watts (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997). Jean E Jackson, "Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers," in *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, ed. Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002). Rachel Sieder, "Introduction," in *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy*, ed. Rachel Sieder (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002). Postero and Zamosc, "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America."; Donna Lee Van-Cott, *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000). Bret Gustafson, "Manipulating Cartographies: Plurinationalism, Autonomy and Indigenous Resurgence in Bolivia," *Anthropological Quarterly* 82, no. 4 (2009).

region? How do they envision their liberation from the current systems of oppression? What are some of the pathways they follow in seizing autonomy? And, most importantly, how do they define concepts such as “self-determination” and “autonomy”? These questions are central to understanding the nuanced transformative processes that indigenous peoples in the region have set into motion. In this sense, this thesis will demonstrate that far from homogenous, each movement, according to its own lived experience of colonization and settlement, national building processes, local history, as well as cultural and political imaginaries and collective memories, conceives autonomy in a different way. To achieve this ambitious objective, this thesis takes one step back from the ivory tower of intellectualism and heeds to the often unheard and silenced voices of indigenous agents in the region. A study of indigenous autonomy in Latin America certainly demands attention to the actual lived experience and the voices of dissent from indigenous subjects. By studying indigenous primary sources such as indigenous texts, political declarations, constitutions, manifestos as well as verbal utterances, this research aims to engage in a dialogue with indigenous movements and activists in Latin America, rather than speaking on their behalf.

In addition to this empirical gap, this thesis aims to fill in a theoretical gap in literature, namely, how does liberal multiculturalism, as a Western political engineering project, affects the lives of indigenous peoples and how does it understand and address these indigenous autonomist demands? Can it achieve more than mere rhetorical processes of national reconciliation and political inclusion? Is it interested in listening to the concerns, demands and aspirations of the indigenous subject? Does it allow the revitalization of indigenous forms of government? Moreover, can it permit a theoretical space that allows for self-invention, a process crucial in the path towards

decolonization? Or, does the voice of the omnipresent, omnipotent divine Western liberal subject override all forms of identitarian reinvention as merely recourses to primitive, atavistic and essentialist forms of identity?

These questions are particularly significant if as scholars we wish to make sense of the ways in which native societies, dominated at home and abroad, are reacting to the imposition or implementation of these liberal multicultural models and regimes of autonomy. If colonialism entails outright imposed separation and segregation and multiculturalism implies political integration, then where exactly is autonomy located in this binary? Multicultural theory, rooted in liberalism, claims to have granted freedom and autonomy to the indigenous subject via conferring on it a differentiated form of citizenship. Within political theory, Will Kymlicka's approach to federacy, Arend Lijphart's consociationalism and Rainer Baubock's pluralistic federation are some of the most influential approaches in this realm of studies. However, this thesis argues that these approaches, drawing from a Western-centric and liberal theory of minority rights, while heeding to the demands of certain indigenous peoples and nations, they prevent others from seizing tangible local forms of autonomy and from following their own paths towards decolonization. These "Others" in this sense, are not Hale's "Indio permitido", which have "substituted 'protest' with 'proposal,' and learned to be both authentic and fully conversant with the dominant milieu,"<sup>30</sup> but rather, they are the unauthorized Indians, "unruly, vindictive and conflict prone."<sup>31</sup>

In other words, this thesis argues that indigenous autonomist demands in the region, far from being homogeneous, are multifarious and diverse and include demands as broad as

---

<sup>30</sup> Charles R. Hale, "Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the "Indio Permitido"," *North American Congress on Latin America Report* 38, no. 2 (2004): 19.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

political integration (i.e., decentralization, political representation, parliamentary racial quotas, etc.) and regional autonomy arrangements (land rights, territorial titling, regimes of autonomy, etc.). However, this thesis also posits that there are alternative articulations of autonomy, which will be grouped under the title “revindicative autonomism,” to denote how these movements argue that tangible self-rule is contingent on the recovery and revindication of the totality of their pre-colonial territory. Moreover, the movements engaging in this political strategy, this thesis argues, present a challenge to the Western approaches to indigenous autonomy by reimagining autonomy in non-Western and non-statist terms. At its core, revindicative autonomism is an emerging strategy for decolonization in Latin America and is epitomized by two prominent indigenous movements: the Council of Miskitu Elders in Nicaragua and the Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee (CAM) in Chile.

These articulations of autonomy, however, this thesis argues have been largely overlooked by current scholarly work. In addition, this thesis theorizes that liberal multicultural theory (both as a discipline and a policy framework) when addressing the concerns of indigenous peoples vis-à-vis these revindicative autonomist demands, is unable to deal with and make sense of these demands. In this sense, liberal multiculturalism functions as a strategy of state power and as a meta-ideological hegemony, aiming to metabolize and absorb these indocile and insurrectionary revindicative autonomist indigenous demands into docile ones. This hypothesis will be developed via juxtaposing the theoretical arguments of Kymlicka (federacy arrangements), Lijphart (consociationalism) and Baubock (pluralist federation) with indigenous articulations of autonomy, excavated and examined during field research in the Mosquitia region in Eastern Nicaragua and Wallmapu in south-central Chile.

This thesis aims to achieve this by engaging with Hale's "activist research methodology."<sup>32</sup> The basic theoretical tenet of this emerging methodology is that there is a particular hegemonic epistemological and methodological approach to conducting research within the social sciences that affects, by and large, how knowledge is produced. As Jeff Corntassel postulates, any research or body of knowledge that threatens the "white privilege and values" and the interests of the "self-appointed guardians of the political science discipline"<sup>33</sup> is then either dismissed as culturally relative and emotionally invested or is outrightly rejected as irrelevant. It is within this nexus of power and knowledge that any ideas and research regarding indigenous peoples and their processes of political mobilization occur. To borrow from Corntassel, reducing the diversity of methodological frameworks in the social sciences to a rigid binary between "objective" scholarly work and politically "engaged" research only hinders quality research regarding indigenous peoples, especially when examining their forms of political mobilization. In this sense, this reflexive but politically engaged methodology adopted in this thesis becomes a powerful counter-hegemonic tool, one that challenges and exposes the so-called objectivity that is so heavily infused in power and Western narratives.

Therefore, in studying the indigenous articulations of autonomy put forward by indigenous movements and organizations in Latin America, this thesis necessitates an engagement with indigenous communities, groups, associations and movements in the region. In other words, this is a process that requires the researcher, to borrow from Hale, to engage in a dialogue with indigenous peoples, a dialogue that allows them to speak for themselves and to take "an active role in the process of

---

<sup>32</sup> ——, ed. *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

<sup>33</sup> Jeff J. Corntassel, "An Activist Posing as an Academic?," *American Indian Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (2003): 159-60.

knowledge creation.”<sup>34</sup> For Hale, this process gives indigenous subjects “the opportunity to make sense of the data.” This methodology, however, rejects cultural relativism. As Hale postulates, it:

[...] does not rest on a naïve, pseudo-populist assumption that the study’s conclusions will be determined or completely redefined through the intervention of the research subjects, but rather that by participating they will enrich the analysis, and also take possession of the results in ways that could be useful for their own purposes.<sup>35</sup>

In this sense, this method of research rejects adopting “social scientific methodologies,” which Corntassel argues are “parochial” and draw from “data-driven questions”<sup>36</sup> and from simple processes of data collection, which treat indigenous peoples as mere “key informants”, as Hale asserts. This thesis then, adopts this approach to studying indigenous demands in the region and moves away from the rigid dichotomy between “they” the provider of “raw data” (indigenous movements) and “we” (researchers). Instead, this methodology regards the people who are subjects of research as “knowledgeable, empowered participants in the entire research process.”<sup>37</sup> Overall, this activist methodology enables an understanding of indigenous articulations of autonomy that is local, diverse and heterogeneous, thus rejects the top-down, statist and Western-centric approaches to autonomy.

---

<sup>34</sup> Charles R. Hale, “What is activist research?,” *Social Science Research Council* 2, no. 1-2 (2001): 14.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Corntassel, “An Activist Posing as an Academic?,” 160.

<sup>37</sup> Charles R. Hale, “Introduction,” in *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, ed. Charles R. Hale (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 4.

Accessing the geographical spaces as well as entering the Miskitu and Mapuche worlds has nevertheless been far from a simple task. The geographical and political context of such spaces, particularly regarding the bellicose state of affairs and the widespread imprisonment of Mapuche leaders in the case of CAM, has rendered them as complex territories to conduct research—even for national and local scholars. As with other dissident groups, distrust runs rampant amongst the communities which provide support for these revolutionary and anti-colonial movements. This is especially significant in the case of CAM, which works clandestinely. Being subject to constant state and corporate surveillance and repression as well as the risk of co-optation and infiltration by counter-insurgency groups, these movements unsurprisingly displayed a lack of trust from the very beginning. Adding to these *de facto* difficulties, this research endeavor was further complexified by the ethical problematic that my own ethnic identity presented within the particular historico-politico context of (neo)colonialism and racial stratification in Latin America. There was little doubt that a light-skinned Mexican *mestiza* with absolutely no connections on the ground would awaken great suspicions amongst the very people I intended to engage in dialogue with. I was cognizant that my privileges epitomized the very statist and Eurocentric power structures, which they so adamantly aimed to obliterate.

Nevertheless, rather than dismissing or downplaying these internal contradictions, I aimed to confront them from the outset. The elaboration of a brief yet detailed document where I introduced myself and my academic career in Australia, expressed my empathy for their liberatory practices and set out the broader objectives of the research was a crucial first step in the process of being acknowledged as a researcher worthy of the “risk”. The first contact with the Council of Miskitu Elders and CAM was established, in both cases, through a third party. Local and

politically-aligned media outlets, upon evaluating the research project and its overall objectives, agreed to contact the respective organizations to seek their consent and permission so that I could contact them directly by whatever means they considered safe and suitable. Contacting the representatives of these movements was not an easy job in itself for the concatenation of the mobility exigencies of their work (travelling from village to village and community to community) and my location in Australia made it even more difficult to engage in prolonged and non-interrupted phone conversations. During the phone conversations we successfully completed without technical difficulties, bridges were starting to be built between us. In particular, my conversations with Miskitu leader, Oscar Hodgson, and CAM spokeswoman, Guacolda Chicahual were immensely valuable for even if my questions on autonomy were mostly left unaddressed, they gave me the opportunity to present myself as a subject which had transcended the statist and nationalist boundaries of my inherently repressive *mestizo* identity. These series of conversations would be the pathway that allowed me to engage in field research not only in the outer spaces of the communities in Mosquitia and Wallmapu but also in the security prison El Manzano in Concepción, where several Mapuche leaders were serving long prison terms.

The nature of this research did not allow for the participation of these movements in its incipient stages. That is, the selection of the thesis topic was not determined through *a priori* horizontal dialogue with these parties. Rather, the delimitation of the thesis topic as indigenous self-determination and autonomy in Latin America was a rather isolated and unilateral process. This, nevertheless, does not detract from the collaborative essence of this project. It has been only via the consultation with Miskitu Council of Elders and CAM leaders and a deep engagement with the projects they put forward that this thesis has come to an

understanding of what alternative and bottom-up projects of decolonization look like in Latin America. My conversations with the movements' leaders did not follow a structured interview guide. Rather, all interaction aimed to be exercised under a conversational one-on-one tone, where I aimed, within the boundaries of the physical spaces themselves, to provide a sense of safety for them so that they could elaborate on the ideological premises of their struggle for liberation. Here, it was precisely the theme of autonomy, which was recurrent in all conversations; thereby it became a foundational element of the thesis. Apart from these conversations, this thesis also engages in impromptu chats with indigenous assembly members, elders as well as other Miskitu and Mapuche locals.

The thesis is structured in five chapters. Chapter I provides an overview of the general demands indigenous movements put forward in the Latin American region. It also aims to holistically investigate their conceptualizations of "autonomy." It does so via thoroughly studying primary sources from forty-six indigenous movements, from CONAIE in Ecuador, to the Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest (AIDESEP) and the Council of All Lands in Chile to the Aymara philosophy of Indianismo in the Bolivian Andes. These primary sources include, but are not limited to political declarations, manifestos, constitutions, as well as other political texts and publications.

Chapter II is subdivided into three sections. The first section seeks to study how multicultural theories and regimes of autonomy address the demands of indigenous peoples, especially those studied in Chapter I. To do that, this chapter digs into the ideological foundations of liberal multiculturalism to understand how these policies affect indigenous collective agents in their everyday lives. To achieve this aim, this section analyzes the

theories put forward by political theorists such as Kymlicka, Lijphart and Baubock. In its second section, the chapter studies the work of prominent scholars such as Hale, Lucero and Postero to understand how these multicultural approaches and policies are executed in practice by nation-states in the region. The third section, for its part, introduces and explores current studies of indigenous autonomy in Latin America and argues that research on this area has so far not aimed to make sense of indigenous demands in the region in a holistic fashion. Here, the section engages with the works of Willem Assies, Jackson, Warren, Sieder, Postero, Zamosc, Van Cott and Gustafson, amongst others.

Chapter III studies autonomy in the Mosquitia region. It provides a comprehensive historical account of Miskitu autonomy from early Spanish expeditions in the sixteenth century to the formation of the Kingdom of Mosquitia, the consummation of a British protectorate in the region and the establishment of a reserve in Mosquitian territory in the mid nineteenth century. Via a thorough examination of colonial texts, historical documents and international treaties, the section analyzes the evolution of autonomy in the region. Furthermore, the chapter traces the trajectory of Miskitu autonomy up to Nicaragua's invasion of the Miskitu territory in 1894. It also explores in detail the Statute of Autonomy as well as other imposed legislation affecting the region. In its later part, the chapter relies on an in-depth study of the Council of Miskitu Elders' political project, political declarations and conventions and juxtaposes them with the utterances gathered during field research in the region—in particular, the interviews conducted with the two most prominent leaders of the Council of Elders, Oscar Hodgson and Hector Williams.

Chapter IV, following a similar structure to Chapter III, provides an in-depth study of the Mapuche organization CAM in

Chile. To trace the trajectory of this movement and uncover its ideological postulations vis-à-vis autonomy (as well as its dynamics, strategies and internal formation), this chapter first provides an account of the history of Mapuche autonomy. It investigates the state of Mapuche autonomy from the first expedition of Diego de Almagro up until the formation of the first parliament and then studies the processes and events leading up to the loss of Mapuche autonomy with the formation of the Chilean state and the military campaigns of the late 1800s. In addition, and most importantly, the second section of the chapter studies the Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee by first exploring its formation within a context of changing politics and discourses in Chile. The section relies on an in-depth study of the organization's literature, including its political project, manifesto, political declarations and communiqés. Finally the chapter further examines CAM's autonomist struggle for the revindication of Wallmapu by drawing from first-hand information gathered during a series of personal interviews and other fieldwork conducted in the region with CAM's leader Héctor Llaitul and other CAM political prisoners including Ramón Llanquileo.

Finally, Chapter V aims to make sense of the articulations of autonomy epitomized by the Council of Miskitu Elders and CAM. This way, the first section studies and aims to demarcate the ideological boundaries of revindicative autonomism. The second section explores the centrality of territory for this form of autonomism. In its third and final section, it draws parallels and divergences between revindicative autonomism, separatism and secessionism—a distinction crucial in understanding this emerging form of autonomy in Latin America.



## **Chapter I: Indigenous Autonomies in Latin America**

### **Introduction**

To a great extent, the ample diversity of indigenous movements in Latin America has since its inception been referred to and understood as a single social and cohesive form of struggle that homogenously pushes for self-determination and autonomy—disregarding what these terms may mean in practice to each of its collective proponents. Whilst it is not the objective of this chapter to deal in detail with current scholarly approaches to studying indigenous movements and the demands they put forward, this chapter is nevertheless concerned with exploring an often unheeded, yet simple set of questions: what are indigenous movements in Latin America struggling for? What do they understand for “autonomy”? What are some of the pathways they follow in seizing autonomy? And, most importantly, what are some of the parallels and disjunctures between these various articulations of autonomy? This scholarly endeavor, via a meticulous examination of indigenous demands in the region, aims firstly to challenge the aloof ivory tower of academia as well as its all-too common mistake of speaking on behalf of the indigenous subject<sup>38</sup> rather than thoroughly engaging in a dialogue with indigenous agents.

The question of autonomy has been at the forefront of indigenous activism in the region since its reemergence in the 1960s and 1970s. However, the question of how these agents understand autonomy has at best, been relegated to a few lines, paragraphs or pages in footnotes and introductory sections or, at worst, been taken for granted without prior engagement with the issue at hand. At times, the scholarly work of political scientists, anthropologists and sociologists regarding indigenous definitions

---

<sup>38</sup> Chapter II and Chapter V thoroughly examine this epistemic violence and its effects on studying indigenous autonomist demands in Latin America.

of autonomy in the region, falls into the trap of what has been denominated the fallacy of the “anthropological present”, through which their research makes an often unintended assumption, in this case: that indigenous mobilization is static, timeless and anchored to a “traditional” and shared definition of autonomy. There is therefore an urgent need to challenge this fallacy and recognize that indigenous mobilization, like any politics, is ever changing and ever evolving. The demands put forward by indigenous movements four decades ago have changed a great deal in the course of time. In the process, their articulations of autonomy have been challenged both internally and externally. There is therefore the need to ask whether the autonomy envisioned by Aymara nationalism or Katarismo in the 1970s has some sort of continuity with the politics embraced by Felipe Quispe’s United Union Confederation of Working Peasants of Bolivia<sup>39</sup> (CSUTCB) today. Similarly, are the late 1980s and early 1990s anti-systemic politics of the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) still present in today’s inclusion-oriented organization? Furthermore, does the outright anti-communist and anti-Sandinista ideology of the counterrevolutionary indigenous forces, during the protracted Nicaraguan conflict, persists in today’s indigenous political party YATAMA<sup>40</sup>? These are just a few questions that remain overlooked in the present.

This chapter then seeks to fill this empirical gap in literature and holistically examine how indigenous movements in the region define autonomy in the present day. It is only reasonable that if as academics we aim to study and understand the nuanced transformative processes that indigenous nations have set into motion, we need first to take one step back and heed to the utterances coming from these movements themselves. This is particularly important because the very diversity of nations,

---

<sup>39</sup> Confederación Sindical Única de Trabajadores Campesinos de Bolivia.

<sup>40</sup> Yapti Tasba Masraka Nanih Aslatakanka, translated as “Sons of Mother Earth”.

movements, linguistic and religious groups as well as other social indigenous groupings renders misguided the attempts to homogenize indigenous politics. In regards to autonomy, the challenge is even greater because autonomy remains ambiguously defined even within Western literature. Etymologically, it denotes the imposition of law on oneself without external intervention but this, of course, is open to interpretation. Therefore, there is the need to ask: how do contemporary indigenous movements and organizations in Latin America envision the exercise of autonomy? As this chapter will demonstrate, each movement, according to its own lived experience of colonization and settlement, national building processes, local political imaginaries and collective memories, conceives autonomy in a different way. Therefore, it is essential to pluralize the term and refer to these articulations as indigenous “autonomies”.

In short, this chapter seeks to shed light on the contemporary autonomies articulated by indigenous nations and peoples in Latin America. It does so via thoroughly studying indigenous primary sources such as movements' texts, including political declarations, manifestos, constitutions, pamphlets as well as other writings, publications and even verbal utterances. The task set for this chapter requires a great deal of empirical research due to the geographical extension of the region, its large and multicultural indigenous populations and the great number of indigenous political organizations and movements working within and across nation-states. Whilst this thesis examines more than a hundred indigenous movements in order to holistically understand and make sense of their demands in relation to autonomy, it narrows down the number to forty-six in this chapter to allow a deeper engagement with these bottom-up articulations of autonomy. These forty-six organizations and movements have been selected for being the most prominent indigenous political organizations in the region. However, indigenous movements and organizations

concerned with more specialized demands vis-à-vis smaller administrative units and corporate agents have been excluded. For example, indigenous organizations in Mexico such as the Otomí and Ñatho-formed Xochicuautla Youth Front<sup>41</sup> and the Oaxacan Ikjot General Assembly of San Dionisio del Mar Peoples,<sup>42</sup> which push for the withdrawal of a certain extractivist industry or project (i.e., large scale mining, construction of interstate highways, pipelines and wind farms) in their territories, are left out from this research. Whilst these organizations certainly struggle for the defense of their territories and in the process, call for autonomy, their political project is rather focused on the immediate expulsion of these corporate agents rather than a more elaborate project for self-determination and political autonomy.

In the same manner, indigenous women movements such as the Bartolina Sisa Confederation of Campesino, Indigenous and Native Women of Bolivia<sup>43</sup> (CNMCOB-BS), the Organization of Indigenous Women of the Amazon<sup>44</sup> (OMIDA) and the National Federation of Peasant, Artisan, Indigenous, and Native Women Workers of Peru<sup>45</sup> (FENMUCARINAP), which advocate for the rights of women and against gender discrimination in both Western and indigenous societies, have not been included in this research. While intersectionality is certainly significant in studying indigenous autonomies, gendered movements are not the focus of this thesis. In the same manner, ethnically hybridized leftist and/or anarchist movements such as the Popular Magonista Army of National Liberation<sup>46</sup> (EPM-LN) in Mexico, the National Liberation Army<sup>47</sup> (ELN) in Colombia and leftist political parties

---

<sup>41</sup> Frente Juvenil Xochicuautla.

<sup>42</sup> Asamblea General de Pueblos San Dionisio del Mar.

<sup>43</sup> Confederación Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas Originarias Bartolina Sisa.

<sup>44</sup> Organización Mujeres Indígenas de Amazonas.

<sup>45</sup> Federación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas, Artesanas, Indígenas, Nativas y Asalariadas del Perú.

<sup>46</sup> Ejército Popular Magonista de Liberación Nacional.

<sup>47</sup> Ejército de Liberación Nacional.

such as the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unit<sup>48</sup> (URNG) have also been disregarded from this work. The rationale behind this exclusion is that the purpose of this chapter is to illustrate how indigenous movements and organizations envision, imagine and work towards an autonomous society *qua* indigenous peoples and for indigenous peoples—not for proletarian, anarchist or other hybridized groups. Thus, even if these Marxist and anarchist revolutionary organizations have a strong indigenous support base, they have generally not been taken into consideration for this thesis.

For the most part, the forty-six indigenous movements, organizations and associations studied in the following pages are locally, nationally and regionally the most prominent of them all. At times, as in the case of the Interethnic Association of the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest<sup>49</sup> (AIDESEP), the National Indigenous Organization of Colombia<sup>50</sup> (ONIC) and CONAIE, umbrella organizations are selected for study against smaller and more locally based indigenous centers, associations and institutions. This goes hand in hand with the overall purpose of this chapter, which is to study indigenous demands in the region at the macro and meso level rather than micro. As aforementioned, the identitarian component of the movement or organization is a central factor in the selection process. The movement must not only be composed of indigenous self-identified agents but also reach, almost exclusively, to an indigenous audience, be led by a self-identified body of indigenous leaders and have an indigenous constituency. The Council of All Lands in Chile,<sup>51</sup> the National Indigenous Plural Assembly for Autonomy<sup>52</sup> (ANIPA) in Mexico and the Council of Maya

---

<sup>48</sup> Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatimalteca.

<sup>49</sup> Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana.

<sup>50</sup> Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia.

<sup>51</sup> Consejo de Todas las Tierras.

<sup>52</sup> Asociación Nacional Indígena Plural por la Autonomía.

Organizations of Guatemala<sup>53</sup> (COMG) are a few examples of these movements. In addition, a common feature of the movements this chapter examines is that they seek to deploy an agenda that is first and foremost political, that challenges the status quo and aims to effect social change primarily in the interest of indigenous societies.<sup>54</sup>

There is no doubt that this endeavor is an arduous one for there are at all times, new movements emerging, others undergoing internal changes and still others disintegrating. Adding to this layer of complexity is the fact that the movements here analyzed do not always fall within the neat boundaries of selection criteria set for this chapter for these organizations are inherently multifaceted and multi-dimensional and fall simultaneously within many categories at once. Nevertheless, aiming to adhere to these selection criteria as best as possible, this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section explores the diverse demands upheld by indigenous movements and organizations in the region. It is divided into three subsections, which study each of the most prevalent demands put forward by these agents. Here, indigenous utterances and political declarations are referred to and quoted briefly throughout these sections in order to illustrate the similarities and differences regarding approaches to autonomy. For its part, the second section of this chapter aims to develop a spectrum of autonomy, which reveals the existence of largely unheeded indigenous autonomies.

## **Contemporary Indigenous Demands in Latin America**

---

<sup>53</sup> Consejo de Organizaciones Mayas de Guatemala.

<sup>54</sup> While these organizations may also comprise mestizo, ladino, creole and other ethnic and social groupings, they are for the most part formed by self-identified indigenous peoples.

The study of forty-six indigenous movements and organizations reaffirms just how diverse are the historicities, aspirations, demands and political realities of indigenous nations in today's Latin America. There is no doubt that this political mobilization has been shaped by colonization, discourses of mestizaje, state politics and more recently, the menace of neoliberal multiculturalism. At the same time, this resistance has met with vehement opposition from national elites, who as illustrated by Hale's study of Ladinos in Guatemala, face deep anxieties and racial ambivalence amidst the emergence and proliferation of multicultural orders.<sup>55</sup> In this context, while some movements have adamantly challenged the foundations of the colonial state, others have opted for less antagonistic strategies, such as the recognition of the nation-state and the disposition to engage in dialogue and negotiation with their European and mestizo counterparts. There are also other movements, which desire to pursue a politics of indigenous national reconstruction via pushing for the establishment and regulation of regimes of territorial autonomy. This, they argue, would lead to self-government in a variety of realms such as education, customary law and local management, amongst others.

Nevertheless, despite these differences, there are two common denominators to indigenous mobilization and activism in the region: an active resistance against neoliberalism (especially in the form of resource extractivism) and a strong determination to seize some form of autonomy. Here, while the works of Hale, Roberta Rice and Jean E. Jackson<sup>56</sup> address the challenges posed by neoliberal multiculturalism to indigenous mobilization as well

---

<sup>55</sup> Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*.

<sup>56</sup> ——, "Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America." ——, "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34, no. 3 (2002). Roberta Rice, *The new politics of protest: indigenous mobilization in Latin America's neoliberal era* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2012); Jean E Jackson, "Neoliberal Multiculturalism and Indigenous Movements," *Latin American Research Review* 44, no. 3 (2009).

as the intersection between austerity protests and identity politics, the question of autonomy remains largely unexplored. This thesis, however, via the study of numerous indigenous movements and organizations, uncovers a wide diversity of articulations of autonomy. These bottom-up approaches to autonomy range from de-territorialized self-governance to territorial arrangements. The next section explores the former; that is, how certain movements in the region push for a de-territorialized form of autonomy while seeking to integrate their societies into the now so-called “heterogeneous” fabric of the nation-state.

### Inclusionary Autonomies

According to the study conducted for this chapter, a great number of indigenous movements and organizations in Latin America pursue political integration as a strategy for autonomy. The central idea behind this strategy is that via pushing for processes of national reconciliation and major constitutional reforms, indigenous nations and peoples can (re)gain the political power they were long denied and organize their societies in a manner that suits their cultural distinctiveness. Their ideas go hand in hand with the politics of multiculturalism in the sense that they both aspire to transform national societies and build an egalitarian society without compromising the public recognition of ethnic difference. Movements such as CONAIE in Ecuador, CONIC in Guatemala, ONIC in Colombia, the Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations in Honduras (COPINH), the Organization of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname<sup>57</sup> (OIS), the Argentinian Organization of Indigenous Peoples and Nations<sup>58</sup> (ONPIA), the National Front of Indigenous Peoples<sup>59</sup> (FRENAPI) in

---

<sup>57</sup> Organization Van Inheemsen in Suriname.

<sup>58</sup> Organización de las Naciones y Pueblos Indígenas en Argentina.

<sup>59</sup> Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas.

Costa Rica, the Salvadorean National Indigenous Council Coordinator<sup>60</sup> (CCNIS), the Federation of Amerindian Organizations in Guiana (FOAG) and the Pachakutik Plurinational Unity Movement-New Country in Ecuador<sup>61</sup> are just a few organizations that fall within this category.

Furthermore, at the heart of these movements' struggle is cultural revitalization. For the most part, they call for the signature (in case the nation-state is not a signatory), ratification and implementation of international covenants and treaties such as ILO 169 and the UN Declaration on Indigenous Peoples. However, even within this "inclusionary autonomies" categorization, there is still a wide diversity of demands for there are indigenous nations and peoples in today's Latin America whose existence as distinct ethnic groups has not been officially recognized by the nation-state. Such is the case of the Wayana, Teko, Wayampi, Lokono, Palikur and Kali'na nations and the Maroon community in French Guyana. These groups, as ruled by the French Constitution of 1958, are only recognized as French citizens for, the government argues, an explicit recognition of their ethnic identity would threaten the indivisibility<sup>62</sup> and unity of the French nation. In this context, FOAG has focused its efforts for over a decade on demanding constitutional recognition for indigenous peoples in French Guyana. In the words of Alexis Tiouka, speaking on behalf of FOAG:

By virtue of our status as indigenous peoples, given the fact of our prior presence on the territory of French Guyana with respect to European colonization we affirm that the recognition that the rights deriving from this status [...] the right to

---

<sup>60</sup> Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño.

<sup>61</sup> Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik-Nuevo País.

<sup>62</sup> Assemblée Nationale, "Constitution de la République Française," (Paris: Assemblée Nationale, 1958). Article 1 affirms the indivisible character of the French republic.

self-determination, to our own judicial system, to linguistic and cultural rights, are all rights essential to the survival of our peoples.<sup>63</sup>

In the midst of the threats they face to their cultural identity, FOAG demands the enactment of multicultural legislation that protects their traditions and secures the inalienability of their lands. Similarly, the Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname<sup>64</sup> (VIDS) and OIS urge the national government of Suriname to protect and defend indigenous peoples from the current ethnocide they face. The first step, VIDS and OIS argue, is the recognition of indigenous peoples as subjects of a distinct form of citizenship that protects their languages and cultural traditions. They have also lobbied for the enactment of positive discrimination policies, especially in regards to education and political representation.<sup>65</sup> In like manner, CCNIS in El Salvador has worked extensively for the recognition of indigenous peoples by the Salvadorean government. Recently, in mid-2014, this endeavor proved successful when the Salvadorean national constitution was amended to recognize, for the first time in the history of the country, the existence of indigenous peoples. However, while Article 63 certainly provides positive provisos for future multiculturalist projects, CCNIS calls the government to adopt a rather “intercultural” approach in this new conciliatory phase between both parties. According to CCNIS, interculturality, as distinct from multiculturality and pluriculturality, will “promote [...] cultural differences, equality of rights, spaces for positive [intercultural] interaction that enable the prospect of mutual recognition, effective communication, dialogue, debate,

---

<sup>63</sup> Fédération des Organisations Autochtones de Guyane (FOAG), "Declaration on Collective Rights," in *Commission for Human Rights Intersession of the Working Group on the United Nations' Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (Awala-Yalimapo: Fédération des Organisations Autochtones de Guyane (FOAG), 2002), 4.

<sup>64</sup> Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname.

<sup>65</sup> Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname, "Wie is Vids?," Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname, [http://www.vids.sr/?page\\_id=54](http://www.vids.sr/?page_id=54).

learning and exchange [as well as] the peaceful resolution of conflict, cooperation and co-existence.”<sup>66</sup>

As illustrated by the cases of FOAG, VIDS, OIS and CCNIS, the movements and organizations within this category call for national reforms and either the “multiculturalizaton”, “pluriculturalization” or “interculturalization” of the nation-state as a path to self-rule and self-determination. There are still other movements within this same categorization whose demands for self-determination and autonomy are more extensive. FRENAPI in Costa Rica is a great example of these other organizations. Despite the passing of the Indigenous Law in 1977<sup>67</sup> by the Costa Rican government, the eight indigenous nations and peoples in Costa Rica (Cabécar, Bribri, Brunjka, Chorotega, Huetar, Maleku, Ngöbe and Teribe), have struggled against institutionalized discrimination and the reluctance of the government to transcend paternalizing forms of autonomy (i.e., reserves and national parks) and embrace instead tangible forms of autonomous indigenous action. It has pushed for the right to collective property, the enactment of tax-free indigenous lands, the right to practice indigenous medicine, the recognition and respect for traditional native knowledges, the funding of indigenous medicinal research, the participation of indigenous peoples in the design, promotion and direction of school curricula, and the right to practice customary law and to be fairly represented in local and national institutions,<sup>68</sup> amongst other demands. In addition, from 2003 onwards it has worked for the passing of bill 14.352<sup>69</sup> on the

---

<sup>66</sup> Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño, "Pueblos Indígenas y los ODM Post-2015," (San Salvador: Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño, 2013), 7. *Translation mine.*

<sup>67</sup> Asamblea Legislativa de la República de Costa Rica, "Ley Indígena No. 6172," ed. Asamblea Legislativa de la República de Costa Rica and Ministerio Público Poder Judicial (San José 1977).

<sup>68</sup> Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas, "Proyecto de Ley de Desarrollo Autónomo no. 14.352," Servicio Paz y Justicia en Costa Rica, [http://frenapi.serpajcostarica.org/blog/?page\\_id=115](http://frenapi.serpajcostarica.org/blog/?page_id=115).

<sup>69</sup> Proyecto de Ley de Desarrollo Autónomo. This bill has been awaiting action in Congress for twenty years.

right of indigenous peoples to pursue autonomous forms of development. In articles 2 and 3 of this bill, autonomy is defined as:

[...] the right to self-administration of indigenous lands [...] the recognition of local forms of organization, the right to be socially and politically represented [...] the right to pursue a self-defined form of development to protect [native] territories and improve the socio-cultural, political, economic and educational conditions as well as the local infrastructure in these territories, the respect and vindication of customs and autochthonous cultural values [and] the recognition of the institutions of customary law.<sup>70</sup>

In like manner, CONIC in Guatemala has sought to achieve increased political representation for indigenous peoples. Its 2009 bill for indigenous rights<sup>71</sup> demanded the right to self-government for native communities and peoples in internal and local affairs, the right to participate as indigenous peoples in state institutions and for their cosmovisions, traditions, cultures and religions to be fairly represented nation-wide. In addition, it pushed for major constitutional reforms in Guatemala, which would provide destitute communities (whether indigenous, African-descendent, ladino or mestizo) with free and dignified education, housing and healthcare. Overall, its main objective has been to “re-found Guatemala”<sup>72</sup> as an inclusive, multiethnic, multilingual and

---

<sup>70</sup> Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas, "Proyecto de Ley de Desarrollo Autónomo no. 14.352". *Translation mine.*

<sup>71</sup> Propuesta de Ley General de Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas de Guatemala.

<sup>72</sup> Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina, "Objetivos," [http://www.mayaconic.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=13&Itemid=20](http://www.mayaconic.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=13&Itemid=20).

multicultural society.<sup>73</sup> CONIC envisions this society as one where Mayan nations, other indigenous communities as well as underprivileged groups have both the equal right to integrate into the broader society and the right to self-government and self-rule in local affairs. In this sense, CONIC's demands epitomize well the "inclusionary autonomies" categorization for it aims to autonomously organize indigenous societies not only via increased property rights and the protection of indigenous cultures but also via the progressive and democratic integration of indigenous peoples into Guatemalan society. This desire to promote a democratic and integrated state in the context of ethnic diversity is a common feature of this categorization.

The indigenous Pachakutik Movement in Ecuador also exemplifies the demands of what this thesis denominates as inclusionary autonomist movements. After the successful political mobilizations of CONAIE and the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of the Ecuadorean Amazon<sup>74</sup> (CONFENIAE), the Pachakutik Movement emerged in 1995 as a salient political organization seeking primarily to represent the interests of indigenous peoples and nations in Ecuadorean state institutions. As a political party, one of its main objectives has been to resist and oppose neoliberal policies as well as the unrestrained extraction of natural resources from indigenous territories. Its project has successfully resurrected and aimed to inject into mainstream Ecuadorean society historically-marginalized Andean and to a lesser extent, Amazonian cosmovisions and has pushed for the dissemination of the Andean principles of "Ama Shua, Ama Llulla, Ama Quilla", which translate as do not steal, do not lie, do not be lazy. It has also strived for a major electoral reform that would increase the tangible participation and influence of indigenous peoples in local and national affairs. At its core, the

---

<sup>73</sup> ———, "Propuesta de Ley General de Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas de Guatemala," ed. Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina (2009).

<sup>74</sup> Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonía Ecuatoriana.

Pachakutik Movement aspires to transform the Ecuadorean state via eliminating all systems of economic, socio-cultural and political oppression. It has aimed to liberate indigenous peoples and nations via providing them with the adequate institutional frameworks to gain political power and seize autonomy via increased participation in national affairs. Like CONIC, it has aimed to “re-define the state as plurinational, based on the plurinational and multiethnic fabric of its inhabitants.”<sup>75</sup> Today, despite being racked by internal strife, Pachakutik, in the words of Van Cott “has delivered many of the goods its constituents had sought, such as recognition of indigenous territories, bilingual education and political inclusion.”<sup>76</sup>

The Independent Social Alliance (formerly denominated the Indigenous Social Alliance)<sup>77</sup> (ASI) is also a case that needs to be explored, albeit briefly, in this chapter in order to understand the strategic dilemmas that indigenous movements and political parties face in Latin America. Whilst ASI can no longer be considered an “indigenous party” as such,<sup>78</sup> its original platform provides significant insights regarding native regional struggles for cultural integration and multiculturalism. ASI emerged in 1991 as a political platform to unite indigenous peoples and African-descendant communities against extractivist projects and institutionalized cultural marginalization. The 1991 Colombian Constitution had then recently opened previously nonexistent political spaces for indigenous and ethnic mobilization and representation in national institutions. Whereas the original principles and objectives of ASI were to achieve equal representation amidst cultural diversity, throughout the years it

---

<sup>75</sup> Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik-Nuevo País, "Plan de Gobierno Democrático del Estado Plurinacional: Iniciar lo Irreversible," (Quito: Coordinador Nacional del MUPP-NP, 2006), 12. *Translation mine.*

<sup>76</sup> Van-Cott, "Indigenous Movements Lose Momentum," 86.

<sup>77</sup> Alianza Social Independiente. Alianza Social Indígena. The change of name and the replacement of the word “indigenous” with “independent” signaled the leaders’ desire to broaden its constituency—even if that compromised core principles and objectives.

<sup>78</sup> Jackson, "Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers," 84.

has moved away from these indigenous-oriented goals in order to expand its political support nationally.<sup>79</sup> As it allowed the participation of an increasing number of non-indigenous actors into the movement and forged alliances with non-indigenous parties, ASI itself moved away from its initial support base. Today, it still promotes “the visions of a multiethnic, pluricultural [and] tolerant country”<sup>80</sup> but this is no longer its main objective. In this sense, while its original demands can be regarded as “inclusionary autonomist”, its current aspirations are more representative of other (non-indigenous) sectors of Colombian society. A similar process of de-indigenization of local politics can be seen in the case of the Popular Unity Party<sup>81</sup> (PUP) based in Oaxaca, Mexico. Whereas for more than a decade it represented the interests of the Triqui people,<sup>82</sup> its recent association with leftist and center-left political parties has led its strongest grassroots base, the Movement for the Unification of the Triqui Struggle<sup>83</sup> (MULT) to withdraw its support from the organization.<sup>84</sup>

ONIC, nevertheless, is a case of indigenous resistance and activism that does fit into the “inclusionary autonomist” categorization in Colombia. It has worked for the “participation of indigenous peoples and their representatives in decision-making processes and the execution of public policies [...] aiming to] enable conditions of equity within diversity and affect the economic and social development of the country.”<sup>85</sup> It has also called for the social and institutional recognition of ethnic indigenous identity.

---

<sup>79</sup> Van-Cott, "Indigenous Movements Lose Momentum," 88.

<sup>80</sup> Alianza Social Independiente, "Estatutos del Partido Versión con Modificaciones" (Bogotá: Alianza Social Independiente, 2013), 1.

<sup>81</sup> Partido de Unidad Popular.

<sup>82</sup> Francisco Martínez-Sánchez, "El Primer Partido Político Indígena en México," *Derecho y Cultura* enero-abril, no. 13 (2004).

<sup>83</sup> Movimiento de Unificación y Lucha Triqui.

<sup>84</sup> Noticias Net, "En asamblea comunitaria, el MULT acuerda separarse del PUP," *Noticias Net*(2012), <http://www.noticiasnet.mx/portal/blogs/epidiaz/20141216/asamblea-comunitaria-mult-acuerda-separarse-del-pup>.

<sup>85</sup> Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia, "Sobre Nosotros: Misión, Visión, Estructura," [http://www.onic.org.co/sobrenos\\_n.shtml](http://www.onic.org.co/sobrenos_n.shtml). *Translation mine.*

ONIC argues that this recognition will lead to increased participation and the establishment of self-government mechanisms for indigenous autonomy.<sup>86</sup> In this sense, their demands are consonant with the politics of multiculturalism. In the words of Jackson, "ONIC and its affiliates see themselves as transcending a territorial-based ethnicity, achieving a superior, supracommunity administrative level."<sup>87</sup> Similarly, the United Multiethnic Peoples of Amazonas<sup>88</sup> (PUAMA) in Venezuela has put forward a political project that aims to guarantee the political participation of indigenous peoples and communities in the exercise of governance. In the words of Van Cott, it "has helped win the region's most progressive regime of indigenous rights, including the right to guaranteed representation at national, state and, local levels."<sup>89</sup> In addition, PUAMA has argued that transformative changes, such as those envisioned by the Amazonian Regional Organization of Indigenous Peoples<sup>90</sup> (ORPIA) in the realms of education, health, property rights, employment and economic development, can only be achieved via an active involvement and participation of indigenous peoples in the public spaces of the state.<sup>91</sup>

Overall, indigenous movements and organizations that fall within this categorization firstly push for the official recognition of indigenous peoples by the nation-state and the dominant society. Furthermore, as this section has illustrated, once this recognition has been achieved, these movements seek to transform the nation-state in a multicultural, pluricultural or intercultural fashion. There is no doubt that these movements struggle for autonomy. But, contrary to other organizations, they

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Jackson, "Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers," 83.

<sup>88</sup> Pueblos Unidos Multiétnicos de Amazonas.

<sup>89</sup> Van-Cott, "Broadening Democracy: Latin America's Indigenous Peoples' Movements," 83.

<sup>90</sup> Organización Regional de los Pueblos Indígenas de Amazonas.

<sup>91</sup> María Teresa Quispe, *Venezuela: Gobiernos Locales y Pueblos Indígenas* (Puerto Ayacucho: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2005). 26-27.

envision autonomy and the liberation of their peoples in the form of political inclusion. It is through their progressive, independent and democratic participation in state institutions that they aim to effect change for the benefit of indigenous peoples, nations and communities. Other organizations that fall within this categorization are the National Indigenous Maya Ch'orti Council of Honduras<sup>92</sup> (CONIMCHH), the Central American Indigenous Council<sup>93</sup> (CICA), the Movement of Indigenous Peoples of Ecuador<sup>94</sup> (ECUARUNARI), the Indigenous Cultural Center of Peru<sup>95</sup> (CHIRAPAQ), the Confederation of Indigenous, Peasant and Black Organizations<sup>96</sup> (FENOCIN), and the Confederation of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia<sup>97</sup> (CIDOB).

### Territorial Autonomies

In addition to the numerous inclusionary autonomist movements studied in the former section, this chapter hypothesizes there is another category of indigenous movements and organizations in Latin America. The central feature of these movements is that they regard territory as pivotal to autonomy. In this sense, they make a close connection between indigenous liberation and autonomy, and territorial recovery, demarcation and titling. In contrast to the greater desire for ethnic integration espoused by inclusionary autonomist movements, the demands put forward by indigenous actors in this category possess an element of cultural and territorial self-imposed isolation. Rather than struggling for the establishment of a multicultural state, “territorial autonomist movements” call for decentralization, territorial self-government, self-management of local affairs as

---

<sup>92</sup> Consejo Nacional Indígena Maya Ch'ortí de Honduras.

<sup>93</sup> Consejo Indígena de Centro América.

<sup>94</sup> Ecuador Runakunapak Rikcharimuy (in Kickwa), Movimiento de los Indígenas del Ecuador (Spanish).

<sup>95</sup> Centro de Culturas Indígenas del Perú.

<sup>96</sup> Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Campesinas, Indígenas y Negras.

<sup>97</sup> Confederación de los Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia.

well as push for the attainment of political power in the realm of natural resources. Indigenous movements within this category include: the Council of All Lands<sup>98</sup> in Chile, the Indigenous Council of Roraima<sup>99</sup> (CIR) in Brazil, the Indigenous Confederation of Neuquén<sup>100</sup> in Argentina, the Zapatista National Liberation Army<sup>101</sup> (EZLN) in Mexico, the Indigenous Peoples of the Putumayo Zone<sup>102</sup> (OZIP) in Colombia and AIDESEP in Peru. This is certainly not a homogeneous categorization for even within this category indigenous autonomist demands range from land reforms, territorial demarcation and titling to the establishment of regimes of autonomy.

Since its foundation in 1986, OZIP has been at the forefront of the battle for territorial rights in the Department of Putumayo in Colombia. Its objective has been to work for the “conservation, recuperation and legalization of the resguardos in search for a territorial arrangement that takes into consideration the ethnic and cultural reality of the region.”<sup>103</sup> The rationale behind its territorial demands, OZIP argues, has been that territory is the bedrock of indigenous nations and peoples’ survival. Without territorial recovery and demarcation, autonomy is undermined by the influx of corporate agents in the region. Therefore, there is the need to fight for the enactment and implementation of policies that allow and protect the autonomous development of indigenous peoples. This development, according to OZIP, must be in harmony with the environment and local cosmovisions.<sup>104</sup> In like manner, CIR has been struggling since 1971 for the demarcation of indigenous lands in the northern state of Roraima in Brazil. Representing over 220 communities, amounting to

---

<sup>98</sup> Aukin Wallmapu Ngulam (Mapudungun). Consejo de Todas las Tierras (Spanish).

<sup>99</sup> Conselho Indígena de Roraima.

<sup>100</sup> Confederación Indígena Neuquina.

<sup>101</sup> Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional.

<sup>102</sup> Organización Zonal Indígena del Putumayo.

<sup>103</sup> Organización Zonal Indígena del Putumayo, "Nuestro Pensamiento: de los Conceptos y Principios Rectores," Organización Zonal Indígena del Putumayo, [http://ozip.org.co/sitio/?page\\_id=67](http://ozip.org.co/sitio/?page_id=67). Translation mine.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

50,000 people, CIR had aimed initially to secure autonomy rights for thirty-four indigenous lands—about 46% of the total territory of Roraima.<sup>105</sup> Nevertheless, as seen by the case of the 2005 presidential decree that recognized the indigenous land of Raposa Serra do Sol (TIRSS) in Roraima as a “single continuous territory”,<sup>106</sup> the Brazilian government in recent years has ruled in favor of the delimitation and demarcation of indigenous lands. In this context of changing policies, CIR has declared that:

Despite the fact that indigenous lands in Roraima have majoritarily been formally recognized through administrative acts, challenges still remain to ensure the communities effectively exercise their right to property against invaders [and] the usufruct of natural resources through administering their own forms of sustainable development and governing their territories according to their beliefs and customs, strengthening their autonomy.<sup>107</sup>

Furthermore, the Native Federation of Madre de Dios River<sup>108</sup> (FENAMAD) in Peru (member of AIDESEP) has represented the rights of the peoples and nations organized in state-recognized communities as well as those of groups in voluntary isolation.<sup>109</sup> FENAMAD’s demands fit right into the “territorial autonomies” categorization for they are focused on the recovery and protection

---

<sup>105</sup> Conselho Indígena de Roraima, “O CIR,” <http://cir.org.br/index.php/template/template-articles>.

<sup>106</sup> Presidência da República, “Decreto de 15 de Abril de 2005. Homologa a demarcação administrativa da Terra Indígena Raposa Serra do Sol, localizada nos Municípios de Normandia, Pacaraima e Uiramutã, no Estado de Roraima,” ed. Presidência da República Casa Civil Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos (Brasília2005).

<sup>107</sup> Conselho Indígena de Roraima, “O CIR”. *Translation mine.*

<sup>108</sup> Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes.

<sup>109</sup> Beatriz Huertas Castillo, *Indigenous Peoples in Isolation in the Peruvian Amazon: Their Struggle for Survival and Freedom* (Somerset: Transaction Publishers, 2004). 124-25.

of native lands and territories. Since 1982, the organization has called for the establishment and consolidation of indigenous state-recognized territories as well as the rights to exercise self-administration in local affairs and to follow native economic modes of development. Today, FENAMAD represents thirty-three communities and works for the demarcation and legal protection of indigenous territories, with significant emphasis on those territories inhabited by indigenous peoples in voluntary isolation.<sup>110</sup> Large scale mining, illegal logging, as well as other infrastructure projects have threatened the survival of indigenous peoples like the Mashco Piro, who have until now decided to remain in isolation. In this context, FENAMAD has declared that autonomy is contingent on territorial recuperation and control:

Territory is the vital condition for the existence of indigenous peoples for it is their source of nourishment, tools, medicine and resources for the construction of housing. It is the place where the spirituality of a people, its history and knowledge rises and develops.

The [socio-economic and cultural] conditions of indigenous peoples depend on the conditions of the territory and the resources there found. If an indigenous people can access its territory without problems and if it can have at its safe disposal a wide variety and quantity of natural resources, then that people will enjoy well-being.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes, "Quiénes Somos: Historia," Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes, <http://www.fenamad.org.pe/quienes-somos/historia/>.

<sup>111</sup> ——, "Programas: Territorio," Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes, <http://www.fenamad.org.pe/programas/territorio/>. *Translation mine.*

The Wallmapuwen Movement is another example of “territorial autonomist movements”. Since 2005, this movement (later established as a political party) has demanded the Chilean government to grant self-determination and autonomy to the Mapuche people. Although Wallmapuwen does not identify itself as an indigenous or ethnic group organization per se, its goals are focused on providing self-determination and autonomy to the Mapuche people of Ngulumapu. In this context, Wallmapuwen calls for the decentralization of the Chilean state and the enactment of a regime of territorial autonomy in south-central Chile. In addition, it calls for the establishment of a Mapuche Assembly to proactively and accurately represent the needs of the local population. Within this regime of autonomy, Wallmapuwen also envisions the ruling of a Mapuche popularly-elected leader, who would preside over the internal affairs of the “Mapuche-country.” Despite the fact that their autonomist project has, at times, been misinterpreted and misrepresented as a separatist and irredentist project, Wallmapuwen has reaffirmed that it only aims to reconstruct the Mapuche-country within the boundaries of the Chilean nation-state.

Wallmapuwen aspires for the creation of democratic autonomous institutions for the Mapuche country (an executive and parliament of our own) that recover our identity and allow us to govern ourselves and decide over our own life and future as a people [...] this autonomous framework will allow us to develop our own health and education systems [...] our own welfare state with our own budget through tax collection. [...] In Wallmapuwen, we are working for the materialization of autonomy and self-government within the state. [In the Mapuche country] people will

have the right to learn and use the Mapuzungun language in their daily lives and they will have the right to consider themselves Mapuche citizens without being discriminated or asked any proof of whiteness.<sup>112</sup>

Also based in Ngulumapu (Chile), the Council of All Lands has engaged from the 1990s onwards in processes of Mapuche territorial recovery and “symbolic” occupation of lands. In line with the “territorial autonomies” categorization, this organization has struggled for the establishment of an autonomous region south of the Bio-Bio River.<sup>113</sup> For the past ten years, the main objective has been to achieve a form of self-government that is not subjected to the power of the state but that rather works concomitantly with it. This is what Aucán Huilcamán, leader of the movement, has referred to as “co-government” or “parallel government.”<sup>114</sup> This project entails a political, economic and administrative power-sharing arrangement between two different yet equal societies (Chilean and Mapuche). In this sense, the Council of All Lands, deviates from other “territorial autonomist” projects such as those put forward by CIR, OZIP and FENAMAD. The Council of All Lands, while still pushing for territorial autonomy, goes one step further by aiming to challenge and transform the asymmetrical character of the Chilean-Mapuche relation. For its part, from late 1980s, the Zapatista revolution in the Mexican southeast set into motion a process of autonomization of indigenous politics in the region. At the core of their political project was the construction of local autonomous spaces and governments, like the *caracoles*.

---

<sup>112</sup> Partido Autonomista Mapuche Wallmapuwen, "Preguntas Frecuentes," Partido Autonomista Mapuche Wallmapuwen, <http://www.wallmapuwen.net/preguntas-frecuentes-2/>; *ibid. Translation mine.*

<sup>113</sup> Fernando Pairicán, "Sembrando ideología: el Aukiñ Wallmapu Ngulam en la transición de Aylwin (1990-1994)," *SudHistoria* enero-junio, no. 4 (2012): 27-29.

<sup>114</sup> Alejandro Saavedra, *Los Mapuche en la sociedad chilena actual* (Santiago: Lom Ediciones, 2002). 129.

Overall, these “territorial autonomist movements” put forward an understanding of autonomy that is contingent on territory. Contrary to the “inclusionary autonomist movements”, OZIP, CIR, FENAMAD, Council of All Lands and the Wallmapuwen Movement, amongst many others in Latin America, do not seek to achieve self-rule and self-administration via de-territorialized arrangements (i.e., political representation, racial quotas, intercultural education, etc.). Rather, they aim to exercise their right to autonomy from within their lands and territories. It is a form of autonomy that requires the nation-state to first recognize the existence of native lands and consequently, to regulate indigenous peoples’ rights to collective property and the demarcation and titling of their lands. As this section has illustrated, this categorization contains within itself a wide diversity of demands that range from decentralization, land rights, land titling, territorial regional autonomy arrangements as well as territorially-based co-government initiatives. In some cases, these movements demand state recognition of their territories. This is particularly the case with indigenous peoples and nations which inhabit Amazonian regions (e.g., CIR and FENAMAD), which are increasingly vulnerable to the influx of non-indigenous migrants and corporate agents. Movements like Wallmapuwen and Council of All Lands, while challenging the asymmetrical relation between state and Mapuche parties, still seek government recognition and the enactment of autonomous regimes. EZLN is a *sui generis* case within this category for after the failure of the Mexican state in fulfilling the obligations set out in the San Andres Accords, the Zapatista insurrection set into motion a local process for the reconstruction of autonomy in the Chiapas highlands.

### Alternative Autonomies

There are some indigenous movements and organizations in Latin America, which are neither “inclusionary” nor “territorially” autonomist. Amongst them are the Council of Miskitu Elders in the Eastern Coast of Nicaragua and the Mapuche Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee (CAM) in Chile. In addition, the ideology of the late Aymara Amauta, Fausto Reinaga, also belongs to this categorization but there is as of today no active political movement in the Andean region which revives this radical form of indigenous autonomism. In this sense, Fausto Reinaga, for the most part, only survives in the collective memory and political imaginary of Aymaran and Quechuan peoples. Overall, as this thesis hypothesizes, the movements in this categorization have been seldom studied by contemporary scholars of Latin America. Their demands remain largely unheeded and marginalized within current literature. Therefore, to fill this empirical and theoretical gap, this thesis in its latter chapters thoroughly studies two of these movements: the Council of Miskitu Elders and CAM. It is, however, methodologically difficult to explore in detail the articulations of autonomy espoused by Indianismo, for there is no Indianista movement as such. The following paragraphs, however, aim to briefly examine the ideology of Indianismo so as to draw some parallels and differences between this categorization and the two previous ones.

Indianismo calls for the restoration of the Tawantinsuyo and Qollasuyo to recover the respect for symbols, signs and ancestral indigenous values. In the 1970s, Indianismo and its ideological partner, Katarismo, gave foundation to the Tupaj Katari Revolutionary Movement<sup>115</sup> (MRTK) and the Indian Movement Tupaj Katari<sup>116</sup> (MITKA). In contrast to the “inclusionary autonomist” and “territorially autonomist” movements studied in the previous sections, the Indianista-Katarista movement rejects the Bolivian state and condemns the exploitative nature of the

---

<sup>115</sup> Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Katari.

<sup>116</sup> Movimiento Indio Tupac Katari.

current political system, one which continues to subjugate indigenous peoples. For this movement, self-determination and autonomy are only possible through the decolonization of the state. This process requires the revival of and return to the indigenous systems of *Ayllu* and *Qamiri*<sup>117</sup>, which regulate the socio-political and economic realms of indigenous life. In addition, the Kataristas reject the calls for multiculturalism and plurinationality for they regarded them as colonialist projects in essence. Katarista militant and *Qulla* intellectual leader, José Luis Saavedra, outlines this idea:

Plurinationality as a model belongs to the North American (neo) liberal multiculturalism. What we are proposing here, as an alternative is to enhance the economic and political potential of the Quechua and Aymara peoples via *Qulla* hegemony. We are not here to petition for an insignificant representation in Parliament, we do not plea either for racial quotas in the Presidential Cabinet and nor are we pleased with the six or seven indigenous special circumscriptions given to us. We can, we must and we aspire to exercise absolute power.<sup>118</sup>

Furthermore, the Indianista-Katarista movement rejects national reparations and monetary compensation for indigenous peoples as a desirable path towards liberation. The Indianista-Katarista ideology also calls for pre-colonial sovereignty and decolonization as the only means to achieve self-determination

---

<sup>117</sup> *Ayllu* was the fundamental unit of Inca socio-politico organization. *Qamiri*, in turn, denotes an ancestral system of reciprocal distribution of resources amongst the community.

<sup>118</sup> José Luis Saavedra, "El devenir del proceso katarista e indianista," in *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización. Katarismo e indianismo en el proceso político del MAS en Bolivia* (La Paz: Fondo Editorial Pukara, 2010). Translation mine.

and autonomy. This thesis will explore this “alternative autonomies” categorization in detail in the following chapters. However, from briefly analyzing the case of Indianismo-Katarismo, it can be argued that these movements’ articulations of autonomy challenge the foundations of the nation-state and seek to re-construct native pre-colonial societies and systems of government in an anti-Western fashion.

### **Taxonomy of Indigenous Autonomy in Latin America**

This study of forty-six indigenous movements and organizations in Latin America found out that Latin American indigenous demands range from political inclusion and the creation of a multicultural state to a more intrinsic understanding of autonomy, which calls for territorial rights and self-government in local affairs. A third categorization, this thesis postulates, aims to escape the Western inclusionist institutional framework and to liberate indigenous peoples and nations from the grip of colonialism. The following diagram shows the differences between “inclusionary”, “territorial” and “alternative” definitions of autonomy by indigenous movements in the region.

INCLUSION	MODERATE AUTONOMY	RADICAL AUTONOMY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognizes state institutions and seeks to participate in national decision-making process</li> <li>• Demands access to state institutions and the election of indigenous representatives to national assemblies</li> <li>• The creation of an inclusive, multiethnic, multicultural state</li> <li>• Constitutional reforms that allow indigenous languages, religions, traditions and symbols to be officialized in local areas</li> <li>• Bilingual and intercultural education</li> <li>• Demarcation, titling and legalization of indigenous lands</li> <li>• Aspirations framed within the structure of the state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calls for the decentralization and democratization of the state</li> <li>• Demands the creation of autonomous regions within the state</li> <li>• Does not contest the values of Western civilization and seeks to embrace inclusiveness of non-indigenous peoples</li> <li>• Denies aspirations of independence</li> <li>• Seeks self-government within autonomous regions (ancestral lands)</li> <li>• Interprets self-determination in accordance to international covenants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rejects the notion of the Westphalian state (both as concept and entity)</li> <li>• Rejects national symbols and institutions</li> <li>• Denounces the commodification of natural resources and the destruction of indigenous ancestral lands</li> <li>• Calls for the reinforcement of the traditional family-based communal system of organization to replace Western party-systems</li> <li>• Aims to decolonize socio-political practices</li> <li>• Rejects the notion of multiculturalism</li> <li>• Seeks to exercise absolute power</li> </ul>

Figure 1.1 Spectrum of Autonomist Demands.

## Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that indigenous demands in Latin America are diverse and heterogeneous. Contingent on colonial histories, policies of mestizaje and the influx of neoliberal regimes in the region, indigenous movements have put forward distinct political projects to achieve autonomy. In this context, this chapter has shown that while some movements adamantly challenge the foundations of the colonial state, others have opted for less antagonistic strategies, such as the disposition to engage in dialogue and negotiation with national elites. There are also other movements, which desire to pursue a politics of indigenous national reconstruction by pushing for the establishment and regulation of regimes of territorial autonomy.

The study of forty-six indigenous movements and organizations in the region has produced a taxonomy of indigenous demands. Organizations like Pachakutik, FENOCIN and PUAMA have set into motion a process of political participation into state institutions. They push for the multiculturalization, pluriculturalization or the interculturalization of the state for they believe this will open institutional spaces for a fair and democratic representation of indigenous aspirations and demands. Other movements, such as the Council of All Lands, AIDESEP and OZIP

work for the enactment of territorial autonomy arrangements. Contrary to the mostly de-territorialized demands of the “inclusionary” movements, the movements in this second categorization argue that autonomy is contingent on territory and that progressive regimes in the region must be disseminated if indigenous peoples are to ever be politically autonomous. A third categorization calls for decolonization and the rejection of the nation-state. This third categorization is the main subject of study of this thesis and will be explored in detail in the following chapters.



## **Chapter II: Indigenous Autonomy and Multiculturalism**

### **Introduction**

The previous chapter provided a comprehensive and holistic study of indigenous demands in contemporary Latin America. It also illustrated that indigenous articulations of autonomy are far from homogeneous. From demands for recognition and political inclusion to regional autonomy arrangements and other alternative approaches to seizing autonomy, indigenous movements in the region continue to challenge the ideological premises of a *de facto* unitary mestizo state. The taxonomy of indigenous demands in Latin America presented in the previous chapter, however, aids to our understanding of what indigenous agents envision as “autonomy.” Aiming to address indigenous demands and grievances, post-1980s and 1990s, major constitutional changes swept the region. The legislation of a myriad of multicultural schemes, self-government and autonomous arrangements epitomized the new endeavor by Latin American states to simultaneously include and grant some degree of autonomy to indigenous peoples inhabiting “national” lands. Some of these amendments include the establishment of a unique territorial autonomy in the Eastern Coast of Nicaragua in 1987; the enactment of the Colombian *resguardos* following the constitutional reforms of 1991; the creation of three additional *comarcas* in Panama in 1996, 1997 and 2000; the implementation of the *territorios indígenas* in Venezuela in 1999; and the legislation of the *Territorio Indígena Originario Campesino* (Original Peasant Indigenous Territory, TIOC) by the Bolivian Constitution of 2009.

This chapter primarily seeks to address a simple yet unheeded question, are these progressive approaches towards multiculturalism and regimes of autonomy suited to the demands of indigenous peoples studied in the previous chapter? To do that,

this chapter digs into the ideological foundations of multicultural theory to understand how these policies affect indigenous collective agents in their everyday lives. Whether interpreted as state decentralization, self-administration in public policy sectors, devolution of powers to local indigenous authorities, self-government, regional demarcated autonomy or federacy arrangements, the current canon on indigenous autonomy has largely focused on a top-down re-evaluation of state structures to accommodate indigenous demands. Nevertheless, the question here is whether these multicultural models heed to indigenous political projects. Within political theory, Kymlicka's approach to federacy, Lijphart's consociationalism and Baubock's pluralistic federation are some of the most influential approaches in this realm of studies.

The problem, however, this chapter argues in its first section is that these approaches draw from a liberal theory of minority rights and therefore are embedded in a framework that assumes the desirability of Western individuality and Eurocentric forms of government. There is a major flaw in the fabrication of autonomous arrangements, which draw from liberal democratic theory as certain indigenous peoples are eventually included into the very political structure from which they seek autonomy. By denying indigenous agents the right to create and define the terms of their collective existence, this canon not only misinterprets but also marginalizes those demands that elude Western conceptualizations of autonomy—such as the ones hypothesized as “alternative autonomies” in Chapter I.

In addition, this chapter in its second section studies the work of prominent scholars of Latin America such as Charles Hale, José Antonio Lucero and Nancy Grey Postero in order to understand how these multicultural models and policies are executed in practice by nation-states in the region. These scholars question

the feasibility of present-day multiculturalism in fulfilling Latin American indigenous peoples' autonomist demands. However, they do so not by challenging the foundations of liberal multiculturalism (as this chapter does) but by arguing that the promise of multiculturality in Latin America has been shadowed by the renewed backbone of economic growth: resource extractivism as the preponderant model of economic development in the region. This way, they argue, formal autonomy is no more than a rhetorical strategy utilized by the nation-state to gain international credibility and hinder the radicalization of indigenous movements. This second section of the chapter is essential to understand the ambivalent framework within which multiculturalism unfolds in the region.

Finally, this chapter also introduces and explores current studies of indigenous autonomy in Latin America. This third section of the chapter argues that research on this area has so far not aimed to systematically make sense of indigenous demands in the region. Currently, no explicit endeavor has been made to outline, describe, categorize and theorize indigenous demands in Latin America. In this context, whilst vast amount of work has been dedicated to the analysis of the successes and setbacks of indigenous activism, the more fundamental question of what these indigenous agents demand remains largely unexplored in current literature. As epitomized by the works of Yashar, Willem Assies, Richard Falk, Jean E. Jackson, Kay B. Warren, Sieder, Postero, Zamosc, Van Cott and Gustafson,<sup>119</sup> these indigenous demands are at best, typologized in a reductionist fashion, at

---

<sup>119</sup> See Yashar, "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America." Assies, Haar, and Hoekema, "Diversity as a Challenge: A Note on the Dilemmas of Diversity." Falk, "The Right of Self-Determination under International Law: The Coherence of Doctrine versus the Incoherence of Experience." Jackson, "Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers." Sieder, "Introduction." Postero and Zamosc, "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America."; Van-Cott, *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*. Gustafson, "Manipulating Cartographies: Plurinationalism, Autonomy and Indigenous Resurgence in Bolivia."

worst, lumped together under the monolithic notion of “self-determination and autonomy.”

## **Indigenous Autonomy in Contemporary Institutional Engineering**

The current array of formal indigenous autonomous regimes and territorial autonomy arrangements in Latin America stems from a liberal framework of minority rights. To understand the adequacy of the current autonomous arrangements in the region—and indeed, their significance vis-à-vis indigenous demands—it is essential to explore and make sense of the theoretical premises of multiculturalism. As a body of thought, multiculturalism arises out of the 1970s-1980s communitarian critique, linked especially to Charles Taylor and Michael Sandel<sup>120</sup>, of the normative value of community and the ontological presumptions of the self-embedded in liberal theory. This critique was instigated by the writings of John Rawls<sup>121</sup>, in particular his universalist theory of justice. Contrary to the atomistic assumptions of liberal theory, this critique posited a more collectivist framework that embraces the intrinsic value of culture and identity in the life of citizens. As a result, for the first time, the notion of a ‘politics of recognition’ was brought to the fore in political theory.

---

<sup>120</sup> Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, ed. Amy Gutmann (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); ———, *Irreducibly Social Goods* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995). Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

<sup>121</sup> John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Boston: President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1971). ———, "Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory: The Dewey Lectures 1980," *Journal of Philosophy* 77(1980); ———, "Social Unity and Primary Goods," in *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, ed. Amartya Sen and Bernard Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

This sensitization to cultural diversity also harbored a philosophical schism within liberal scholarship. A heated debate between orthodox liberals like Rawls and Donald Dworkin<sup>122</sup> and more communitarian style liberals like Kymlicka gave rise to a theory that, for the first time *within* liberalism, provides a normative framework suited to the realities of cultural diversity. Taking for granted the cultural and ethnic diversity of the citizenry, multiculturalism, albeit in distinct ways, grants a set of group-differentiated rights to address the socio-politico and economic disadvantages that accrue from minority status within society. Regardless of the theoretical gap between communitarians and liberal-communitarians like Kymlicka, they concur in the belief that culture plays a fundamental role in the fabric of society and, as such, that it requires special recognition and accommodation.

Pivotal to the development of a theory of minority rights in the late 1980s, Iris M. Young explored the 'paradox of democracy' by studying and examining the oppressive nature of the one-size-fits-all political model imposed by liberal democracy. Her concept of a "differentiated citizenship" refers to a special set of rights that provide the opportunity for excluded, marginalized, and powerless social groups to voice their needs and interests through participatory democratic schemes and mechanisms of group representation.<sup>123</sup> This idea of a "differentiated citizenship" was further explored by Kymlicka, who espoused the idea of accommodating the distinct needs of cultural groups without "sacrificing [the] core commitments to individual freedom and

---

<sup>122</sup> Ronald Dworkin, *Taking Rights Seriously* (London: Duckworth, 1977). "Liberalism," in *Public and Private Morality*, ed. Stuart Hampshire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978). ——, "What is Equality? Part I: Equality of Welfare," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (1981); ——, "What is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 4 (1981); ——, "In Defense of Equality," *Social Philosophy & Policy* 1(1983).

<sup>123</sup> Iris Marion Young, "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship," *Ethics* 99, no. 2 (1989): 110; ——, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

social equality”<sup>124</sup> upheld by liberalism. Kymlicka presents a political process that through mechanisms of special representation, polyethnic rights and entitlement to self-determination, safeguards sub-state identities from the excessive influence of dominant cultures.<sup>125</sup> Overall, his theory of multicultural citizenship puts forward the most persuasive and influential argument within liberal theory in favor of granting special group rights to indigenous peoples.

Kymlicka’s defense of indigenous rights originates from his distinctive bifurcation of the social whole into two concomitant spheres: political and cultural communities. In *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, he asserts:

On the one hand, there is a political community, within which individuals exercise the rights and responsibilities entailed by the framework of liberal justice. People who reside within the same political community are fellow citizens. On the other hand, there is the cultural community, within which individuals form and revise their aims and ambitions. People within the same cultural community share a culture, a language and history which defines their cultural membership.<sup>126</sup>

Since modern-day democracies are compounded of more than one cultural community, Kymlicka postulates that under the premises of liberal justice, the decisions and interests of the members of minority groups, like indigenous peoples, are at constant risk of being undermined by the rulings of the

---

<sup>124</sup> Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> ———, *Liberalism, Community and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 135.

majoritarian culture. For indigenous peoples, this is the case in terms of equal job opportunity, family law, preservation of cosmological views, defense of territory, and political autonomy. Kymlicka illustrates this inequality by broaching the issues indigenous peoples face in Canada,

A two-year old Inuit girl who has no project faces inequality. Without special political protection, like the restrictions on the rights of transient workers, by the time she is eighteen the existence of the cultural community in which she grew up is likely to be undermined by the decisions of people outside the community. This is true no matter what choices she decides to pursue. Conversely, an English-Canadian boy will not face that problem, no matter what choices he makes<sup>127</sup>.

In this context, for Kymlicka, to secure the equal treatment of all citizens is to transcend Rawls's 'overlapping consensus'<sup>128</sup> and rather compensate minority groups for the unequal circumstances they encounter in their everyday lives. It is precisely this rectification of inequality that serves as a basis for Kymlicka's defense of indigenous rights. He asserts, "[...] we can defend aboriginal rights as a response not to shared choices but to unequal circumstances."<sup>129</sup>

Furthermore, Kymlicka's revised liberalism offers a stronger protection to indigenous groups on the basis of the consideration that unlike immigrants and other national minorities, they were involuntarily incorporated into the nation-state via conquest,

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>128</sup> Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*.

<sup>129</sup> Kymlicka, *Liberalism, Community and Culture*: 187.

colonization, international treaties or independence wars. Currently, they seek “greater powers of self-government so as to maintain their status as culturally distinct and self-governing societies within the larger state.”<sup>130</sup> Therefore, to address their demands, Kymlicka proposes a more extensive scope of rights, including: legislative powers important to their culture (i.e. education, language, resource development, etc.), intergovernmental representation, control over immigration and self-government in autonomous territories.<sup>131</sup> But, in addition to promoting these rights, in *Politics in the Vernacular*, Kymlicka calls into question the underlying principles of federalism since—drawing from the cases of the United States and Canada—“far from empowering Indian peoples, [federalism] has simply increased their vulnerability, by making their self-governance subject to encroachment from both federal and state/provincial governments.”<sup>132</sup>

The solution, for Kymlicka, is not to redefine reserve lands to give indigenous peoples an equal federal status, for “[...] Indian peoples do not want to be treated as federal subunits, since the sort of self-government they seek involves a very different set of powers from that exercised by provinces.”<sup>133</sup> For him, the current jurisdictional impasse that constrains the political leverage of indigenous peoples in crucial areas can only be rectified by enacting a federacy system, a term which he borrows from Daniel Elazar. In contrast to the equal and symmetrical status of federal subunits, a federacy is an “asymmetrical permanent linkage between two self-government units with the larger having specific power within the smaller in exchange for specific privileges.”<sup>134</sup> In

---

<sup>130</sup> ———, “Being Canadian,” *Government and Opposition* 38, no. 3 (2003): 369.

<sup>131</sup> ———, *Multicultural Citizenship*

<sup>132</sup> ———, *Politics in the Vernacular* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). 112.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> Elazar states that the smaller polity gains greater autonomy but surrenders its right to play a greater role in the governance of the larger power. This is the rationale behind federacy arrangements. Daniel Judah Elazar, *Constitutionalizing Globalization: the Postmodern Revival of Confederational Arrangements* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield

addition, a federacy provides greater flexibility in redefining self-government powers to suit the interests and needs of indigenous peoples.<sup>135</sup> Under a federacy:

Rather than possessing the standard rights and powers held by federal subunits, and governing under the same rules which apply to federal subunits, [the units] instead possess a set of group-specific powers and exemptions which partially removes them from the federal process, by reducing the jurisdiction of both the federal and state/provincial governments over them.<sup>136</sup>

For Kymlicka, a federacy, in contrast to other non-separatist and non-federalist alternatives to the quest for self-determination,<sup>137</sup> provides a laudable decentralized alternative in which indigenous peoples simultaneously recover self-government rights and redefine their polity as a self-constitutive unit in a variety of realms. However, beyond decentralization, it is the asymmetrical character of a federacy that undergirds a fairer interaction between the two polities. In this context, Kymlicka endorses federacy arrangements within a multinational federation as the optimal “solution” in granting geographically concentrated indigenous peoples special rights to self-determination and autonomy.

The relevance of Kymlicka’s multicultural theory to autonomism in Latin America is hampered by two central factors.

---

Publishers, 1998). 8. ——, *Exploring Federalism* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1987).

<sup>135</sup> Under a federacy, indigenous peoples can choose to be exempted from international treaties and national laws that undermine local socio-politico and economic practices.

<sup>136</sup> Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular*: 111-12.

<sup>137</sup> These include power-sharing arrangements, consociationalism, symmetrical and non-symmetrical confederation, associated statehood, and union, amongst others.

First, his stern commitment to defend individual autonomy from internal restrictions imposed by cultural structures and ascribed identities utterly undermines the right of indigenous peoples to recover, revitalize and establish their own socio-politico principles and economic structures—a process that often recurs to what Gayatri Spivak has called “strategic essentialism”, namely, a process through which ethnic identity is “essentialized” or recognized as a stable and unchanged entity for practical political purposes.<sup>138</sup> Second, his inherent allegiance to “modern liberal forms of governance” precludes tangibly non-western forms of autonomy from flourishing even within his proposed federacy arrangements. In relation to this last factor, he contends,

There is a real issue here, but I think that many people exaggerate it, and misidentify it. First, it is simply untrue that most conflicts between ethnocultural groups in the West are over the legitimacy of liberal principles. On the contrary, most members of most groups accept liberal democratic norms, whether they are immigrants or national minorities.<sup>139</sup>

This claim will be disputed in this thesis. In addition to this groundless presumption about the acceptance of liberal principles by indigenous peoples, Kymlicka’s overall theory exudes at best, epistemological blindness or at best, denotes the perpetuation of symbolic violence, imposed upon the represented indigenous subject, from Rawls and Dworkin to Young in regards to defining autonomy. His “equality argument” leaves no space for the right of independent action and sovereignty that lies at the heart of the struggle for indigenous autonomy. Kymlicka aims to include

---

<sup>138</sup> Chris Barker, *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice* (London: SAGE Publications Inc., 2012). 250.

<sup>139</sup> Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular*: 60.

indigenous peoples into the very political structures from which many of them (as the next chapter will illustrate) seek autonomy. Via the redefinition of the politics of citizenship, Kymlicka expects to thwart the rising tide of indigenous autonomist movements in liberal democracies. Liberal multicultural reforms, he asserts, are already surfacing across continents,

Consider the revival of the treaty rights through the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand, the recognition of land rights for Aboriginal Australians in the *Mabo* decision; the creation of the Sami Parliament in Scandinavia, the evolution of 'Home Rule' for the Inuit of Greenland; and the laws and court cases upholding self-determination rights for American Indian tribes (not no mention the flood of legal and constitutional changes recognizing indigenous rights in Latin America). In all these countries, there is a gradual but real process of decolonization taking place, as indigenous peoples regain their lands and self-government.<sup>140</sup>

By touting liberal multiculturalism as the most suitable foundation for the propagation of indigenous rights, Kymlicka hinders the possibility of challenging Western democratic deliberation and colonial institutional structures as the only means for indigenous peoples to achieve autonomy. As the epitome of non-orthodox liberalism, he is the most prominent and influential figure in the theorization of indigenous rights to self-determination and autonomy. Nonetheless, there are also other approaches to redefining the interaction between state and indigenous peoples. These efforts emanate also from the field of

---

<sup>140</sup> ——, "Being Canadian," 372.

institutional engineering and include most prominently the works of Lijphart and Bauböck.<sup>141</sup> Whereas neither of these political models has been designed to suit the particular demands of indigenous peoples, they are of significance in revealing the current scholarly approaches to autonomy.

Lijphart's consociationalism is one of the most influential works in the realm of comparative politics and institutional engineering. It originated in late 1960s when he published two of his groundbreaking texts: *Typologies of Democratic Systems* and *The Politics of Accommodation*. His empirically grounded normative theory addresses the issues at stake in the reconciliation and reconstruction of deeply divided societies. Aiming to accommodate ethnic diversity through non-territorial arrangements, Lijphart puts forward a progressive scheme based on guaranteed group representation, consensus and power-sharing. His theory draws from his early awareness of a paradox in his native homeland, the Netherlands, where despite the existence of steadfast enclaves, a strong and stable democracy prevails.<sup>142</sup>

Lijphart's consociational model posits a challenge to orthodox democracy. Contrary to the "winner takes all" politics of the majoritarian system, consociationalism requires the formation of a coalition government, which must include all members of the pluralistic society. Depending on the form of government, this coalition can take the form of a grand coalition cabinet in parliamentary systems, a grand advisory council, or a grand

---

<sup>141</sup> Other works have also contributed to this literature. Brian Barry's "cooperation without cooptation" system has at times been broached as a solution to divided societies. However, the inherent reductionism of his theory—especially his attempt to prolong the rule of the "moderate majority" at the expense of the minority—precludes his theory from surfacing as a real and serious alternative to reconcile ethnic divisions. Similarly, Donald Horowitz's "alternative vote" relies, like Barry, on the perpetual rule of the "moderate majority." In this sense, he disregards the desire of ethnic minorities to redefine current structures. Furthermore, the notion of granting autonomy *per se* to ethnic minorities is absent from both, Barry's and Horowitz's theory. Thus, their works are excluded from this research.

<sup>142</sup> This is commonly regarded as the "Dutch-paradox."

coalition of officeholders in a presidential system. In addition, there are three other key elements of consociational democracy, which are: mutual veto power, guaranteed proportionality in political representation (PR) and extensive autonomy in internal affairs for each ethnic group.<sup>143</sup> Due to its frequent practical applications worldwide,<sup>144</sup> it is crucial to examine and assess consociationalism in the task of revisiting the current designs at play affecting indigenous peoples and their autonomist demands.

Via the creation of ethnic political parties, which represent minority groups, Lijphart asserts that grand coalitions in the executive and proportional representation in the legislative branch will provide the institutional space for minority groups to voice demands that were previously overlooked or marginalized by the majoritarian government. In addition, Lijphart proposes mutual veto power as a crucial element to empower ethnic minorities in decision-making processes, granting a leeway to reject policies or legal rulings that could adversely affect them. Overall, the purpose of this veto is to prevent these groups from being outvoted by the majority—either by formal or informal mechanisms. However, it is not Lijphart's grand coalition, PR, or even mutual veto power that makes his theory noteworthy here. Rather, it is his distinctive stance on autonomy. He argues that “segmental autonomy”:

[...] entails minority rule: rule by the minority over itself in the area of the minority's exclusive concern. It is the logical corollary of the grand coalition principle. On all matters of common interest, decisions should be made by all of the segments together with roughly

---

<sup>143</sup> Arend Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 25.

<sup>144</sup> Some examples include but are not limited to Cyprus, Lebanon, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, Netherlands, South Africa and Colombia. To a lesser or larger extent these countries adopted elements of consociational democracy.

proportional degrees of influence. On all other matters, however, their decisions and their execution can be left to the separate segments.<sup>145</sup>

In contrast to Kymlicka, Lijphart presents a sound defense of federal theory. In his words, a relatively decentralized federation is “undoubtedly an excellent way to provide autonomy for [minority] groups.”<sup>146</sup> He posits that when ethnic groups are geographically concentrated, federalism can be approached as a consociational method to redress an unequal distribution of powers. This flows from the argument that federal boundaries will coincide with the ethnic constituent segments,<sup>147</sup> thereby enabling the design of regional autonomies.<sup>148</sup> Nevertheless, throughout his work, Lijphart provides a loosely defined notion of autonomy where “groups run their own internal affairs, especially in the areas of education and culture.”<sup>149</sup> In this context, he contends that the scope of segmental autonomy will depend on the particular historical and socio-politico contexts of each national society. As well as being vague, this way of formulating his principle clearly gives the state in question predominance when deciding how autonomy will be practiced. In this sense at least, Lijphart’s model remains statist rather than autonomist.

In contrast to Kymlicka’s federacy, Lijphart’s federal arrangements presuppose shared-sovereignty amongst the parties. This in turn further relegates the most fundamental premises of indigenous autonomy, namely the right as self-constituting nations to create, define and regulate the terms of

---

<sup>145</sup> Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies*: 41.

<sup>146</sup> ———, “Constitutional Design for Divided Societies,” *Journal of Democracy* 15, no. 2 (2004): 104.

<sup>147</sup> ———, *Democracy in Plural Societies*: 42.

<sup>148</sup> In the case of geographically dispersed ethnic minorities, Lijphart proposes the implementation of non-territorial autonomy arrangements such as educational and religious autonomy.

<sup>149</sup> Lijphart, “Constitutional Design for Divided Societies,” 97.

their collective existence. In addition, power-sharing elements such as those of grand coalition and PR regimes require the rearticulation of indigenous mobilization into political parties—further aggravating the internal fragmentation of indigenous activism and enabling cooption by the national state. Ultimately, despite their distinct approaches to a centrifugal reconfiguration of the state, Kymlicka and Lijphart concur on the desirability of liberal inclusion rather than thoroughgoing autonomism. Overall, their theories stem from a paternalist Western endeavor to tenuously palliate the inequalities in the racial and ethnic distribution of wealth and power.

Bauböck, meanwhile, advances a pluralist approach to the dilemma of federation and secession. For him, the solution to the quest for self-determination by national minorities lies in the redefinition of federal arrangements, rather than their abandonment. He contends that certain national minorities, like indigenous peoples, have a primary right to self-determination and self-government based on a historical experience of colonial resettlement and confinement to reserve-like territories.<sup>150</sup> This collective desire for autonomy, he asserts, liberal democracies "should accommodate rather than attempt to overcome"<sup>151</sup>. Overall, his normative theory argues for a large-scale decentralization of the state to allow for geographically concentrated indigenous groups to re-organize their communities into federal autonomous subunits. He states,

Territorial autonomy in multinational  
states will therefore provide [...]  
indigenous minorities with means to

---

<sup>150</sup> Rainer Bauböck, "Why Stay Together? a Pluralist Approach to Secession and Federation," in *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, ed. Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (New York: Oxford Scholarship Online, 2000), 386-87.

<sup>151</sup> ———, "Multinational Federalism:Territorial or Cultural Autonomy?," in *Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations*, ed. Ronald Stade (Sweden: International Migration and Ethnic Relations, 2001), 14.

establish their distinct languages, legal or educational systems and to promote their own national histories in the public sphere.<sup>152</sup>

In addition, Bauböck calls into question both, Kymlicka's federacy arrangements and Lijphart's consociational methods. On the one hand, he argues that *prima facie* the asymmetrical character of a federacy grants national minorities more flexibility in their execution of autonomy, providing a series of entitlements denied to other units, as in the case of federal tax exemptions or in the exercise of customary law. However, he asserts that for segmental units to acquire these special autonomy rights, they are necessarily required to give away their rights of representation within the larger state. This trade-off between integration and autonomy, according to Bauböck, leads to the exclusion of indigenous peoples from national debates over crucial areas such as the federal redistribution of resources.<sup>153</sup> Overall, Bauböck argues that federacy arrangements inherently jeopardize the ideal level of integration and cohesion of a stable multinational state.

Furthermore, Bauböck contests Lijphart's over-reliance on "cultural autonomy" in his consociational democracy theory. He concedes that power-sharing arrangements have worked well in Netherlands and Austria but only as a single step in the process of granting minorities the right to self-determination and self-government—that is, transcending into a multinational federation. For him, "the consociational formula is no adequate response to nationality conflicts [...] for national minorities are not willing to trade off their autonomy for stronger involvement in central government."<sup>154</sup> Moreover, for Bauböck, consociational democracy simultaneously overemphasizes the desirability of national

---

<sup>152</sup> ——, "Beyond Culturalism and Statism: Liberal Responses to Diversity," *Eurosphere Working Paper Series* 2008, 28.

<sup>153</sup> ——, "Multinational Federalism:Territorial or Cultural Autonomy?," 7-8, 12.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

integration and downplays the centrality of autonomy for indigenous peoples. On that account, he dismisses consociationalism as a suitable normative framework to address the ‘internal’ quest for self-determination.

Bauböck’s theory proposes a (re)drawing of internal boundaries and the devolution of political power from central authorities to symmetrical territorial units.<sup>155</sup> He argues that it is only via the implementation of territorial autonomy (TA) that indigenous peoples can secure a regional majority within federal segments. This, in turn, will confer on them greater political advantage to influence and legislate over cultural, legal and economic issues within their territory. Moreover, Bauböck’s theory also grants indigenous peoples special powers to exclude non-indigenous peoples from their territory since “forcing indigenous minorities to open their territories and public cultures to the inflow of non-members would thus continue a history of colonization and would deprive them of their capability to reproduce their culture.”<sup>156</sup> This pluralistic federation, according to Bauböck, will eventually dampen the burgeoning calls for secession within multicultural societies.<sup>157</sup>

Nonetheless, the success of this “permissive” federation lies in the re-foundation of a federal citizenship, where both regional and national identities converge. This shared citizenship requires indigenous representatives to equally voice the concerns and interests of indigenous and non-indigenous inhabitants in their territory:

---

<sup>155</sup> ——, “Beyond Culturalism and Statism: Liberal Responses to Diversity,” 6, 28.

<sup>156</sup> ——, “Why Stay Together? a Pluralist Approach to Secession and Federation,” 387.

<sup>157</sup> Territorial autonomy “will promote the emergence of civic conceptions of nationhood.” Most importantly, long-term stability will “only be achieved when minorities regard federal citizenship as adding something important to their national affiliation.” Only then will minorities opt for integration rather than independence. ——, “Multinational Federalism:Territorial or Cultural Autonomy?,” 27.

[T]he governments of autonomous provinces in liberal states are accountable to all citizens living within their jurisdictions, no matter whether these identify with a state-wide majority, a regional majority that is a state-wide minority or an internal minority within the autonomous region.<sup>158</sup>

This orthodox liberal presumption in Bauböck's theory implicitly coerces indigenous peoples to adhere to a monolithic notion of citizenship and to implement a Western form of intra-governmentality based on the centrality of the individual subject, political parties, majoritarian voting, and a separation of powers into rigid branches of government. Like Kymlicka and Lijphart, Bauböck fails to observe that these so-called "neutral" elements of liberal democracy are not necessarily accepted and shared by indigenous groups, who at times call for the re-construction of their societies via the revitalization of non-Western traditional forms of government and the resurrection of pre-colonial leadership models. In this sense, Bauböck's pluralist federation may well ameliorate the appalling living conditions that mar indigenous communities in developed and developing countries today. It may also grant them greater political power to maneuver certain cultural and legal issues to their advantage. Nevertheless, it denies indigenous peoples the right to impose law on themselves and to autonomously direct the course of their affairs without the imposition of *a priori* normative provisos.

In sum, present-day indigenous autonomous regimes draw from a liberal multicultural framework, which in the words of Glen Coulthard is "ill equipped to deal with the interrelated structural and psycho-affective dimensions of colonial power [...] implicated

---

<sup>158</sup> ———, "Beyond Culturalism and Statism: Liberal Responses to Diversity," 28.

in the preservation of colonial hierarchies.”<sup>159</sup> The works of Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck have been highly influential—and controversial within the mainstream liberal camp—in the pivotal realms of policy-making, constitutional writing and the drafting of statutes of autonomy—especially in Western nation-states.<sup>160</sup> Beyond group-differentiated rights, these theorists propose alternative frameworks to respect and safeguard the principles of equality and justice in modern-day multicultural societies. In regards to indigenous peoples, these frameworks predominantly revolve around the notion of autonomy. Whether favoring the granting of cultural, political or territorial autonomy, these liberal theorists, despite their reformist character, continue to universalize Western categories, standards, principles and norms. In addition, the models for indigenous autonomy that they advance deny the equality of power and fundamentally marginalize the social norms, systems of meaning, cosmovisions, forms of socio-politico organization, and economic structures upheld by indigenous peoples. In theory, federacy arrangements, consociational democracy and pluralistic federation reconfigure the nation-state to accommodate native groups and other national minorities. Nevertheless, in praxis, the route to autonomy—that is, the right to reproduce the collective self without external intervention—is closed for indigenous peoples. Therefore the urgent need to theoretically rethink and re-interpret autonomy from below.

---

<sup>159</sup> Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014). Amazon Kindle.

<sup>160</sup> Kymlicka’s theory of minority rights has gained particular attention in his native Canada, where his writings have had an impact on the legal debate over self-determination in the Quebecois region and the right to autonomy of indigenous peoples in United States and Canada. In turn, Lijphart’s consociationalism has been central to the furthering of special constitutional rights in his native Netherlands, and for the reconfiguration of segmental regions in Italy, Switzerland and Cyprus. For his part, Bauböck has been a central figure in the drafting of special rights in the Netherlands and also the Scandinavian countries.

## **Indigenous Autonomy and “Neoliberal Multiculturalism” in Latin America**

So far, this chapter has introduced and critically examined the understanding of indigenous autonomy in mainstream liberal theory. It has explored how the works of scholars like Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck challenge the orthodox presumptions of a unitary citizenship embedded in liberalism and pave the way for the recognition of indigenous peoples’ desire for autonomy. In Latin America, prospective democracies, influenced by these theories, have welcomed the notion of multicultural citizenship. Nonetheless, none of the scholarship revised in the former section looks at indigenous autonomist demands in Latin America. On that account, this section investigates and analyzes recent literary work on the issues at stake in implementing this set of rights, including self-determination and autonomy specifically in Latin America.

The study of indigenous autonomy in Latin America takes place in the midst of the paradoxical framework of Karl Offen’s “territorial turn”<sup>161</sup> and Charles Hale’s “neoliberal multiculturalism.”<sup>162</sup> As the Latin American state surrendered to the global pressure for economic reforms and increased democratization in the late 1980s and 1990s, it touted its political openings, constitutional reforms and policy amendments in recognizing—for the first time since the discourse of *mestizaje* became official—the existence of indigenous peoples in its national territory. In addition, in the attempt to emulate the multicultural model of Western societies, the demise of *La Raza*

---

<sup>161</sup> Offen, “The Territorial Turn: Making Black Territories in Pacific Colombia.”

<sup>162</sup> Hale, “Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America.” ———, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*.

*Cósmica*<sup>163</sup> doctrine led to the legislation of a myriad of self-government and autonomous arrangements in the region.

Cases such as the establishment of a unique territorial autonomy in the Eastern Coast of Nicaragua in 1987; the enactment of the Colombian *resguardos* following the constitutional reforms of 1991; the creation of three additional *comarcas* in Panama in 1996, 1997 and 2000; the implementation of the *territorios indígenas* in Venezuela in 1999; and the legislation of the *Territorio Indígena Originario Campesino* (Original Peasant Indigenous Territory, TIOC) by the Bolivian Constitution of 2009; are some of the examples that reflect this liberal endeavor by Latin American states to simultaneously include and grant autonomy to indigenous peoples inhabiting “national” lands.

Nonetheless, despite the enactment of these pioneering autonomy arrangements, the great majority of indigenous peoples throughout the region remain devoid of agency, oppressed and vulnerable to the power of the state and corporate structures. In this context, Hale, Postero, Gustafson, Lucero and Isabel Altamirano-Jimenez call into question the feasibility of these approaches in providing indigenous nations with tangible forms of self-determination. These scholars contend that as Latin American states move toward economies based on resource extraction, the benefits of adopting a set of multicultural reforms

---

<sup>163</sup> Post-revolutionary Mexican scholar and minister of education José Vasconcelos was one the central figures of the doctrine of *mestizaje* in Latin America. His essay, *La Raza Cósmica*, published in 1925, hypothesizes the genesis of a “final” race—the *raza cósmica* “cosmic race”—the amalgamation of all races on earth: European, African and Asian (indigenous) in a single, final and superior race which would flourish in the Universópolis (Amazonian region). For Vasconcelos, the propagation of this world-wide *mestizaje* would ensure that progressive races (European) absorb backward ones (African and indigenous). Eventually, for Vasconcelos, this would give rise to an era of “aesthetic eugenics” where only beauty and knowledge would flourish and consequently, misery and ignorance would vanish. In this context, *hispanidad* (Spanishness) would continue to be prominent within this neo-cosmic breed as the bastion of European values and progress. José Vasconcelos, *La Raza Cósmica: misión de la raza iberoamericana* (Distrito Federal: Editorial Porrúa, 2007).

are hindered by the power of corporate agents. In the words of Altamirano-Jimenez:

The neoliberalization of the environment incorporates indigenous peoples into the market and intensifies commodity production as a way to encourage Indigenous peoples to abandon their land-dependent livelihoods and practices. Moreover, although the emphasis is on preservation, the extraction of resources such as oil, gas and minerals is concomitant with conservation.<sup>164</sup>

None of these scholars question the theoretical premises of liberal multiculturalism but they do question whether the interplay between corporate structures, government institutions and indigenous communities allows for meaningful autonomy. They uncover the political realities behind the official adoption of multicultural citizenship in the region. Drawing from the cases of Guatemala, Bolivia and to a lesser extent Mexico and Ecuador, these scholars explore the imminent “risks” and the potential opportunities arising from “(neoliberal) multiculturalism” for indigenous peoples.

Hale critically examines the 1990s recognition of Maya culture and the endorsement of multicultural policies in post-civil war Guatemala.<sup>165</sup> Throughout his work, he refutes the almost axiomatic belief that state-led multiculturalism is antithetical to neoliberalism. He contends that the pro-environment and pro-

---

<sup>164</sup> Isabel Jimenez-Altamirano, *Indigenous Encounters with Neoliberalism: Place, Women and the Environment in Canada and Mexico* (Vancouver: UCB Press, 2013). 68.

<sup>165</sup> Guatemala adopted a package of multicultural policies in the midst of the Peace Accords negotiations between state and guerrilla parties. According to Hale, the first indication of this move toward multiculturality took place in 1991 when the National Education Law was enacted. This law recognizes, for the first time, the multiethnic and pluricultural character of the national society. Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 246.

indigenous reforms of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank during this decade<sup>166</sup> replaced orthodox liberal approaches to indigenous identity with a reformulated framework intended to strengthen the legal and institutional schemes affecting indigenous peoples<sup>167</sup>. According to Hale, in the case of Guatemala, these lending institutions as well as powerful NGOs and bilateral aid programs<sup>168</sup> mandated the government to respect indigenous rights, such as the right to hold communal lands and the right to practice their distinct culture. By making funds available and exerting tenacious pressure, international organizations—via the deployment of what Hale denominates a “neoliberal cultural project”—played a key role in the shift toward multicultural policies and the granting of self-determination to indigenous groups in the region.<sup>169</sup>

In this context of rising democratization, decentralization and cultural rights, Hale calls into question the viability of redefining the Guatemalan state in an ethnically inclusive fashion. He argues that the broader forces of market-oriented state economics undermine the potential for political transformation not only in Guatemala but also in the region overall.<sup>170</sup> His theory of “neoliberal multiculturalism” pointedly addresses this ambivalent framework which is on the rise throughout Latin America. He asserts that under neoliberal multiculturalism, the nation-state recognizes ethnic difference, reforms constitutions to reflect the multicultural and plurilingual character of its society, and funds

---

<sup>166</sup> ———, "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala," 487-88.

<sup>167</sup> These changes take place in line with the development of the theories of multiculturalism in Western nation-states examined in section one of this chapter.

<sup>168</sup> Hale highlights bilateral aid programs from powerful donors in Scandinavia, Western Europe and the United States (USAID). Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 74.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

<sup>170</sup> Hale asserts that the “cultural project” embedded in neoliberalism does not necessarily follow a strict market-oriented individualist logic. Rather, it allows collective articulations and responses to emerge as long as they “opt for development models that reinforce the ideology of capitalist productive relations and embody and advance the neoliberal project.” Ibid., 75.

projects for the demarcation and titling of indigenous lands.<sup>171</sup> Nonetheless, he warns of the concealed effects of neoliberal multiculturalism:

The recognition of cultural difference gives states and, equally important, civil society and transnational organizations, greater prerogative to shape the terms of political contestation, to distinguish between authentic and ersatz expressions of identity, between acceptable and disruptive cultural demands. Neoliberal multiculturalism thrives on the recognition of cultural difference, and by extension, on high-stakes distinctions between those cultural rights that deserve recognition and those that do not.<sup>172</sup>

Hale argues that Latin American nation-states embrace multiculturalism to suit their political and economic ambitions rather than to decolonize the nation. Similarly, Coulthard has argued that despite the shift toward the politics of recognition and accommodation, settler colonialism “remains structurally oriented around achieving the same power effect it sought [before]: the dispossession of indigenous peoples of their lands and self-determining authority.”<sup>173</sup> In this sense, the state adopts nothing more than a purely rhetorical form of multiculturalism. This form of minority rights is accompanied by a self-interested neoliberalism—which selectively acknowledges and positively recognizes indigenous demands that fit within overall state and corporate interests, i.e. indigenous groups calling for the

---

<sup>171</sup> Hale argues that the Latin American state strategically utilizes this institutional reforms to gain international recognition and therefore, become eligible for international credits, funds and aid programs.

<sup>172</sup> Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 35.

<sup>173</sup> Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*.

officialization of native languages in local schools or pushing for proportional representation in the legislative branch. Hale argues that for the state, these groups voice “legitimate” identity-based demands, therefore they deserve recognition as “acceptable” forms of mobilization. It is this category of indigenous movements and activist groups that Hale encapsulates under the concept of *indio permitido* (authorized Indian).<sup>174</sup>

The *indio permitido*, in Hale’s words, “has passed the test of modernity, substituted ‘protest’ with ‘proposal’ and learned to be both fully authentic and conversant with the dominant milieu.”<sup>175</sup> This figure epitomizes the idyllic indigenous subject tacitly yearned for by liberal scholars like Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck. In contrast, indigenous groups and nations who raise “illiberal” demands—that is, demands outside the scope of identity rights and the limited demarcation programs offered by the state, such as the “alternative autonomist movements” explored in Chapter I—are deemed “unruly, vindictive and conflict prone.”<sup>176</sup> These movements challenge and resist the newly opened spaces for political participation, focusing instead on self-determination and autonomy.

The problem, according to Hale, is not solely that neoliberal multiculturalism incentivizes the further alienation and disenfranchisement of certain indigenous groups. Rather, the main risk arises out of the blatant division this system propagates within indigenous communities. To avoid the possibility of internal ethnic conflicts, the Latin American state, under the guise of neoliberal multiculturalism, devises a self-functioning mechanism that perpetuates indigenous fragmentation from below; “those

<sup>174</sup> The term was coined by Rosa Millamán and Charles Hale, borrowing from Bolivian sociologist, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, “who uttered it spontaneously, in exasperation, during a workshop on cultural rights and democratization in Latin America”. Hale, “Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the “Indio Permitido”, 17.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid. ———, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 241.

who occupy the category of the *indio permitido* must prove they have risen above the racialized traits of their brethren by endorsing and reinforcing the divide.”<sup>177</sup> In this context, a small indigenous elite secures its benefits by claiming to represent an indigenous majority from which it is alienated.<sup>178</sup> On the whole, the menacing effect of neoliberal multiculturalism is that it includes and benefits a few indigenous actors at the expense of the greater struggle for indigenous empowerment, self-determination and autonomy.<sup>179</sup>

Contrary to the nationalist politics of mestizaje, the logic of neoliberal multiculturalism is that it utilizes and appropriates cultural rights activism rather than opposing it.<sup>180</sup> In this sense, according to Hale, the Latin American neoliberal state is also “more inclined to draw conflicting parties into dialogue and negotiation rather than preemptively slam the door.”<sup>181</sup> It also recognizes the legitimacy of local forms of indigenous autonomy as long as these arrangements do not threaten the role of the state as the guarantor of political order and stability. Nevertheless, mirroring the models advanced by Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck, the preferred response to these challenges of local autonomy is, “to concede limited autonomy, in the form of decentralization, participatory budgeting, and various other types of limited local control.”<sup>182</sup> This in turn has led to an international perception of the region as increasingly democratic and moving towards a multicultural framework.

---

<sup>177</sup> ———, “Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the “Indio Permitido”,” 17-19.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>180</sup> ———, “Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala,” 498.

<sup>181</sup> ———, “Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the “Indio Permitido”,” 18. According to Hale, neoliberal multiculturalism registers dissent and re-directs it toward less threatening targets. He foregrounds the case of Guatemala, where Mayas were welcomed into government positions in the sphere of education and language. Nonetheless, other realms, such as the Ministries of Finance or Defense remained as unattainable and were reserved for Ladinos and Europeans only. ———, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 75.

<sup>182</sup> ———, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 37.

In regards to those “uncommon” demands for territorial sovereignty, Hale asserts that these can only be perceived by the state as threats to the framework of neoliberal multiculturalism if they secure enough power to undermine both state authority and the structure of productive relations whereby neoliberalism thrives.<sup>183</sup> He contends:

The Central American states offer an especially dramatic case in point. If the current massive flow of international aid, loans and development funding were cut off, these tiny dependent states would collapse. Without the state however, neoliberal economic development would lack the coercive means and minimal legitimacy to proceed. Cultural rights up to and including many forms of local autonomy, do not threaten to contravene this principle, especially as neoliberal elites gain the wisdom to respond to their indigenous critics not by suppressing dissent but by offering them a job.<sup>184</sup>

In this context, Hale argues that indigenous peoples in the region face the binary machinations of, at best, a politics of progressive autonomous regimes and the encroachment of those very territories by the new resource extraction schemes. Neoliberal multiculturalism entices indigenous resistance into a fictitious win-win scenario to solve past colonial wrongs and amend the contemporary apartheid-like state of affairs. With the *indio permitido* legitimizing the policies and structures of neoliberal multiculturalism, not only does it not allow for a

---

<sup>183</sup> ——, "Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the "Indio Permitido"," 19.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid.

transformative political project to emerge but it also perpetuates one that “remake[s] racial dominance in a gentler, less offensive, and more sustainable guise.”<sup>185</sup> He states:

Neoliberal multiculturalism [...] comes with an expansive rhetoric that calls forth visions of sweeping change. It also contains a powerful encoded message, which ladino [mestizo] power holders are coming to decipher and embrace: you can support multicultural reforms, pursue ‘development with identity’ and other cultural rights agendas, without placing ladino racial dominance in jeopardy.<sup>186</sup>

In this sense, the efforts by indigenous peoples to decolonize the state and reconfigure the homogeneous framework of the state are undermined by multicultural citizenship itself. In a similar way to Hale, Postero reflects on the problems of what she calls “state-sponsored multiculturalism” in Bolivia.<sup>187</sup> Via an analysis of the reemergence of indigenous and *campesino* (peasant) public demonstrations across the country in the period from 2000 to 2007—including the gas war of *Octubre Negro* (Black October)<sup>188</sup>—she exposes the tenuous implementation of the internationally lauded state reforms adopted back in the early nineties. Mirroring the case of Guatemala, these constitutional reforms re-constructed Bolivia into a “multi-ethnic” and “pluricultural” nation, as well as provided the legal framework for bilingual education and political autonomy to flourish.<sup>189</sup> However, this so-called reformist framework also produced a powerful discourse that legitimates and vindicates the power of the Bolivian

---

<sup>185</sup> ———, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 31.

<sup>186</sup>Ibid., 36.

<sup>187</sup> Postero, *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia*: 13.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., 2-5.

<sup>189</sup> ———, "Articulations and Fragmentations: Indigenous Politics in Bolivia," 197.

state despite that state's wider subordination to neoliberal programs.

Drawing from extensive ethnographic research in the seldom-studied lowlands of Bolivia, Postero elucidates the effects of both multicultural policies and neoliberal restructuring on the indigenous Guaraní. She asserts that the genesis of a new citizenship regime promises both to include indigenous individuals into the broader citizenship system as well as integrate them into the logic of the free market. According to Postero, the enactment of the Law of Popular Participation (LPP), Law INRA and the Intercultural Bilingual Education Law, to address political autonomy, territorial titling and intercultural education respectively, failed to deliver tangible benefits to indigenous peoples. In this context, Postero renders these political reforms, particularly LPP, as "mostly symbolic [...] not produc[ing] a meaningful redistribution of resources or radically challeng[ing] the structured inequalities of power."<sup>190</sup> Thereby, far from being eradicated, the entrenched legacy of racism in Bolivia undergoes only a superficial re-articulation under the paradigm of neoliberal multiculturalism.

In analyzing this new form of Bolivian citizenship, Postero calls into question this regime, "what does multiculturalism mean when 'traditional indigenous' lifestyles are recognized by the constitution but swallowed up by the economic realities of rapid urbanization or resource exploitation?".<sup>191</sup> She argues that to understand the logic of state-endorsed multiculturalism it is crucial to comprehend how the state appropriates the language of ethnicity and autonomy to its own advantage. She contends that Bolivia, her fieldwork locale, was re-constructed in a dual fashion under the administration of President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada

---

<sup>190</sup> ———, *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia*: 5-6, 14-15.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., 7.

(1993-97). On the one hand, by ascribing to a ‘Kymlickan’ Western-like participatory and inclusionary democracy, Bolivia extols its modernity to its foreign allies and commercial partners. On the other hand, by dissolving the homogeneous essence of its national citizenship and integrating indigenous peoples into the fabric of Bolivian identity, the state turns to its advantage the uniqueness of indigenous folklore in global markets. This way, by simultaneously partaking in cosmopolitan “modernity” and “a traditional past”,<sup>192</sup> Bolivia—bearing resemblance to the rest of Latin America—utilizes and exploits indigenousness in an inimical manner.

Nonetheless, both, Hale and Postero also foreground the opportunities that arise for indigenous peoples from this dual multicultural/neoliberal framework. By assuming the “rationalities” of neoliberalism, participating into electoral politics and voicing their demands through institutional channels, indigenous agents engage with popular groups and civil society in an entirely new manner. This in turn, they argue, strategically benefits their struggle to achieve rights to self-determination and autonomy. In Bolivia, the series of mobilizations and mass protests of *Octubre Negro*,<sup>193</sup> according to Postero, were not events exclusively performed by “Indian” subjects. On the contrary, “the protagonists blended indigenous activism with a renewed populist notion of the nation, reflecting the fact that the majority of Bolivians are both indigenous and poor.”<sup>194</sup> This rekindling of relations between indigenous and non-indigenous citizens led to a “strikingly new social formation by which the protesters made objections of behalf of the Bolivian people.”<sup>195</sup> As a result, a new

---

<sup>192</sup> ———, “Articulations and Fragmentations: Indigenous Politics in Bolivia,” 204.

<sup>193</sup> Transcending the boundaries of ethnicity and class, protesters derided the proposal to join the Latin American Free Trade agreement, rejected national security laws and demanded the abandonment of national plans to privatize Bolivian gas.

<sup>194</sup> Postero, “Articulations and Fragmentations: Indigenous Politics in Bolivia,” 5.

<sup>195</sup> ———, *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia*: 4.

episode in Bolivian history was inaugurated, what Postero denominates “post-multicultural citizenship”,

[...] a new Bolivian public [has been] formed that presents the state with demands based on experiences of race *and* class discrimination [...] this emerging public is raising demands in the language of citizenship, rights, and democracy, reflecting both Bolivian’s positive experiences and their frustrations with the neoliberal and multicultural reforms of the 1990s.<sup>196</sup>

This new social formation, Postero hypothesizes, has led to the renewed building of alliances, the construction of hybrid spaces and the articulation of new forms of resistance that move away from the discourses of indigenous rights and class revolution. By simultaneously incorporating aspects of the neoliberal paradigm and contesting its underlying philosophies, Postero argues that “post-multicultural” citizens in Bolivia inaugurate a new era; in challenging the chronic exclusion and marginalization that still dwells in most corners of Latin America, indigenous peoples participate as “post-multicultural” citizens to voice their cultural, economic and political demands. This is, according to Postero, the greatest advantage that the system of neoliberal multiculturalism provides for indigenous peoples. However, as we shall see, Postero’s hypothesis of the rise of a “post-multicultural citizenship” in the region is challenged by a new set of indigenous movements whose demands and strategies detach their communities from citizenship altogether.

For their part, Gustafson and Lucero—albeit less extensively—also address the impact of the paradoxical framework of

---

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., 5.

multicultural reforms and resource extractivism on indigenous autonomist demands in the region. In examining the Bolivian Gas War and the more recent resistance to Evo Morales's proposed megaproject that threatens to cut through the territorially autonomous Isiboro Secure National Park and Indigenous Territory (TIPNIS), Gustafson probes the so-called Bolivian "democratic and cultural" revolution.<sup>197</sup> Symptomatic of the breach between official and rhetorical multiculturalism, he argues that a novel discourse of "progressive extractivism" has been flourishing in the so-called "pluricultural" nation. According to Gustafson, despite the significant progress achieved in terms of bilingual education, municipal decentralization and land demarcation for autonomous territories, these reforms have recently been shadowed by the steadfast neoliberal project pursued by the Bolivian government. In this context, "indigenous rights are ignored or legislatively hollowed out."<sup>198</sup> In addition, Gustafson, like Hale and Postero, warns that this incongruous paradigm—what he calls "liberal indigenism"—should not be interpreted as "the recent inclusion of heretofore excluded indigenous peoples,"<sup>199</sup> but simply as a new articulation of the historicized interplay between state and indigenous parties.<sup>200</sup>

Mirroring Postero's "post-multicultural citizenship" hypothesis, Gustafson also reflects on the possibility of transforming the well-delineated ethnic, racial and class spaces of resistance into hybrid political articulations that include both indigenous and non-indigenous rural and urban agents. Recalling the work of Aymara

---

<sup>197</sup> Bret Gustafson, "Amid Gas, Where Is the Revolution?," *NACLA Report on the Americas* 46, no. 1 (2013).

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 66-67.

<sup>199</sup> ———, "Paradoxes of liberal indigenism: Indigenous movements, state processes and intercultural reform in Bolivia," 274.

<sup>200</sup> Gustafson also narrates the appropriation of the language of autonomy by the non-indigenous urban middle-class elite of Santa Cruz to claim regionalized autonomy in the midst of the so-called rise of indigenism and socialism led by Evo Morales's MAS Party. Thereby, freighting autonomy with a "corporatist, neoliberal and racist" overtone. ———, "Manipulating Cartographies: Plurinationalism, Autonomy and Indigenous Resurgence in Bolivia," 1007.

sociologist, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Gustafson asserts that urbanites—especially the youth—are today the main supporters and allies of those indigenous groups and movements that call for the implementation of tangible forms of autonomy and denounce the incursion of mining, hydroelectric dams and other projects in their regions. In analyzing the “resource-rich, aspiration-high and job-scarce” context in which a great proportion of Bolivia’s urban and rural youth is located, Gustafson anticipates the rise of a hybrid “environmentalist, anti-patriarchal, anti-racist and decolonizing thought.”<sup>201</sup>

Like Postero’s “post-multicultural citizenship”, for Gustafson, it is within this new social formation that alternative visions of the Bolivian nation will be debated, critiques of the extractivist project will flourish and a rethinking of Bolivia’s national agenda will pave the way for increased democratization. In addition, this phenomenon will open the door to various strategies to counter the all-too common criminalization of indigenous protest, division of its movements, deployment of coercive clientelistic networks, and the overall state and corporate co-optation of indigenous demands.<sup>202</sup> Only then, he argues, will spaces for the configuration of indigenous autonomy flourish.<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>201</sup> ———, "Amid Gas, Where Is the Revolution?", 65-66.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 64.

<sup>203</sup> While the works of Postero and Gustafson contribute significantly to the understanding of modern-day indigenous resistance, the birth of a ‘post-multicultural citizenship’ in regions beyond Bolivia remains a questionable matter. As chapters two and three of this thesis illustrate, the politics of autonomism in La Moskitia (Nicaragua) and Wallmapu (Chile) evince the reassertion of purity and the alienation from non-indigenous social movements and alliances. In these geographical spaces, indigenous movements like the Council of Elders of La Moskitia and the Arauco Malleco Coordinating Committee, rather than transcend the boundaries of race *and* class, embark on a novel endeavor to re-construct their nation, vindicate the right to their territory and challenge the subordinate relationship to the nation-state. In this sense, the hypothesis that posits an imminent deployment of a ‘language of citizenship’ by a new hybrid social formation is not applicable to these cases. Nonetheless, as stipulated by Hale and is often the case, hybridity may be utilized by indigenous movements as a strategic recourse.

Finally, Lucero, like Hale, Postero and Gustafson, also reflects on the struggle for indigenous rights within this ambivalent neoliberal multicultural framework. In foregrounding the cases of Ecuador, Bolivia and Mexico, he argues that despite the rise of indigenous *de facto* autonomy regimes—such as those of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (Good Government Councils) in Zapatista territory, the Mixteco and Tlapaneco *comunitaria* police in Guerrero and the *minga* in the Andean region—indigenous peoples face a contradictory moment. State law embraces self-determination, cultural revitalization and autonomy while federal governments pursue a stern policy of resource extraction<sup>204</sup>. Whilst the discourse of constitutional multiculturalism remains strong, Lucero contends that new challenges arise as presidents from both side of the political spectrum appropriate and criminalize indigenous activism in order to transform unheeded territories into global productive zones. Lucero calls into question whether the new multicultural nations, in translating official policies into tangible long-term policies, can fulfill indigenous autonomist demands.

In sum, in the last two decades, (neo)liberal multiculturalism—as a new, modern and internationally eulogized mode of governance in Latin America—has undergone serious scholarly scrutiny. As this section elucidated, the political reforms of the 1990s transformed homogenous nation-states into “pluri-cultural” and “multi-lingual” entities—at least officially. Nevertheless, as the works of Hale, Postero, Gustafson and Lucero attest, multiculturalism and territorial titling *per se* are no panacea for the acute colonial ills that continue to mar the process of attaining indigenous autonomy in the region. As neoliberalism intersects with multiculturalism, the former appropriates the latter's cultural project and engenders a new state ideology. In this context, the Latin American states, rather than engaging in the previous

---

<sup>204</sup> Lucero, "The Paradoxes of Indigenous Politics."

doctrine of “separate and unequal”<sup>205</sup> or in policies of “indigenismo,”<sup>206</sup> push for a vertical opening of new social spaces where indigenous identity can thrive. Nevertheless, this symbolic form of multicultural citizenship as of yet has not produced any genuinely transformative changes. As epitomized by the Yaqui resistance in Northern Mexico to the construction of Acueducto Independencia,<sup>207</sup> the resistance of Awa tribes in voluntary isolation to the extraction of oil in their territories in the Peruvian Amazon, and the Mapuche struggle in Southern Chile to expulse all agents of neoliberalism from the Wallmapu,<sup>208</sup> indigenous movements in Latin America continue to grapple with political forces and megaprojects that exude formerly unseen racial and economic contradictions. These are some of the challenges that hamper the establishment of indigenous autonomous spaces in Latin America today.

### **Inclusion or Autonomy: Typologies of Indigenous Demands**

The literature on indigenous movements in Latin America encompasses a myriad of geographical spaces, ranging from densely populated indigenous regions like Bolivia and Peru to locales like Colombia and Venezuela, where indigenous peoples

---

<sup>205</sup> Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 75.

<sup>206</sup> Indigenismo, as a political project, explicitly recognized Indians qua Indians. However, it implicitly aimed to politically, economically and socially assimilate and integrate indigenous peoples into the fabric of a national homogenous society.

<sup>207</sup> This megaproject—financed by the state of Sonora and Mexico’s federal government—threatens to re-route Yaqui water resources to urban, industrial-non-indigenous areas.

<sup>208</sup> See Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco Malleco (CAM). La Chispa and Héctor Llaitul, "Héctor Llaitul: "Nuestra Lucha es necesariamente anti-capitalista, si no es imposible la reivindicación de lo propio"," WEFTUN Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, <http://weftun.org/ENTREVISTAS/lachispa2012.html>. See Héctor Llaitul Carrillanca, "Habla Héctor Llaitul Prisionero político de la CAM: "La Lucha Mapuche debe ser Anticapitalista"," political declaration,(2013), <http://www.werken.cl/?p=9695>. Pablo Vergara, "Llaitul, el mapuche más temido por las forestales," (2012), <http://www.theclinic.cl/2012/01/10/llaitul-el-mapuche-mas-temido-por-las-forestales/>.

are a state minority. In line with this heterogeneity, this literature also embodies a multiplicity of research methods, ranging from Lucero's constitutive approach to Hale's activist method and Van Cott's comparative designs. Likewise, scholarly work has so far broached extensive and multifarious themes of indigenous activism: it has examined the historicity of the movements, the institutionalization of resistance, and the formation of hybrid alliances, amongst many other themes. Nonetheless, this thesis argues that this canon encounters a thread of homogeneity in probing and typologizing the demands voiced by the movements studied.

As this section elucidates, current research lacks an explicit holistic taxonomy that outlines, describes and theorizes, in a systematized formula, indigenous demands in Latin America. Whilst a good amount of work has been dedicated to the analysis of the successes and setbacks of indigenous activism, the more fundamental question of what these indigenous agents demand remains largely unexplored in current literature. As epitomized by the works of Yashar, Willem Assies, Richard Falk, Jean E. Jackson, Kay B. Warren, Sieder, Postero, Zamosc, Van Cott and Gustafson,<sup>209</sup> these indigenous demands are at best, typologized in a reductionist fashion, at worst, lumped together under the monolithic notion of 'self-determination and autonomy'. In addition, for the most part, these discussions are limited to the realm of introductory chapters or reserved to the peripheral character of side notes. What is needed is a typology that would endow social scientists with a theoretical instrument to discern and make sense of the plurality of indigenous demands, including

---

<sup>209</sup> See Yashar, "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America." Assies, Haar, and Hoekema, "Diversity as a Challenge: A Note on the Dilemmas of Diversity." Falk, "The Right of Self-Determination under International Law: The Coherence of Doctrine versus the Incoherence of Experience." Jackson, "Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers." Sieder, "Introduction." Postero and Zamosc, "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America."; Van-Cott, *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*. Gustafson, "Manipulating Cartographies: Plurinationalism, Autonomy and Indigenous Resurgence in Bolivia."

those which are unfashionable to the liberal multicultural camp in the region. Most importantly, this theoretical tool would also aid scholars in tracing and probing the transformation of indigenous movements in a more comprehensive fashion.

However, this idea of categorizing indigenous autonomist demands attracts vehement opposition. Warren and Jackson warn of the risks arising from “political scientists’ attempts to categorize [indigenous movements] in neat typologies, such as ‘resource focused’ or ‘culturally focused’”<sup>210</sup>. They argue that these “movements” are rarely standardized,

Their heterogeneity may be an asset in some situations and a liability in others. Some are community or regionally based, while others—fluent in the transnational language of cultural rights—still manage to maintain local, often weaker, ties. Some are long-standing; others ephemeral. Some movements incorporate class politics; others resist this framing.<sup>211</sup>

Nonetheless, a taxonomization of indigenous demands does not *per se* imply downplaying the internal hybridity of indigenous movements. On the contrary, a categorization of indigenous demands works in tandem with already existing analytic strategies that seek to explore and explain the dynamics of internal pluralism. Likewise, this taxonomization does not entail the creation of rigid categories with unchangeable fixed delineated borders, for it recognizes that it is hard to discern where inclusionary demands end and territorial self-government arrangements begin. Uncovering and typologizing the diversity of demands voiced by indigenous movements in the region, allows

---

<sup>210</sup> Warren and Jackson, "Studying Indigenous Activism in Latin America," 11-12.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid.

for correlations and disjunctions between demographics, colonial history, class, political and ethnic hybridity and strategic resources to be drawn. Above all, a taxonomization brings to light previously unheeded indigenous movements and largely unheard autonomist demands.

Currently, scholarly work predominantly revolves around those indigenous movements, organizations and political parties that call into question the neoliberal paradigm and challenge the praxis of the so-called multicultural state. Indigenous movements such as Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador, CONAIE), Congreso Regional Indígena del Cauca (Regional Indigenous Council of Cauca, CRIC) and the Pan-Mayanist umbrella organizations in Guatemala, amongst others, have been subject to extended research by anthropologists and political scientists.<sup>212</sup> These and other such movements call for the "pluriculturalization" of the nation-state, namely the political recognition of difference and representation at different levels of government.

Nonetheless, beyond these demands for Young's "differentiated citizenship" or "internal self-determination", rests an entirely

---

<sup>212</sup> For recent research on CONAIE see James D Bowen, "Multicultural Market Democracy: Elites and Indigenous Movements in Contemporary Ecuador," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 43, no. 3 (2011). Zamosc, "The Ecuadorian Indian Movement: From Politics of Influence to Politics of Power." Amalia Pallares, *From peasant struggles to Indian resistance: the Ecuadorian Andes in the late twentieth century* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2002). For recent research on CRIC and the indigenous mobilization of Colombia, see David D Gow and Joanne Rappaport, "The Indigenous Public Voice: The Multiple Idioms of Modernity in Native Cauca," in *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, ed. Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002). Brett Troyan, "Ethnic Citizenship in Colombia," *Latin American Research Review* 43, no. 3 (2008). Jasmin Hristov, "Indigenous Struggles for Land and Culture in Cauca, Colombia," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 32, no. 1 (2005). For research on Pan-Mayanist movements see Victor Montejo, "The Multiplicity of Mayan Voices: Mayan Leadership and the Politics of Self-Representation," in *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, ed. Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002). Edward Fischer, "Beyond Victimization: Maya Movements in Post-War Guatemala," in *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, ed. Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc (Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 2012).

distinct category of demands. Rachel Sieder acknowledges the calls for “greater political autonomy”<sup>213</sup> by indigenous peoples in Latin America. This encapsulates Lijphart’s power-sharing arrangements like consociationalism and Bauböck’s self-government within a federal state. In a similar fashion, Postero and Zamosc assert that, beyond identity claims, indigenous movements also call for the Kymlickan implementation of regional autonomy arrangements to control land and natural resources under the auspices of the nation-state.<sup>214</sup> In regards to this category of movements, scholarly work has primordially included studies on territorial demarcation in the Amazonian region, *de jure* autonomous regimes of Nicaragua, Panama and Colombia and the *de facto* autonomy achieved by the Zapatistas in Mexico.

Accordingly, scholars attempt to interpret indigenous demands either as the call for political inclusion or for territorial autonomy. These two demands dominate today’s categorizations. This is particularly evident in the work of Van Cott, Yashar, Sieder, Postero and Zamosc. For Van Cott, indigenous peoples in Latin America “seek to redefine the terms of their citizenship and to establish mechanisms to protect their individual and collective rights.”<sup>215</sup> On the other hand, Yashar asserts that indigenous peoples in the region demand “[...] the right to territorial autonomy, respect for customary law, new forms of political

---

<sup>213</sup> Rachel Sieder, “Rethinking Democratisation and Citizenship: Legal Pluralism and Institutional Reform in Guatemala,” *Citizenship Studies* 3, no. 1 (1999): 103-05. She states that in some cases these demands extend to secessionist demands. However, she is referring to overall ethnic groups in Latin America rather than indigenous movements.

<sup>214</sup> Post-1990s, formerly antagonist lending organizations to indigenous rights to territory, like the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, incorporated this struggle in their agendas. As a result, projects for collective land titling were initially launched in Colombia, Nicaragua, Honduras and Brazil with international funding. Offen, “The Territorial Turn: Making Black Territories in Pacific Colombia,” 46-47; Postero and Zamosc, “Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America,” 5-6.

<sup>215</sup> Van-Cott, *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*: 1-2.

representation and the right to bicultural education."<sup>216</sup> In like manner, for Sieder, indigenous people demand autonomy as:

[...]a combination of land, resources and normative and administrative space, what has been referred in some contexts as '*territorio etnico*'. Yet disputes persist between organizations over the precise nature of territorial autonomy, some advancing positions favouring community-based and municipal-based autonomy, others preferring regionally centred arrangements.<sup>217</sup>

Echoing Sieder, Postero and Zamosc posit that indigenous autonomist demands refer to a heterogeneous set of notions:

[...] decision-making at the local level. Autonomy can also mean political autonomy, which guarantees self government for indigenous peoples. [...] such a political-juridical regime would recognize their rights to choose their own authorities, exercise legal responsibilities, legislate their internal life, and administer their own affairs.<sup>218</sup>

As such, this fixed spectrum is well summarized by what Patricia Richard calls "integrationist" demands for "identity rights and cultural recognition" and "autonomy demands" for "control

---

<sup>216</sup> Yashar, "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America," 93, 96. ———, "Indigenous Politics and Democracy: Contesting Citizenship in Latin America," (The Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies, 1997), 1.

<sup>217</sup> Sieder, "Introduction," 7.

<sup>218</sup> Postero and Zamosc, "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America," 15-16.

over land and natural resources.”<sup>219</sup> However, the literature on indigenous autonomy in Latin America has marginalized other interpretations of autonomy. As this has uncovered initially in the first chapter, there are distinct approaches to autonomy defined by indigenous peoples. Furthermore, as will be seen in the following chapters, “alternative articulations of autonomy” transcend the traditional hegemonic liberal notion of regional self-government within the colonial nation-state.

Nevertheless, this set of demands has been largely unexplored and marginalized in current scholarly work. Jackson’s work epitomizes this epistemological marginalization of radical autonomist voices. She argues that indigenous mobilizing “has never intended to establish a sovereign, exclusively indigenous state or even a “state within a state.” In general, indigenous activists seek to ensure [...] political and cultural autonomy.”<sup>220</sup> In addition, in reviewing core literary works in the field of indigenous activism, she argues: “[a]s is true throughout Latin America, none of the mobilizations discussed in these books espoused a separatist agenda. Rather a major goal was recognition, which requires a relationship with the apparatus of the state.”<sup>221</sup>

Similarly, Gustafson denies the existence of non-statist indigenous approaches to autonomy, “[i]n Latin America, indigenous struggles have never been framed in the language of secession from the state—nor in fact for sovereignty (*soberanía*)—but through attempts often allied with non-indigenous movements to recover ancestral territories in some form and achieve a degree

---

<sup>219</sup> Patricia Richards, *Pobladoras Indígenas and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004).

<sup>220</sup> Jackson, “Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers,” 109.

<sup>221</sup> ———, “Neoliberal Multiculturalism and Indigenous Movements,” 206.

of self-determination or autonomy within the nation-state.”<sup>222</sup> Mirroring Jackson and Gustafson, Postero and Zamosc argue:

The Indian Question is a question of nationhood, but not in the sense of irredentism or separatism. Some indigenous groups advocate autonomy, although generally they are referring to regional autonomy within existing nation-states, rather than to break-away nations, or a return to a presumed pre-conquest sovereignty [...] indigenous groups are instead working to redefine their relation to the nation-states in which they live.<sup>223</sup>

In like manner, Philip Mauceri asserts that “ethnic conflicts involving the indigenous in Latin America have not been separatist in nature [...] borders have been relatively stable and unchallenged since the mid [...] nineteenth century.”<sup>224</sup> Likewise, Yashar argues that indigenous peoples demand “that the state recognize political and juridical spaces [...] administered by indigenous communities.” For her, these proposals would “promote inclusion and autonomy simultaneously [but] these are not demands for secession but for institutional pluralism in multiethnic settings.”<sup>225</sup>

These analyses of indigenous demands in Latin America disregard movements such as the Council of Elders of the Communitarian Nation Moskitia in Nicaragua, the Arauco Malleco

---

<sup>222</sup> Gustafson, “Manipulating Cartographies: Plurinationalism, Autonomy and Indigenous Resurgence in Bolivia,” 990.

<sup>223</sup> Postero and Zamosc, “Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America,” 6.

<sup>224</sup> Philip Mauceri, “Internationalization as an Explanation? The Development of Ethnic Conflict in Latin America,” in *Ethnic Conflict and International Politics: Explaining Diffusion and Escalation*, ed. Steven E Lobell and Philip Mauceri (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 108.

<sup>225</sup> Yashar, “Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America,” 96.

Coordinating Committee in Chile and the Indianista movement in the Bolivian Andes. As we shall see, the principle objective of these movements fundamentally contradicts and rejects the claims and assertions drawn together from Kymlicka to Postero. The following chapters comprise an in-depth exploration of these movements' rhetorics and practices in order to first uncover these unheeded autonomist demands. Later, this exploration will facilitate the creation of a presently nonexistent systematized taxonomy of indigenous demands in Latin America. This taxonomization overcomes and rectifies the present epistemological marginalization of those indigenous movements, which do not ascribe to a liberal agenda of inclusion within the state.

## Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that the path to understanding the dominant conceptualization of autonomy travels first through the realm of institutional engineering, as represented by the likes of Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck. Influenced primarily by the Western framework of liberal theory, their federacy arrangements, consociational democracy and pluralist federation arrangements were a break away from the far more orthodox liberal school of Rawls and Dworkin. Nevertheless, their models for the reconfiguration of the state, still assume the centrality of the individual and the desirability of Western "modern" forms of government, which inherently contradict the right of indigenous people to autonomously define the terms of their collective existence. As these approaches remain rights-based, they can only imagine indigenous politics in terms of inclusion *within* the state. The thought of a politics of autonomy *from* the state remains unthinkable for them. Yet as this thesis will go on to demonstrate, this type of autonomism is precisely what many indigenous actors are seeking to theorize and practice across Latin America today.

In addition, this chapter has also provided a critical overview of the position of the canon in regards to the implementation of indigenous autonomy in the region. It has shown that as resource extractivism intersects with multicultural citizenship, it gives rise to what theorists like Hale call “neo liberal multiculturalism”. Scholars in this field like Postero, Gustafson and Lucero contend that liberal multiculturalism and self-government arrangements, by themselves, do not address the chronic colonial legacy that continues to affect indigenous peoples. As Hale argues, neoliberalism in Latin America appropriates the cultural project of multiculturalism and thereby engenders a new state ideology that further silences the calls for tangible forms of autonomy.

Finally, this chapter, through a critical examination of the works of scholars in the Latin American field, uncovered a strict and reductionist typology of indigenous autonomist demands in the region. It demonstrated that these typologies oscillate only between “inclusionist” and “autonomist” demands. This is best reflected in the works of Van Cott, Yashar, Sieder, Postero, Gustafson and Zamosc respectively. However, via a critical engagement with the works of these scholars, it was evident that these typologies are incapable of understanding, theorizing and positioning unheeded and unheard indigenous movements like the Council of Elders of Moskitia in Nicaragua, the Arauco Malleco Coordinating Committee in Chile, and the Indianista movement in Bolivia. Contrary to movements like ONIC, FOAG, FRENAPI, OZIP and CIR, these movements do not seek autonomy as a means to greater recognition by the state but as an end in itself. Rather than seeking rights to autonomy from the state, such movements want autonomy from it. But the epistemological marginalization of these movements no accident. It derives, at best, from a paternalist liberal outlook incapable of remotely understanding the Other or, at worst, from a conscious ideological power-laden symbolic

attempt to reject and ostracize these unfashionable and “illiberal” definitions of autonomy.



## **Chapter III: Miskitu Autonomy in Nicaragua**

### **Introduction**

Unlike CONAIE, CONIC and the Council of All Lands as well as other Latin American indigenous movements reviewed in Chapter I, the Council of Miskitu Elders of the Communitarian Nation Mosquitia in the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua presents an articulation of autonomy that deviates from the conventional spectrum of political inclusion and de-territorialized regional self-determination. The Council of Elders challenges Western statist approaches to indigenous autonomy and envisions the liberation of the peoples of the region via the rejection of all Western forms of socio-politico organization, administrative division, economic models and imposed Western frameworks. Furthermore, the movement pushes for the total vindication of their territory, the resurrection of local knowledge, the re-establishment of a Mosquitian way of life and the recovery of indigenous cosmovisions—all of which had been obscured by Nicaraguan colonization and its nationalist project since 1894.

The peoples of Mosquitia, divided today by the territorial borders between Nicaragua and Honduras, have been granted, since 1987, what has been praised as the most progressive and permissive regime of autonomy in Latin America. But despite the efforts of this pioneering project to finally fulfill the demands of the peoples of the region, Mosquitia is today battling against the increasing incursion of state-sponsored mestizo settlers into their territory, the depredation of their natural resources at the hands of logging, mining and mega-infrastructure projects in the region, as well as a politics of corruption, nepotism and co-option at the hands of the Sandinista government. In this context, the re-emergence of the Council of Elders since the late 1980s has challenged the subordination of Mosquitian peoples even under this regime of autonomy. This chapter aims to explore the

autonomist project of this multicultural organization as well as situate its struggle within a broader historical context.

In its first section, this chapter provides a comprehensive historical account of Miskitu autonomy from early Spanish expeditions in the sixteenth century to the formation of the Kingdom of Mosquitia, the consummation of a British protectorate in the region and the establishment of a reserve in Mosquitian territory in the mid nineteenth century. Via a thorough examination of colonial texts, historical documents and international treaties, the section analyzes the evolution of autonomy amidst the battle between Spain and Great Britain over the region. The second part of this first section traces the trajectory of Miskitu autonomy up to Nicaragua's invasion in 1894. For its part, the second section, in order to understand the radicalization of Mosquitian demands, explores in detail the Statute of Autonomy as well as other imposed legislation affecting the region. In its later part, the section relies on an in-depth study of the movement's political project, political declarations and conventions and juxtaposes them with the utterances gathered during field research in the region—in particular, the interviews conducted with the two most prominent leaders of the Council of Elders, Oscar Hodgson and Hector Williams.

### **A Genealogy of Autonomy in Mosquitia**

#### Miskitu Autonomy: from the Kingdom of Mosquitia to the Mosquito Reservation

Christopher Columbus's fourth and final voyage from 1502 to 1504 was the first European expedition to explore the lands West of the Caribbean Coast in today's Central America. Sailing from Cadiz with only four caravels, Columbus voyaged through the Atlantic Coast, bypassing Nicolás de Ovando's Hispaniola, in his

attempt to “discover” a much-desired isthmus that would potentially facilitate a direct route to the East Indies as well as allow, for the first time, a circumnavigation of the world. His expedition reached Cape Cajinas<sup>226</sup> in today’s Honduras in 1502, where he encountered the Misumalpan, Chibchan<sup>227</sup> and Mam-speaking peoples.<sup>228</sup> Although passing by Cape Gracias a Dios and travelling along the entire Mosquito shore, Columbus’s incessant desire to find a strait led him to continue the expedition further south toward the Darien Peninsula of Panama,<sup>229</sup> without settling in Mosquitian territory. This first diplomatic yet aloof encounter between Europeans and Miskitu would be indicative of the interaction between the two actors in the following centuries.

Diego de Nicuessa was one of the few Spanish conquistadors to venture on an expedition to reconnoiter the hitherto unexplored and unreachable lands of the Atlantic Coast. Nevertheless, after his ship wrecked at the Coco River near Cape Gracias a Dios in 1512, his expedition encountered not only an inhospitable terrain of mangrove swamps but also fierce resistance from the peoples of Mosquitia,<sup>230</sup> who shortly after drove Nicuessa out of the region. Apart from a few other brief and failed private expeditions to Mosquitia, in 1528 Pedro de Alvarado—who had been one of the major actors in the conquering of Mexico and had then just defeated the last independent Maya Kingdom in today’s Guatemala—commanded an expedition to settle the “rebellious” natives of the Mosquito Coast. However, with no more success than Nicuessa and other Spanish colonizers, Alvarado’s losses

---

<sup>226</sup> Now called Cape Honduras. Evelina Gužauskytė, *Christopher Columbus's naming in the diarios of the four voyages (1492-1504)* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014). 193.

<sup>227</sup> Laura Hobson Herlihy, "The Mermaid and the Lobster Diver: Gender and Ethnic Identities among the Río Plátano Miskito Peoples" (University of Kansas, 2002), 1.

<sup>228</sup> The Misumalpan and Mam-speaking peoples are today, for the most part, grouped under the broader ethnic and linguistic categories of Miskitu and Mayangna (Sumu). The Chibchan-speaking Rama people are other indigenous group native to this region.

<sup>229</sup> Washington Irving, *The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, vol. II (New York: G.P. Putnam and Son, 1868). 348-75.

<sup>230</sup> Nicholas Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 26, no. 3 (2002): 117.

during the expedition forced him to abandon the region and retreat to the already settled Pacific Coast.<sup>231</sup> The lack of success in these series of Spanish expeditions allowed for the perpetuation of a sovereign and autonomous Mosquitia, which set itself apart from its subdued Toltec-Chorotegan neighbors.

In the early seventeenth century, however, the Miskitu witnessed an unprecedented influx of British buccaneers into the region. The Protestant pirates were attracted to both the rich and abundant forests of mahogany and logwood as well as the safe shelter from Spanish *guardacostas* provided by the cloistered lagoons, archipelagos and shores along the Atlantic Coast.<sup>232</sup> Apart from establishing an amicable relationship with British pirates, the peoples of Mosquitia sought their own interest by participating in the looting of their now long-time enemies, the Spanish colonists and their galleons in the Caribbean Coast. For their part, the British saw in their relationship with the Miskitu the opportunity to regroup and replenish their supplies as well as the prospect of smuggling goods to the Spanish-controlled Pacific Coast.<sup>233</sup> Furthermore, apart from the extraction of dyes from logwood and mahogany—which were in high demand in Europe—the profits from trading timber, sugar, sarsaparilla tortoiseshell<sup>234</sup> and rum were also incentives for the corsairs to further strengthen their relationship with the distinct nations of Mosquitia.

The British settlement in Providence Island in 1631 is perhaps the most palpable example of how British incursions, albeit geographically scattered, significantly transformed the political

---

<sup>231</sup> Marc Rangel, *Memories of Mosquitia* (Xlibris Corporation, 2009).

<sup>232</sup> Wolfgang Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," in *National Integration and Contested Autonomy: the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua*, ed. Luciano Baracco (New York: Algora Publishing, 2011), 13.

<sup>233</sup> Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast," 119.

<sup>234</sup> Bruce P. Lenman, *Britain's Colonial Wars 1688-1783* (New York: Routledge, 2001). 58.

landscape in Mosquitia as well as aided the Miskitu in the process of building an economic alliance with British official agents. The settlement, nevertheless, was short-lived for in 1641 it was invaded, raided and destroyed by the Spanish, who removed all Englishmen and African slaves from the island.<sup>235</sup> The Spanish invasion of Providence was a close call for the Miskitu, who had by then successfully defended the Mosquitia region from Spanish colonizers for over a century. In this sense, the seizure of Providence Island not only ignited the arrival of an ever-increasing number of British pirates to mainland Mosquitia, but most importantly, it inaugurated a period of bilateral exchange between Miskitu and British parties amidst an intense imperial rivalry between European powers for control over this geographically pivotal region.

In contrast to most indigenous nations in Mesoamerica, this *sui generis* relationship between Miskitu and European pirates was catalyzed by the unofficial, horizontal and non-violent nature of their initial encounters.<sup>236</sup> The Miskitu perceived British privateers as non-threatening foreign traders rather than agents of formal incursions aiming to settle and evangelize the region. This distinction between friendly “grey-eyed people”<sup>237</sup> and evil *ispail nani* (Spanish)<sup>238</sup> was woven into the fabric of Miskitu society from an early stage. On account of this friendly interaction, by the 1630s, British pirates had already established small colonies along the Mosquitia Coast, including those of Cape Gracias a Dios and Bluefields.<sup>239</sup>

---

<sup>235</sup> The African slaves who fled Providence found safe shelter in Mosquitia, where a process of miscegenation was set into motion.

<sup>236</sup> Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast," 118-19.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., 126.

<sup>238</sup> Baron L. Pineda, *Shipwrecked Identities: Navigating Race on Nicaragua's Mosquito Coast*, second ed. (New Brunswick Rutgers University Press, 2006). 236.

<sup>239</sup> According to Gabbert, other settlements included those in Belize and Black River. Wolfgang Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," in *National Integration and Contested Autonomy*, ed. Luciano Baracco (New York: Algora Publishing, 2011), 13.

This interaction between the peoples of Mosquitia and British pirates is well illustrated in the chronicles of Huguenot writer Alexandre Oliver Exquemelin. Upon arrival in Cape Gracias a Dios, he describes the unexpectedly welcoming conduct of Miskitu tribes towards Englishmen,

As we dropped anchor we saw two Christians on the beach, who waited to welcome us. The rovers are on such friendly terms with the native people they can stay and live among them without risk of harm, and without a care in the world [...] the Indians give them all they need, in exchange for which they give the Indians [...] knives, axes and tools of that sort.<sup>240</sup>

In the mid-seventeenth and early eighteenth century, however, this hitherto informal yet friendly economic association was officialized to include a solid military alliance, where both parties would benefit by keeping Spanish forces at bay from Mosquitia, which was then constantly attacked on both eastern and western fronts. British buccaneers advanced into Western Mosquitian territories via the Coco River in the hope of seizing the Spanish town of Nueva Segovia in 1654. Similarly, in 1665, British pirates in Mosquitia attacked the Spanish settlement of Granada, plundering other establishments along the way.<sup>241</sup> Particularly important for the strengthening of this alliance was the British seizure of Jamaica from Spain in 1655. Not long after, in 1687, the Governor of Jamaica crowned the first Miskitu king, Jeremy I,<sup>242</sup> in

---

<sup>240</sup> Alexandre O. Exquemelin, *The Buccaneers of America, translated by Alexis Brown* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969). 219.

<sup>241</sup> Lenman, *Britain's Colonial Wars 1688-1783*: 58.

<sup>242</sup> According to Michael Olien, the first historical evidence of Miskitu kingship can be traced back to 1687. Sir Hans Sloane, the governor of Jamaica's physician, in 1707 describes "Jeremy" as the ruler of Miskitu territory in the reign of England's Charles I.

what theretofore was to be denominated the Kingdom of Mosquitia. Whereas the existence of a royal, centralized and hereditary government in Mosquitia predating the arrival of British corsairs is widely contested,<sup>243</sup> most scholars agree on the fact that the crowning of Jeremy I was a strategic move by the Miskitu. According to Nicholas Rogers, Jeremy I “presented himself before the governor of Jamaica and asked him for some British governance to protect his people from the Spanish [...]”<sup>244</sup> But apart from the Miskitu seeking increased military protection, the establishment of a kingdom also benefited Britain’s economic interests in the region. British forces saw the prospect of utilizing the figure of the king to assist them in exploring the possibility of discovering an interoceanic canal starting on the delta of the San Juan River.<sup>245</sup>

For their part, in the early eighteenth century, two of the most prominent groups in Mosquitia, the Miskitu and Zambos,<sup>246</sup> launched a series of forceful attacks against two separate Spanish assaults on the Mosquitia Coast, thereby protecting the now more populous British settlements along the shore.<sup>247</sup> In addition, the Miskitu participated in several British expeditions across the Atlantic Coast, contributing to the containment of Spanish incursions in Central American territories—where, despite their repeated unsuccessful invasions, they still claimed sovereignty.<sup>248</sup> However, the forging of this Miskitu-British

---

Sloane in Michael D. Olien, "The Miskito Kings and the Line of Succession," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 39, no. 2 (1983): 201.

<sup>243</sup> See Mary W. Helms, "Of Kings and Contexts: Ethnohistorical Interpretations of Miskito Political Structure and Function," *American Ethnologist* 13, no. 3 (1986).

<sup>244</sup> Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast," 123.

<sup>245</sup> Luciano Baracco, "Introduction," in *National Integration and Contested Autonomy: The Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua*, ed. Luciano Baracco (New York: Algora Publishing, 2011), 4.

<sup>246</sup> The Zambo (Sambos) and the Tawira are two ethnics groups belonging to the Miskitu. The Sambo inhabit the north whilst the Tawira populate the south.

<sup>247</sup> Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast," 124.

<sup>248</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," 13.

military alliance underwent a significant transformation after the War of Jenkins Ear<sup>249</sup> (1739-1748), when Britain appointed, for the first time, a colonial official into the region. This colonial maneuver by the British not only imposed the figure of a military superintendent without popular consultation of the peoples in Mosquitia<sup>250</sup> but also established an official protectorate over the Mosquito Shore from 1749 onwards.<sup>251</sup>

The protectorate was founded upon the figure of a powerless and unrepresentative monarch, who was required to receive Britain's consent for his legitimization as King of Mosquitia. Michael Olien explains that the official crowning of Miskitu kings took place either in England or in the British-controlled territories of Jamaica and Belize in the Americas.<sup>252</sup> Whilst the choice of king was entirely left to the Miskitu, the influence exerted by Britain permeated the politics of kingship for "princes were taken to England, Jamaica or Belize to be educated. English became the prestige language of the coast and the followers expected the kings to become fairly fluent in the language."<sup>253</sup> Adding to this subtle yet powerful acculturation process, the king held no tangible power and was often puppeteered by the newly-arrived British colonial officers in the region.<sup>254</sup> In the words of Eduard Conzemius, who was the first anthropologist to conduct research on the Mosquitia region, the king "became a tool in the hands of his foreign protectors, with whose aid his nominal authority was extended over the larger part of the coast."<sup>255</sup>

---

<sup>249</sup> The War of Jenkins Ear or "Guerra de Asiento" refers to the war starting in 1739 between Great Britain and Spain for the dominion of American territories.

<sup>250</sup> Marie Léger, "Regional Autonomy on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast," in *Aboriginal peoples: toward self-government* ed. Marie Léger (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1994), 40.

<sup>251</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," 13.

<sup>252</sup> Olien, "The Miskito Kings and the Line of Succession," 200.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid.

<sup>254</sup> Other political figures emerged in the course of the 1750s and 1760s such as those of "general", "governor" and "admiral". These positions, however, remained subordinated to the power of the Miskitu king. Ibid., 199.

<sup>255</sup> Eduard Conzemius, *Ethnographical Survey of the Miskito and the Sumu Indians of Honduras and Nicaragua* (Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin, 1932). 101.

Whilst the creation of a Miskitu kingdom neither altered the acephalous nature of Miskitian society<sup>256</sup> nor affected the indigenous nations' territorial control over Mosquitia, the very presence of British officials wielded power over procedures such as the codification of laws and the formalization of territorial titles. In this context of conflicting and overlapping powers, the British and the Miskitu held different views regarding who was the real sovereign and who was the nominal one. On the one hand, the British perceived Mosquitia to be under the control of the English governorship of Jamaica and, therefore, a pseudo colony in the Americas.<sup>257</sup> Nevertheless, the Miskitu regarded their king as the legitimate and sole sovereign of the region. In this sense, they collectively perceived their political, economic and military alliance with the British as a crucial strategy in preserving their independent status within an already European-controlled geographical area.

The Treaty of Paris (1763), the Battle of Black River (1782), the Peace of Versailles (1783) and the Anglo-Spanish Convention of London (1786) all had a strong impact on the politics of the Kingdom of Mosquitia. Under the Treaty of Paris, Spain reaffirmed its claims to territorial sovereignty in the Caribbean Coast yet allowed British settlers to remain in the region strictly for economic and trading purposes; in particular, allowing them to extract logwood in the Bay of Honduras and across the Atlantic Coast.<sup>258</sup> In 1782, however, after seizing and securing the Mobile

---

<sup>256</sup> See Helms, "Of Kings and Contexts: Ethnohistorical Interpretations of Miskito Political Structure and Function." Olien, "The Miskito Kings and the Line of Succession."; Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast."

<sup>257</sup> The idyllic economic circumstances in Mosquitia boosted British migration to the region. By mid-eighteenth century, 1,100 Europeans had settled in the shores of Mosquitia. Léger, "Regional Autonomy on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast," 40.

<sup>258</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," 13.

and Pensacola British ports in West Florida,<sup>259</sup> Charles III of Spain commanded the Captain General of Guatemala, Matías de Galvez, to dispatch forces to the Mosquito region. In a 1781 letter addressed to Galvez, Charles III declared that the goal was to:

Dislocate the English from their hidden establishments on the Gulf of Honduras, and especially the castle on the San Juan River, impeding [British] intrusion into the Great Lake of Nicaragua [...] even at [the cost] of exterminating [...] the nations of the Mosquito and Zambo Indians allied as a rule with our enemies.<sup>260</sup>

The arrival of Spanish battalions ignited a series of battles in Mosquitia during 1782, today widely known as the Black River War. It ended with the recognition by Britain of the sovereignty of Spain over the great majority of territories in the Atlantic Coast.<sup>261</sup> In addition, the Treaty of Versailles confined Britain's area of influence to those territories located between Belize and the Hondo Rivers.<sup>262</sup> Finally, in 1786, subduing under Spanish pressure, the Convention of London set the foundations for Britain's withdrawal from Mosquitia.<sup>263</sup> The treaty led to the evacuation of all British troops and settlements from the coast, amounting to an estimated 2650 people, the great majority of whom fled to British-controlled Belize.<sup>264</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> David J. Weber, *The Spanish frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). 267-68.

<sup>260</sup> Carlos III in Thomas E. Chávez, *Spain and the independence of the United States: an intrinsic gift* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002). 151.

<sup>261</sup> Troy S. Floyd, *The Anglo-Spanish Struggle for Mosquitia* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1967).

<sup>262</sup> "A colony in dispute: past and future of British Honduras," *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 48, no. 190 (1958): 156.

<sup>263</sup> Under the convention, Britain was granted rights to cut logwood and mahogany in Belize. Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," 13; Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast."

<sup>264</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," 13.

Notwithstanding Britain's withdrawal, the Spanish endeavor to finally colonize Mosquitia did not materialize. Stern Mosquitian resistance once again drove Spanish forces out of the region. Despite winning over one Miskitu chief, named Colville Briton, Spanish efforts to repopulate the Black River with immigrants from the Canary Islands proved unsuccessful. The tense situation between the parties reached breaking point in 1794 after the French invasion of Spain. The invasion influenced Spain's decision to retreat from Roatan and Cape Gracias a Dios. In 1800, the Miskitu advanced toward Spain's stronghold in the Black River, attacking Spanish forces and driving them back to Trujillo.<sup>265</sup> In this sense, even under this hostile climate and without the military support of their long-time European allies, the Miskitu managed to perpetuate their territorial sovereignty and political autonomy over Mosquitia.

Britain's withdrawal from the region was only ephemeral. The wars of independence that snowballed across the Spanish colonies from 1806 onwards, left a political vacuum in Central America that Britain was eager to fill. A renewed European interest in the extraction of mahogany brought along a new wave of British merchants and traders to the region. These traders, however, were soon accompanied by British officials, who returned to the region in 1844.<sup>266</sup> British Consul, Patrick Walker, declared Mosquitia a British protectorate and established the southern city of Bluefields as its capital. In addition, in 1846, he established a formal system of government via the creation of a Mosquitia Council of State.<sup>267</sup> According to Luciano Baracco,

---

<sup>265</sup> Rogers, "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast," 134-35.

<sup>266</sup> Eleonore von Oertzen, Lioba Rossbach, and Volker Wunderich, eds., *The Nicaraguan Mosquitia in historical documents, 1844-1927: the dynamics of ethnic and regional history* (Berlin: D Reimer, 1990), 15.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid., 106.

Britain justified its actions in Mosquitia as just another diplomatic engagement with peoples and states in the Americas.<sup>268</sup>

Apart from fragmenting and reducing the size of the Miskitu territory,<sup>269</sup> the establishment of this protectorate did not significantly transform the way the peoples of Mosquitia governed themselves. Nor did it affect their modes of subsistence, for the great majority of peoples in the region remained marginalized from the urban and Creole<sup>270</sup>-dominated centers of Pearl Lagoon and Bluefields. The king remained an unrepresentative figurehead with no real power over the scattered and geographically distant territories of Mosquitia. In this sense, while the protectorate provided previously non-existent powers to British colonists and Moravian missionaries,<sup>271</sup> the resilience of Mosquitian peoples to a centralized form of government allowed the preservation of their autonomous status once again.

In 1850, the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, signed by the United States and Great Britain, reaffirmed Mosquitia's status as an independent territorial and political entity from Nicaragua.<sup>272</sup> Not long after,

---

<sup>268</sup> Luciano Baracco, "From British colonialism to revolutionary developmentalism: The 're-birth' of autonomy in Nicaragua's Caribbean Coast," *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 8, no. 4 (2012): 377.

<sup>269</sup> The Mosquito Coast has previously which previously stretched from the coasts of Honduras to those in Panama. Léger, "Regional Autonomy on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast," 41.

<sup>270</sup> The Creole are descendants of African slaves and other African immigrants from the Caribbean.

<sup>271</sup> After Walker's failed attempts to set into motion an Anglican evangelization process in Mosquitia, in 1849, the Moravian Church officially sent its first mission to the region, compounded by three missionaries. The effects of Moravian evangelization were to be slow but steady, converting first the more "acculturated" Creoles and then the "heathen" Miskitus. Under the protectorate, Moravian missionary H.G. Pfeiffer was given the position of magistrate in the Kingdom of Mosquitia. In the 1850s, Moravian missionaries expanded their missions to Pearl Lagoon and Rama Cay. Eleonore von Oertzen, "Protestantism and Ethnic Identity: Moravian Missionaries on the Nicaraguan Coast in the 19th Century," *Cuadernos de Antropología*, no. 15 (2005). Léger, "Regional Autonomy on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast"; Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?"; Charles R. Hale, *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan state, 1894-1987* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

<sup>272</sup> In this treaty, both parties also agreed to jointly control and protect the possible isthmian canal. Dean Fafoutis, "Clayton-Bulwer Treaty," in *Britain and the Americas*:

however, the peoples of Mosquitia were betrayed by an unexpected change of course in the relationship between Nicaragua and Britain. In 1860, the Treaty of Managua, between Great Britain and Nicaragua, recognized, for the first time, Nicaragua's sovereignty over Mosquitia. The treaty dissolved the Kingdom of Mosquitia and dictated the withdrawal of all British officials from the area within a short period of time. The treaty, nevertheless, granted the peoples of Mosquitia rights to self-government. It stipulated:

The Mosquito Indians shall be assigned a district as part of the territory of Nicaragua [...and] under the sovereignty of the Republic of Nicaragua [...] the Mosquito Indians inhabiting [this district] will enjoy the right to govern themselves and govern all the inhabitants of such territory according to their own customs [...] The Republic of Nicaragua shall respect and not oppose these customs and norms.<sup>273</sup>

The treaty transformed the Mosquitia Coast into the "Mosquito Reservation,"<sup>274</sup> a term borrowed by Nicaragua from the United States—a concept which denoted paternalism and animalistic-like confinement as well as promoted the myth of the noble savage. The Mosquito Reservation's boundaries, under this new territorial arrangement, were set to the Hueso River to the north, Rama River to the south, 84° 15' degrees to the West and the Atlantic Coast to the east.<sup>275</sup> This meant that the treaty deprived the Miskitu of the historically and culturally significant area of Cape

---

*culture, politics, and history*, ed. Will Kaufman and Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO Inc, 2005), 229.

<sup>273</sup> Reino Unido de la Gran Bretaña e Irlanda and República de Nicaragua, "Tratado de Managua," ed. Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores (Londres: La Gaceta, 1860). *Translation mine.*

<sup>274</sup> "Reserva Mosquitia" is the original Spanish term for the region.

<sup>275</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?," 25.

Gracias a Dios, San Juan del Norte (Greytown),<sup>276</sup> and the Coco River. In combination with an 1859 treaty between Great Britain and Honduras,<sup>277</sup> Mosquitia was divided into two separate regions, one falling within Honduran territory and the other within Nicaragua. Despite Nicaragua's newly acquired power over the region, the peoples of Mosquitia continued to govern themselves via their own socio-politico systems as well as retained jurisdiction over the extraction of natural resources in the region. In this sense, from early 1500 to 1860, the Miskitu were the only nation in Central America to escape the yoke of Spanish colonialism. The challenge for the peoples of Mosquitia from 1860 onwards, however, was to maintain their autonomous status, their internal political power and keep Nicaraguan economic interests at bay from the region—possibly via building new alliances with powerful actors in the Americas. The next section explores Miskitian autonomy from the late nineteenth century to the late twentieth century.

#### The End of Autonomy: Miskitu-Creole conflict and Zelaya's invasion of Mosquitia

Miskitu autonomy perdured throughout most of the second half of the nineteenth century, even after the establishment of the Mosquito Reservation. Despite this continuation of formal autonomy, however, the new political and territorial arrangements brought along a series of new external and domestic challenges for the peoples of Mosquitia from 1860 onwards. On the one hand, the United States, as an emergent regional power, regarded the British-influenced and "Westernized" Mosquitia as one of the most suitable places for resource extraction (rubber, mahogany and minerals) and commercial exchange (bananas, cassava in return for petroleum,

---

<sup>276</sup> Reino Unido de la Gran Bretaña e Irlanda and República de Nicaragua, "Tratado de Managua."

<sup>277</sup> Patricia Galeana, *El tratado McLane-Ocampo: la comunicación interoceánica y el libre comercio* (México Distrito Federal: Editorial Porrúa, 2006).

clothing and flour)<sup>278</sup> in the Americas. In addition, the San Juan River in southern Mosquitia was seen as the preferred geographical space for the transisthmus canal route.<sup>279</sup> Exerting influence and building solid ties with elites in the region became a U.S. priority.

Furthermore, in the eyes of American explorers and business investors, Mosquitia provided not only an English-speaking and Protestant Creole labor force—similar to their own African descendants—but also a population which had been exposed, like the peoples of Jamaica and Belize, to a high degree of Anglo-Western customs, social norms and forms of political organization. This “acculturation” was seen as a determinant factor in favoring economic incursions into Mosquitia rather than into the neighboring Spanish-speaking and Catholic Nicaragua. By 1890, ninety percent of the region’s investment was in the hands of U.S. citizens and corporation.<sup>280</sup>

American influence in Mosquitia, nevertheless, sowed the foundations of internal discrepancies between the native Miskitus, Mayangnas and Ramas, and the African descendant Creoles. The Creoles, who had historically been Britain’s preferred ethnic group, had by now acquired veritable political advantage, paving the way for a reconfiguration of racial politics in the region. This alteration of racial hierarchy left the Miskitu, Mayangna and Rama socially and economically marginalized from the urban and elite centers of Bluefields and Pearl Lagoon, mostly inhabited by Creoles and whites. Records from 1855 show that the Miskitu, Mayangna and Rama constituted only one-sixth of the population of Bluefields at that time. Most of this population, however, “abandoned the town as a result of the discrimination and

---

<sup>278</sup> David M. Pletcher, *Diplomacy of Trade and Investment: American Economic Expansion in the Hemisphere 1865-1900* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1998). 146.

<sup>279</sup> Hale, *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan state, 1894-1987*: 39.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., 40.

cheating they experienced at the hands of Afro-American and white residents."<sup>281</sup> For the Americans, no differently to the British, the African descendant population was more suited to be in control of the economic affairs of the region, for they:

[...] respond with enthusiasm to the call  
for conventions, participate in debate [...]  
As a result, Mosquito men are almost  
entirely excluded from power, and the  
government [... falls] easily into the hands  
of the mixed population ... consisting  
chiefly of Jamaicans who still claim to be  
British soldiers.<sup>282</sup>

Indeed, the Creole were the neo-middlemen between the United States and the peoples of Mosquitia. According to Charles Hale, during this period, the Creole "became shop owners, middle-level employees of North American companies and small scale producers (mainly of bananas)."<sup>283</sup>

The period from 1860 to 1894 saw the ostracization of indigenous peoples from political affairs in Mosquitia. This is despite the fact that the Miskitu were the official rulers of the region. Under the laws of the Mosquito Reservation, the Hereditary Chief replaced the former King of Mosquitia. Indigenous village leaders were required to participate in the newly-constituted General Council (first chamber). This General Council would then appoint the seventeen members of the second chamber, the Executive Council. Here, the British consul, Moravian missionaries and other non-indigenous actors (mainly the Creole elite) played a significant role as advisors. In particular, Moravian

---

<sup>281</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?", 26.

<sup>282</sup> Courtney de Kalb, "Nicaragua: Studies on the Mosquito Shore in 1892," *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 25(1893): 275.

<sup>283</sup> Hale, *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan state, 1894-1987*: 41.

missionaries exerted great influence in the realms of law and taxation as they continuously held the position of regional treasurer up to 1894.<sup>284</sup> Although the role and power of these external agents affected indigenous groups' influence over the political affairs of the region, nevertheless, the highly centralized quality of the government conferred a great degree of autonomy on Mosquitia. In other words, the Creole-dominated power-politics of Bluefields, Western customs and ways of life seldom reached the geographically isolated indigenous towns and villages of the west and north. Thus, the peoples of the region not only managed to preserve the legal status of Mosquitia as a completely autonomous entity from Nicaragua, but most importantly, kept Creole and Western interests at bay from their own societies.

For its part, Nicaragua, since its independence from Spain in 1838, had been marred by chaos, violence and warfare. The liberal forces from the city of León and the conservatives from Granada had been battling each other for decades to the extent that, by 1854, Nicaragua had already had twenty-four heads of state.<sup>285</sup> But the triumph of the Liberal Revolution in 1893 brought to government a political elite committed to expanding Nicaragua's borders to the Atlantic Coast. In this context, a new discourse of patriotism, national unity and "Nicaraguanness" emerged and as its logical corollary was the stern belief that Nicaragua had the inherent right to integrate the hitherto autonomous Atlantic Coast region into the nation.<sup>286</sup> Very much like Justo Rufino Barrios and Miguel Estrada Cabrera in Guatemala and Porfirio Diaz in Mexico, President José Santos Zelaya implemented a series of structural reforms, mainly in the economic and social realms, with the

---

<sup>284</sup> Gabbert, "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?", 26.

<sup>285</sup> Clifford L Staten, *The History of Nicaragua* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2010). 22.

<sup>286</sup> The 1893 war with Honduras also fueled Nicaragua's expansionism. Against the menace of a military attack, the needs of deploying troops to Bluefields became a prime concern for the government. Volker Wunderich, "La unificación nacional que dejó una nación dividida: el gobierno del Presidente Zelaya y la 'reincorporación' de la Mosquitia a Nicaragua en 1894," *Revista de Historia*, no. 34 (1996): 15.

purpose of integrating Nicaragua into the global economic market.<sup>287</sup> Zelaya's expansionist project reflected the interests of Nicaragua's *latifundista* elite, who saw the prospect of an economic bonanza by annexing the resource-rich Mosquito Shore to Nicaragua and incorporating the isthmian region of the San Juan River near Bluefields.<sup>288</sup>

On February 12, 1894, General Rigoberto Cabezas and his army, at the behest of President Zelaya, occupied the city of Bluefields, inaugurating a process of territorial incorporation and Mosquitian cultural integration into Nicaragua. Zelaya had commanded Cabezas to "occupy Bluefields militarily: dispose the Mosquito Chief and leave the consequences to me."<sup>289</sup> Under this colonialist operation, Bluefields' government buildings and centers were seized, Miskitu and other indigenous and local authorities were deposed, police stations were occupied,<sup>290</sup> streets and social spaces were raided, the city's green landscape was obscured by uniformed Nicaraguan forces and the Nicaraguan flag, for the first time, was unfurled in the region. Soon, Nicaragua declared sovereignty over Mosquitia, officialized the use of Spanish language and set into motion a large-scale project for granting concessions to allow the extraction of natural resources in the region.<sup>291</sup> In addition, General Cabezas declared:

2) We withdraw our recognition of the  
Reserve's authorities. The Commissioner of

---

<sup>287</sup> Ibid., 11-12.

<sup>288</sup> Zelaya's expansionist policy was first supported by the United States, who saw the possibility of exerting greater influence on the canal by unifying Mosquitia and Nicaragua. However, not long after, the U.S decided to build the much-desired interoceanic canal in Panama, thereby withdrawing support from Zelaya. As a consequence, Zelaya launched a stern campaign to attract foreign investment for the construction of the San Juan River canal in Nicaragua. From then onwards, Zelaya became U.S's nemesis. Ibid., 12.

<sup>289</sup> Excerpt from a declaration made by Carlos Alberto Lacayo, who was a government official during Zelaya's presidency. Pedro Joaquín Cuadra Chamorro, *La reincorporación de la Mosquitia, estudio de interpretación histórica* (Managua1944). 11-13.

<sup>290</sup> Prof. Hugo Sujo, "La reincorporación de la Mosquitia," *WANI* 1986, 19.

<sup>291</sup> Pineda, *Shipwrecked Identities: Navigating Race on Nicaragua's Mosquito Coast*: 61.

the Republic will take charge, as he judges pertinent, of the political and administrative regime. 3) No vessel will be allowed to leave the port without previous consent from this command. 4) The formation of groups and public gatherings are prohibited as well as the carriage of weapons. 5) Crimes committed will be prosecuted by military justice [...].<sup>292</sup>

On March 8, the Miskitu Hereditary Chief, Henry Clarence, in a letter addressed to Queen Victoria, voiced the concerns and fear of the peoples of Mosquitia. The petition, signed by 1,800 people,<sup>293</sup> appealed to Great Britain to protect the autonomy conferred to the peoples of Mosquitia by the Treaty of Managua in 1860. It pleaded:

We will be in the hands of a government and people who have not the slightest interests, sympathy or good feeling for the inhabitants of the Mosquito Reservation; and as our manner, customs, religion, laws and language are not in accord, there can never be a unity ... We most respectfully beg to lay before your Majesty ... to take back your protection of the Mosquito nation and people.<sup>294</sup>

Nevertheless, British officials in Bluefields had instructions not to become involved in the political affairs of the region. "Kearsage" and "Cleopatra," American and British warships respectively, arrived in the region in February. But apart from a few failed

---

<sup>292</sup> Cabezas in Sujo, "La reincorporación de la Mosquitia," 19-20. *Translation mine.*

<sup>293</sup> Pineda, *Shipwrecked Identities: Navigating Race on Nicaragua's Mosquito Coast*: 62.

<sup>294</sup> Henry Clarence in Oertzen, Rossbach, and Wunderich, *The Nicaraguan Mosquitia in historical documents, 1844-1927: the dynamics of ethnic and regional history*, 369.

attempts at negotiation with Nicaragua, these states were, for the most part, concerned with the protection of their own citizens from the unfolding violent turmoil. Eventually, these foreign actors implicitly sided with Nicaraguan forces against Miskitu and Creole rebellions. Realizing that their former allies refused to aid their resistance against Nicaraguan colonization, organized insurrection erupted in July 1894. The insurrection re-established the powers of the Miskitu Hereditary Chief as well as seized the police headquarters from the Nicaraguan army.<sup>295</sup> Not long after, the rebellion gained momentum, spreading from Bluefields to the port of Bluff, then to Corn Islands and Prinzapolka, where Creole forces successfully overthrew Nicaraguan authorities and demanded the restoration of the Mosquito Reservation. This fierce resistance culminated on July 11 when Cabezas's men were forced to retreat to the city of Rama.<sup>296</sup>

On August 3, however, General Cabezas, accompanied by a larger battalion and with explicit support from the United States, invaded Mosquitia once again. This second military invasion seized Bluefields, crushed the rebellion and resumed Nicaragua's nationalist and developmentalist project. Furthermore, President Zelaya renamed the region as the Department of Zelaya, made General Cabezas its first governor and established a municipal government in Bluefields.<sup>297</sup> On the 20<sup>th</sup> of November of the same year, a group of Miskitu and other indigenous elders signed the Convention of Mosquitia, a bilateral treaty with the Nicaraguan nation that was meant to give Nicaragua international legitimacy for its annexation of the Atlantic Coast. The so-called "voluntary incorporation" treaty made all inhabitants of the region subjects of Nicaraguan national law, reconfigured local forms of government, established police forces across the area, regulated

---

<sup>295</sup> Sujo, "La reincorporación de la Mosquitia," 20.

<sup>296</sup> Charles R. Hale, ""Wan Tasbaya Dukiara": Contested Notions of Land Rights in Miskitu History," in *Remapping Memory: The Politics of TimeSpace*, ed. Jonathan Boyarin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 72.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid.

local hunting practices and exempted the region from taxation.<sup>298</sup> This annexation of Mosquitia into Nicaragua is today known as the *Reincorporación* or *Reincorporation*, a term which illustrates how Nicaraguan colonial interests at the time fabricated a national myth that re-constructed Mosquitia as an inherent part of Nicaraguan territory. For Nicaraguans, Mosquitia could only be *re-incorporated* for it belonged to the nation-state since its very inception.

The Reincorporation brought to an end the autonomous status of Mosquitia, which had, up to 1894, resisted numerous colonial interventions and military invasions from Columbus and Spanish expeditions in the early sixteenth century to British corsairs, British government officials and United States investors in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries respectively. The Mosquitia, now Department of Zelaya, was no longer an autonomous and self-governed entity outside of the borders of the Nicaraguan state. Rather, in the eyes of the Nicaraguan nationalist *latifundista* elite, it was a resource-rich territory in need of exploration and exploitation. By 1903, Zelaya had granted American investor, James Dietrick, concession for the development of railroads and other infrastructure projects in an area in the Department of Zelaya south of the Coco River that represented almost a quarter of Nicaragua's national territory.<sup>299</sup> The case of Dietrick epitomizes the extent to which Zelaya's government dispossessed indigenous peoples and Creoles from the region to give way to "progress" and "development." In the words of Zelaya, the purpose was to:

[...] sell hectares of land in our Atlantic  
littoral to allow the incursion of colonies of  
workers, who will remove the unexplored

---

<sup>298</sup> Convención Moskitia, "Convención de la Moskitia," (Palacio de las Sesiones de la Convención Mosquita: Consejo de Anciano de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia, 1894).

<sup>299</sup> Wunderich, "La unificación nacional que dejó una nación dividida: el gobierno del Presidente Zelaya y la 'reincorporación' de la Mosquitia a Nicaragua en 1894," 32-33.

riches of our soil. The companies [that will be established in the region] promise great benefits for our agriculture and commerce.<sup>300</sup>

The state-sponsored immigration of Pacific Nicaraguans to the region, the forced Hispanicization of Mosquitia (aided by Moravian missionaries), the eviction and racial abuse of indigenous families at the hands of lawless banana, mining, logging and railway companies, as well as the imposition of arbitrary and illegal fines on local peoples, led to disenfranchisement, marginalization and dispossession for the peoples of the region. For the most part of the twentieth century, Mosquitia was subjected to a nationalist and extractivist project sheltered by a discourse of modernization and progress. The next section explores the current state of Mosquitia under the Nicaraguan government and studies the political project of a multi-cultural local organization, the Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia (Council of Miskitu Elders of the Communitarian Nation Moskitia).

### **Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia**

#### Historical Background

The Sandinista Revolution of 1978 marked the beginning of a new era for the peoples of Mosquitia. The Sandinista political project was anchored in a discourse of modernization reminiscent of Zelaya's presidency, although, concealed under the more popular anti-imperialist nationalism that stirred up the Nicaraguan masses. This explains the Mosquitian rebellion of 1980. This insurrection led to a violent conflict between the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) and the peoples

---

<sup>300</sup> "Mensaje del General J. Santos Zelaya al Congreso," (Managua1904), 15. *Translation mine.*

inhabiting the Atlantic Coast region. By the mid-1980s, the conflict prompted FSLN to change its approach to the region in order to “pacify” and halt indigenous collaboration with the *contras*. The government recognized for the first time indigenous peoples’ right to autonomy and started negotiations with MISURASATA (Miskitu, Sumu, Rama, and Sandinista, Asla, Takanka).<sup>301</sup> In this context, the former top-down integrationist approach adopted *ab initio* by FSLN was replaced with a series of policies that attempted to grant autonomy to Mosquitia. Accordingly, in 1987, a multi-ethnic assembly was held in Bilwi, which “marked the culmination of a participatory process of meetings, workshops, educational sessions [...] and opinion polls, known as the *consulta popular*.”<sup>302</sup>

This resulted in the approval of the Statute of Autonomy or Law 28, which transformed the Department of Zelaya into a *su generis* autonomous area divided into two regions: the Northern Atlantic Autonomous Region (RAAN) and the Southern Atlantic Autonomous Region (RAAS)—together covering broadly fifty per cent of Nicaraguan national territory.<sup>303</sup> Leading the way in Latin America, Nicaragua officially recognized the multi-ethnic nature of its citizenry. The peoples of Mosquitia positively welcomed this change of policy, which they anticipated would restitute the autonomy granted to the region by the Treaty of Managua in 1860.

In theory, Law 28 grants territorial, political, legal and educational autonomy to the six groups of peoples inhabiting the Atlantic Coast region: Miskitus, Creoles, Sumos, Garifunas, Ramas and mestizos. Nonetheless, more than two decades after the

---

<sup>301</sup> Hale, *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan state, 1894-1987*: 2.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., 166. *Italics in original*.

<sup>303</sup> Presidencia de la República and Asamblea Nacional de la Repùblica de Nicaragua, “Ley 28: Estatuto de la Autonomía de las Regiones de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua,” ed. Asamblea Nacional de la Repùblica de Nicaragua (Managua: La Gaceta Diario Oficial de la Federación, 1987).

enactment of this autonomous regime, innumerable historical, economic and socio-political factors have hindered its objectives. Institutionalized discrimination and repression, a plundering extractivist economy, skyrocketing poverty, unrepresentative local regional councils, chronic corruption and widespread discontent evince an autonomist project which has many limitations in the implementation of grassroots indigenous demands. Throughout the legislation, there is an implicit endeavor to integrate indigenous nations into the broader fabric of Nicaraguan citizenship and enable, simultaneously, the licensed incursion of neo-settlers into this formerly unheeded region.<sup>304</sup>

In terms of natural resources, Law 28 and Law 445<sup>305</sup> subordinate indigenous sovereignty to national development plans regarding the management of water, rainforests and communal lands.<sup>306</sup> In particular, Article 12 of Law 445 bestows the central government with the power to coordinate decisions in regards to concessions and contracts for the exploration, extraction and exploitation of natural resources in the area.<sup>307</sup> This leaves limited space for indigenous councils and grassroots organizations to decide over megaprojects in their territory. Accordingly, controversial projects such as the Hydroelectric Project Tumarín<sup>308</sup> and the Interoceanic Railroad and Ports

---

<sup>304</sup> See Articles: 2, 8, 10, 11.3, 11.5, 11.8, 13, 18, 32.

<sup>305</sup> Ley del Régimen de Propiedad Comunal de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua y de los Ríos Bocay, Coco, Indio y Maíz. Approved by Congress in 2003 to set out the regulations of the autonomous regime.

<sup>306</sup> Presidencia de la República and Asamblea Nacional de la Republica de Nicaragua, "Ley 28: Estatuto de la Autonomía de las Regiones de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua."

<sup>307</sup> Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua and Presidencia de la República, "Ley No. 445: Ley del Régimen de Propiedad Comunal de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua y de los Ríos Bocay, Coco, Indio y Maíz," ed. Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua (Managua: La Gaceta Diario Oficial, 2003), 6-7.

<sup>308</sup> The Nicaragua Dispatch, "Congress approves reforms for Tumarín," *The Nicaragua Dispatch*, 13 of November 2012 2012; Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua, "Aprueban reforma de proyecto hidroeléctrico en Tumarín," *Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua*(2012), <http://www.asamblea.gob.ni/86672/aprueban-reforma-de-proyecto-hidroelectrico-tumarin/>.

Project<sup>309</sup> have been unilaterally approved by Managua officials despite the opposition of indigenous communities and local socio-politico organizations. Despite Nicaragua's ratification of the ILO Convention 169, the peoples of Mosquitia were seldom consulted in the construction of these megaprojects.

Furthermore, Law 28 incentivizes intraregional and interregional trade as a means to consolidate and strengthen Nicaraguan national economy. Article 23 of Law 445 stipulates that the central government "guarantees the participation of Regional Councils in discussions over market policies in the Atlantic Coast region."<sup>310</sup> Nevertheless, RAAN and RAAS do not have the right to decide over their own economic activities in local communities. In addition, this article, rather vaguely, frames the conditions under which financial credits and technical cooperation can flourish between the parties.<sup>311</sup> However, neither Law 28 nor Law 445 acknowledges indigenous formulations of the concept of development or the popular notion of *Pawanka*.<sup>312</sup> There is no mention of indigenous modes and methods of production or local strategies for horizontal exchange within the communities of the Atlantic region. Similarly, the Statute of Autonomy denies indigenous agency the basic right to develop and constitute its own political institutions according to local systems of knowledge. Articles 15-32 and 28-39 of Law 28 and 445 respectively, impose three levels of government in RAAN and

---

<sup>309</sup> Asamblea Nacional de la República Nicaragua and Presidencia de la Repùblica, "Ley de Régimen Jurídico de el Gran Canal Interoceánico de Nicaragua y de Creación de la Autoridad de el Gran Canal de Nicaragua," ed. Presidencia de la Repùblica and Asamblea Nacional de la Repùblica de Nicaragua (Managua: Asamblea Nacional, 2012).

<sup>310</sup> Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua and Presidencia de la Repùblica, "Ley No. 445: Ley del Régimen de Propiedad Comunal de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua y de los Ríos Bocay, Coco, Indio y Maíz," 12. *Translation mine*.

<sup>311</sup> Ibid.

<sup>312</sup> In Miskitu, Mayagna and Rama communities the concept of development does not exist. Life is not a linear process of underdeveloped and developed beings or societies. In this sense, *Pawanka* epitomizes the opposite of profit and commodification. It refers to the outmost state of spiritual elevation and happiness that any being can achieve in the course of life. Oscar Hodgson-Arguello, "La soberanía de la moskitia un desafío a la doctrina occidental," *El Nuevo Diario Nicaragua*, 8 of June 2010.

RAAS: *Consejo Regional* (Regional Council), *Coordinador Regional* (Regional Coordinator) and *Autoridades Comunales* (Communal Authorities).<sup>313</sup> In this context, whilst relative power has been conferred to the Regional Council and Regional Coordinator, communal authorities have been relegated to the symbolic realm in this hierarchized and centralized state-system.

Overall, the Statute of Autonomy, by granting special rights to native societies in a Kymlickian fashion, has opened up political spaces for indigenous communities to voice their concerns, organize and administer their societies. Nevertheless, filled with loopholes, exceptions and marred by corruption, the Statute has not fulfilled the territorial, political and economic demands of the peoples of Mosquitia so far. Since its early stages of implementation, the Statute of Autonomy sparked distrust amongst the peoples of Mosquitia. As Hale narrates, townspeople were not fooled by the Statute of Autonomy, instead "they maintained a critical and subversive stance toward the whole process. I often asked Sandy Bay people, 'Will you achieve Miskitu rights through autonomía?' Most answered with a definitive 'No,' expressing gut-level distrust of the Sandinistas."<sup>314</sup>

In the words of Hale, "by 1990 Miskitu people [had] gained a codified law and an elected autonomous, but their struggle to exercise full rights of autonomy had barely begun."<sup>315</sup> In this context, prominent local socio-politico organizations, like the Council of Elders, have been either ostracized or exoticized and folklorized for their cosmovision, native organizational structure and demands. Their vision of territorial, political and economic

---

<sup>313</sup> Presidencia de la República and Asamblea Nacional de la Repùblica de Nicaragua, "Ley 28: Estatuto de la Autonomía de las Regiones de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua." Asamblea Nacional de la Repùblica de Nicaragua and Presidencia de la Repùblica, "Ley No. 445: Ley del Régimen de Propiedad Comunal de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua y de los Ríos Bocay, Coco, Indio y Maíz."

<sup>314</sup> Hale, *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan state, 1894-1987*: 193.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid., 197.

autonomy, as well as their views of customary law and educational policy, are either disregarded or treated paternalistically by the system. In short, the Statute of Autonomy grants nothing more than a symbolic form of self-government within the confines of the Nicaraguan state and citizenship.

The enactment of the Statute ignited an influential campaign by the Council of Elders—a historical and traditional authority for the peoples of Mosquitia—who denounced the lack of tangible forms of autonomy in the region. The Council of Elders' widespread mobilization across the region culminated in the establishment of the General Assembly of Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Communities, which encompassed more than 149 communities. By 1995, this Assembly had proclaimed the Council of Elders as the only legitimate representative of the indigenous peoples and ethnic communities of the region.<sup>316</sup> In the process, it disregarded the Westminster-like power structures imposed by the regime, including the ruling Regional Council, Regional Coordinator, municipal authorities and political parties like the Sandinista-sponsored indigenous party YATAMA.<sup>317</sup>

In 1998, during the IX General Assembly of Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Communities For Land, Nature, Life and the Future, the Council of Elders publicly condemned the imposed autonomous regime for intentionally creating “a lack of leadership in our territory, leading to mismanagement and abuse of our natural resources, disrespect for our organizations and traditions and to deteriorating living conditions.”<sup>318</sup> In like manner, the X General Assembly, the Norms of the Communitarian Nation Moskitia and posterior documents also continued with this wholesale rejection

---

<sup>316</sup> Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia, "Proclama de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de la Nación Comunitaria," (Bilwi: Pueblo Indio, 1997).

<sup>317</sup> YATAMA is an acronym of *Yapti Tasba Masraka Nanih Aslatakanka* in Miskito language, which translates as the “Sons of Mother Earth”.

<sup>318</sup> IX Asamblea General de Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas, "Por la Tierra, la Naturaleza, la Vida y el Futuro," (Organización Pueblo Indio, 1998).

of the Sandinista-sponsored autonomous project. In the words of Oscar Hodgson, prominent Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders:

[We] really have a dysfunctional system. Why doesn't it function? Precisely because there's no autonomy because we don't dispose of the management of economic resources. Secondly, tax revenues go to Managua. Hence, we ask ourselves what is the autonomy concept? For the political parties it's a matter of fortifying the system, as they said in the elections. But for the communities the issue is that their natural resources are being handed away in concessions by the central government. Furthermore, all tax revenues from those concessions are being managed under the criterion of discretionality. That's to say, they aren't even respecting the Budget Law. We ask ourselves why are there timber concessions on the Atlantic Coast whereby a mahogany tree sells in foreign markets at six or seven thousand dollars and what benefit comes [...] to Indigenous communities?<sup>319</sup>

In the midst of this widespread discontent, in 2001 the Second Convention of Mosquitia was promulgated. It was enacted by the same twenty-two communities which in 1894 had agreed to their annexation into Nicaragua. The Second Convention proclaimed:

---

<sup>319</sup> Edgard Solorzano, "Interview with Dr. Oscar Hogdson Arguello," *URACCAN Update*, 18 of March 1998.

As the Communitarian Nation Moskitia,  
we have decided to dissolve the link that  
ties [us] to the Republic of Nicaragua [...]  
unanimously we have accorded to advance  
the promotion of new relations with  
distinct nations and cultures under a  
framework of self-determination [and]  
mutual cooperation [...].<sup>320</sup>

In 2007, Otis Lam Hoppington, the Miskitu elder representative, in a letter addressed to President Daniel Ortega, condemned Nicaragua's colonial policy towards the Atlantic Coast region. On behalf of the Council of Elders, he criticized Nicaragua's flagrant violation of the commitments set out by the 1860 Treaty of Managua, the 1894 Convention of Moskitia and the 1987 Statute of Autonomy. In addition, the letter announced that the historically sovereign peoples of Mosquitia would not be subject to Nicaraguan citizenship any longer. Only two years later, kindling separatist demands throughout the region, Miskitu Reverend Héctor Williams referred to Mosquitia as a "different country," sparking Nicaraguan distrust and fear.<sup>321</sup> Similarly, Hodgson voiced Mosquitian discontent with the autonomous regime: "how is it possible to have autonomy if your natural resources, which are the pillar of your cultural, political and economic [self-determination], are being controlled and distributed from and to Managua?"<sup>322</sup>

---

<sup>320</sup> Segunda Convención de la Moskitia, "Resolución: Segunda Convención de la Moskitia," (Polideportivo de la Ciudad de Bilwi: Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria La Moskitia, 2001). *Translation mine.*

<sup>321</sup> See "Temen violencia en Bilwi," *La Prensa*(2009), <http://www.laprensa.com.ni/2009/10/18/departamentales/1373744-temen-violencia-en-bilwi>. Fermín López, "Estalla violencia en Puerto Cabezas," *El Nuevo Diario*(2009), <http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/nacionales/59739-estalla-violencia-puerto-cabezas/>. "Nicaragua Indigenous Protests Include Kidnapping," *Newsroom Panama*(2012), <http://www.newsroompanama.com/index.php/news/latin-america/nicaragua-indigenous-protests-include-kidnapping>.

<sup>322</sup> La Brújula Semanal, *Entrevista con el Wihta Tara sobre la independencia de La Moskitia*, (2009). *Translation mine.*

Influenced by this re-ignition of Mosquitian demands for autonomy—outside of the Nicaraguan state—the region witnessed a multicultural militant mass mobilization in 2009. On April 19, more than 370 communities from the Atlantic Coast region assembled in the city of Bilwi<sup>323</sup> to proclaim the independence of Mosquitia from the Nicaraguan state. In a letter addressed to the Nicaraguan government in the midst of this political turmoil, the Council of Elders declared:

Our last convention [2001] decided to defend our historical rights and territorial integrity against any form of aggression. Consequently, now our communities, led by their Head of Government, the Wihta Tara, have taken the necessary steps to guarantee the peoples' human, democratic and libertarian rights.<sup>324</sup>

This movement led to the election of the *Almuk Nani* (Council of Elder Authorities), the *Wihta Tara* (great judge) and the creation of an indigenous army to defend the sovereignty of Mosquitia. In this context, Miskito elder Nicodemus Serapio Klapa and leaders Hodgson and Ernesto Scott, embodying Richard Falk's utopian dream of total autonomy from colonial states,<sup>325</sup> declared that the region had the *ipso facto* right to break free from Nicaragua. They proclaimed that "the region was never colonized nor occupied [by Spanish conquistadores] as the Communitarian Nation Moskitia remained a British protectorate [until 1860]."<sup>326</sup>

---

<sup>323</sup> Bilwi is the indigenous name for the city. It defies the Spanish denomination "Puerto Cabezas", given to the town by President Zelaya to honor General Rigoberto Cabezas, who led Nicaragua's colonization of Mosquitia.

<sup>324</sup> Council of Elders in "Dirigentes indígenas miskitos piden independencia de Nicaragua," *La Nación Mundo*(2009), [http://www.nacion.com/mundo/Dirigentes-indigenas-miskitos-independencia-Nicaragua\\_0\\_1079892022.html](http://www.nacion.com/mundo/Dirigentes-indigenas-miskitos-independencia-Nicaragua_0_1079892022.html). *Translation mine.*

<sup>325</sup> Falk, "The Right of Self-Determination under International Law: The Coherence of Doctrine versus the Incoherence of Experience."

<sup>326</sup> Oscar Hodgson-Arguello, "La soberanía de la moskitia un desafío a la doctrina occidental." *Translation mine.*

In addition, Miskito elder and Head of the Directive Junta, Gamelias Enríquez declared: “after more than a hundred years of oppression at the hands of Nicaraguan governments and so-called regional representatives [...] the time has come for the Coast to rise and pursue its own form of development.”<sup>327</sup> Furthermore, the Council of Elders contended that their rights over the region of Mosquitia are backed by a series of international treaties such as the Austrian Arbitration of 1881, the Treaty of Managua of 1860 and the Convention of Moskitia of 1894.<sup>328</sup>

For the Council of Elders, the declaration of independence in 2009 represented the pinnacle of their centuries-old struggle for the vindication of their territory and the re-establishment of pre-colonial sovereignty. Amidst political turmoil and infiltration by counter-insurgency groups—such as the Citizen Power Council<sup>329</sup>—indigenous groups led by the Council jointly proposed a return to the ancestral communitarian system embedded in local and native principles and philosophies. In addition, the Council of Elders conveyed a series of demands to the Nicaraguan state. First and foremost, it demanded the immediate abrogation of the Sandinista autonomous regime and the expulsion of all government officials, military personnel and police forces from the theretofore autonomous and self-governed Mosquitia.<sup>330</sup> Furthermore, the Council of Elders also demanded the prompt dissolution of the regional councils RAAN and RAAS. It demanded Nicaragua to cancel all upcoming elections in La Moskitia and announced that all land titles, concessions, and contracts

---

<sup>327</sup> Fermín López, "En lo que devino Asamblea de Pueblos Indígenas: Consejo de Ancianos declara independencia de Costa Caribe," *El Nuevo Diario*(2009), <http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/nacionales/45639-consejo-ancianos-declara-independencia-costa-carib/>. *Translation mine.*

<sup>328</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson," (2013). In 1881, the Habsburg Emperor of Austria's arbitration determined that Nicaragua's sovereignty was legally restricted by the territorial boundaries set out in the Treaty of Managua 1860.

<sup>329</sup> United States Embassy in Managua, "Miskito Independence: Death & Mayhem in Bilwi Protests," (Managua: WikiLeaks, 2009).

<sup>330</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson."

conferred to non-indigenous settlers needed to be re-negotiated with the Council of Elders. Moreover, according to this organization, indigenous institutions would replace the Nicaraguan Ministry of Treasury in the collection of all business-related taxation in the area. Finally, the Council announced the complete revindication of their historic territory, including internationally areas such as the Corn Islands, the Miskito and Rama Keys, Provincia de Gracias a Dios, and the San Andres Island.

#### Autonomy in Mosquitia: Council of Elders

The Council of Elders conceptualizes autonomy as the outright rejection of the Nicaraguan nation-state, the exclusion of mestizo settlers, the total revindication of Mosquitia and the absolute recovery and revitalization of local systems of thought, communitarian forms of government and indigenous ideas of development. Furthermore, for the Council of Elders, the struggle for autonomy is framed within an anti-capitalist, anti-colonial, anti-Western, anti-statist, anti-systemic and non-leftist paradigm. In an interview I conducted with Hodgson, he spoke of the declaration of independence as "a way to contest, via the reification of indigenous cosmogonies, the Western imposition of the illegal and illegitimate colonial state over the traditional authorities of the region."<sup>331</sup> He stressed that the anachronistic and partidized autonomy imposed by the Sandinista government, has, at best, enforced nothing more than a Marxist-peasant revolutionary outlook in the region, rendering indigenous identity meaningless.<sup>332</sup> For him, this unilaterally imposed autonomy has brought the deterioration of socio-politico and economic conditions in Mosquitia in comparison to the *status quo ante*.

---

<sup>331</sup> Ibid. *Translation mine.*

<sup>332</sup> Ibid.; Oscar Hodgson-Arguello, "La soberanía de la moskitia un desafío a la doctrina occidental." *Translation mine.*

I personally witnessed this widespread social discontent with the current Sandinista regime. On my arrival at Bilwi, in the Northern Atlantic Autonomous Region (RAAN), public opposition to the current policies of the FSLN was blatant and conspicuous. Across the city, I encountered graffitied street walls and banners that expressed the region's desire for liberation from the yoke of Sandinismo and Nicaraguan nationalism. In fact, my first glance outside of the parameters of the well-guarded airport was the striking graffiti declaring, "FSLN get out of our territories!" and "down with the Sandinista revolution". After only a few days in Bilwi, it became undeniable that this social discontent was rooted in the century-long perpetuation of a caste-like system in the autonomous region. Even after two decades of the enactment of the Statute of Autonomy, indigenous Miskitu, Mayangna and Rama are subordinated to the fairer and visibly privileged Nicaraguan mestizo elites. Like the owners of the Monter Hotel, local supermarket and other booming businesses in Bilwi, most of this mestizo population has migrated to the region in the last fifty years, swapping their lives as lower middle-class tradesmen, peasants or urban vendors in Western Nicaragua to pursue a higher quality of life in the indigenous region.

In contrast to other indigenous movements in the region, for the Council of Elders, autonomy does not denote a process of national reconciliation for indigenous autonomy and citizenship are antagonistic concepts in their framework. Likewise, autonomy for the movement does not equate to Kymlicka, Lijphart or Baubock's multicultural liberal citizenship approaches to self-determination. The Council regards multicultural policies as a political façade that constrains indigenous cosmologies and systems of knowledge within the confines of the hegemonic Western state. In this sense, the vertical imposition of "Western individualism," for Hodgson, is liable for the "historical setback of

indigenous progress.”<sup>333</sup> In this context, Hodgson describes the Council of Elders’ political, social and economic project as “indigenous communitarianism.” He postulates this is both a challenge to Western socio-political systems of belief and economic models and also a fundamental tenet in the revindication of the entire Mosquitian territory.

Furthermore, the movement, driven by this indigenous communitarianism, advocates and puts into practice a set of interconnected principles with the intent of reviving historical social relations and resurrecting the national memory of the pre-colonial past. These principles include; *Latuan Laka* (pain as a source of love for fellow neighbours), *Kiamkamra Alba Laka Ba Pura Luaya an Swaki Sakaya* (enjoyment of freedom), *Indian Iwankaba Tabayki Wayasa* (defence of identity), *Indian Bapanka wal wapayasa* (behaving in accordance with indigenous philosophy), and *Almuknanira Rispik Munankayasa* (respect for all elders).<sup>334</sup> Apart from indigenous communitarianism, Hodgson states there are four other fundamental cosmological pillars for the revindication of Mosquitia: *Asla*, *Yawan Nani*, *Talia Mana*<sup>335</sup> and indigenous ideas of nature. Roughly translated, these can be understood as cultural unity, indigenous solidarity, and an egalitarian and reciprocal distribution of resources.<sup>336</sup> In this context, *Asla* or cultural unity implies harmony and cooperation amongst the diverse indigenous nations in the region, and nature alludes to the co-existence between human and non-human beings inhabiting the territory. These core concepts are either unintelligible or deemed irrelevant by the current Nicaraguan regime of autonomy.

---

<sup>333</sup> ———, “La soberanía de la moskitia un desafío a la doctrina occidental.”

<sup>334</sup> Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia, “Perceptos y Normas de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia: discutido y aprobado en la décima Asamblea General de Naciones Indígenas y de Comunidades Multiétnicas y en la Segunda Convención de la Moskitia,” (Bilwi: Organización Pueblo Indio, 2001).

<sup>335</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>336</sup> La Brújula Semanal, *Entrevista con el Wihta Tara sobre la independencia de La Muskitia*.

In addition, the movement calls for an indigenous political infrastructure divested of political parties. *Wihta Tara*, Hector Williams, in an interview I conducted during field research in Bilwi, declared that the peoples of the Atlantic Coast perceive Western political representation and participation via political parties as not only foreign to, but conflicting with their traditional forms of government. Furthermore, the *Wihta Tara* added, “we have our own ancestral forms of government. I was elected by the people on the 19 of April 2009, I am the legitimate representative of the indigenous community [...] the political parties do not represent us.”<sup>337</sup> The *Wihta Tara* condemned all political parties—including the ones that appeal to indigenous cosmologies, such as YATAMA and YATAMA no Sandinista—for, according to him and the Council of Elders, the system of political parties only incentivizes the peoples of the region to change their forms of government to fit into a Western model of political organization that fragments communal leadership and undermines the power of local authorities.<sup>338</sup> In this sense, the Council of Elders is highly critical of indigenous ex combatants, now political party leaders, such as Stedman Fagoth and Brooklyn Rivera, whom they believe have betrayed the Miskitu people and work now for the interests of the state under the protection of FSLN.

Autonomy for the Council of Elders not only entails the expulsion of all Western political forms of government, the rejection of Nicaraguan administrative divisions (region, municipality, community), and the dismissal of non-indigenous cultural outlooks, but it also requires the absolute rejection and destruction of Western development in the region. I personally witnessed the extent to which the Nicaraguan-sponsored extractivist economy has affected indigenous communities across

---

<sup>337</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader, the *Wihta Tara*, Héctor Williams," (Bilwi2013).

<sup>338</sup> Ibid.

the Northern Atlantic Autonomous Region (RAAN). The one-hour flight from Managua to Bilwi provided a clear aerial diagnosis of the damage inflicted on the environment by logging activities, both legal and illegal. It was evident that recurrent kilometer-long patches of native rainforest had been cleared. At times, the only vegetation remaining were the lined-up trees located along the course of the river. I discovered later on that some of these immense areas of rainforest have been cleared bit by bit and silently throughout the years by Nicaraguan mestizo immigrants to the region, who gradually occupy isolated areas of land, destroying all vegetation to graze their cattle. In addition, during my stay in Bilwi, I was informed by community members that the culturally significant Coco River banks near the border with Honduran Mosquitia now suffer from major erosion problems. This has had a negative impact on the communities near the riverbanks for not only fishing (the main source of aliment) has been affected during the dry season, but navigation and communication between communities has also become increasingly difficult.

In line with Charles Hale's critique of neoliberal multiculturalism, the Council of Elders believes the Nicaraguan state has devised a self-serving mechanism that perpetuates indigenous fragmentation from below. In Hale's words, "those who occupy the category of the *indio permitido* must prove they have risen above the racialized traits of their brethren by endorsing and reinforcing the divide."<sup>339</sup> Mirroring Hale, for Hodgson, a small indigenous elite, like the "lackeys" of YATAMA and YATAMA no Sandinista, further their interests by claiming to represent an indigenous majority from which they are alienated. For the Council of Elders, the menacing effect of neoliberalism, functioning under the guise of the Statute of Autonomy, is that it has "included" and benefited a few indigenous collectivities at the

---

<sup>339</sup> Hale, "Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the "Indio Permitido"," 17-19.

expense of the greater struggle for indigenous empowerment, self-determination and autonomy. In regards to the effects of Western development and neoliberalism, Hodgson stresses that in the last twenty years local communities have witnessed the widespread deforestation of the region, threatening the livelihood of tens of thousands of people. In a personal interview, he lamented:

Western development is not development. Development in La Mosquitia is founded upon the essence of our ancestral communitarian system. Western development has only given us spiritual death [...] it has turned us against our animals, we have become enemies of nature, of flora and fauna. But we propose an alternative project by first recovering our essence as people and revitalizing our local ways of development based on the oral teachings of our ancestors. For us, let me tell you, material satisfaction is not development. Development can only flourish when spiritual harmony is achieved.<sup>340</sup>

Therefore, the Council intends to launch a reconscientization campaign to re-educate people in the values and principles that have historically governed the region, such as those of *Asla* and *Indian Bapanka wal wapayasa*, which reject Eurocentric-anthropocentric views of nature and instead promote a harmonic interaction with the environment.

---

<sup>340</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson."

Unlike the great majority of indigenous movements in Latin America, the Council of Elders envisions a complete separation from the Nicaraguan state as the sole course of action to impede the further plundering of Mosquitia and the continuous subordination of its peoples. This separatist approach to autonomy, in turn, has ignited fear in government officials and mainstream national media, who portray the people of Mosquitia as either Hale's radical or obstructionist subject or as Postero and Zamosc's "terrifying class of subalterns who might subvert the racial domination"<sup>341</sup> of the mestizo and European elites. This fear has been further ignited by the interchangeable use of the words *independence* and *autonomy* by the Council of Elders. This is how the 2009 declaration of independence has been misinterpreted as an attempt by indigenous leaders to secede and form a new nation-state in the territory of Mosquitia.

Nonetheless, my interview with Hodgson clarified the Council's stance on separatism and secession. When addressing the charges of secessionism, he asserted "we do not intend to form a new nation-state because the concept of state is alien to our principles [...] is a Western imposition over local forms of organization."<sup>342</sup> Far from an ethnonationalist-secessionist movement, the Council of Elders perceives itself as an indigenous autonomist movement that pushes for the absolute vindication of their territory but disregards the notion of nation-state and its associated apparatus of power. For Hodgson, once Mosquitia has seized full sovereignty and recovered its autonomy, the Council envisions the implementation of a communitarian system in accordance with indigenous cosmologies and ideas of development.<sup>343</sup> Simply put, for Hodgson, autonomy is an

---

<sup>341</sup> Postero and Zamosc, "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America," 6.

<sup>342</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson." *Translation mine.*

<sup>343</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams."

affirmation of the “desire to restore our historic government in La Moskitia [...] Our desire is to overturn the imposition of a false autonomy. Our struggle challenges the anachronistic and neo-colonialist approach of Western states to indigenous liberation.”<sup>344</sup>

As already illustrated, the rhetorics of the Council of Elders present a concrete interpretation of autonomy. An analysis of the Council’s texts and spoken conventions reveals a unified and coherent autonomist approach towards Mosquitian liberation from the Nicaraguan state. However, field research uncovered a multi-faceted and complex socialization of autonomy that often does not run parallel to the Council’s rhetorics. Power and factional relations, the juxtaposition of old and new social paradigms, as well as divergent interpretations of the past come to play a major role in the exercise of autonomy. When I asked the Wihta Tara about the current political goals of the movement, he denied that *independence* was part of their political agenda. Before addressing the question, the *Wihta Tara*, visibly hesitant, cautiously proceeded to clarify the events that led to the uprising in 2009. For him, Hodgson was practically the *only* leader responsible for the declaration of independence. According to his account, Hodgson provoked and led the Council of Elders into mobilizing the peoples of Mosquitia and declaring independence. In this sense, the *Wihta Tara* absolved himself from this declaration, to which he implicitly attached a negative connotation. In addition, he claimed that his political involvement in the uprising began only after he was popularly elected as the first *Wihta Tara* by the peoples of the region. In regards to the declaration of independence, he revealed:

---

<sup>344</sup> Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia, "Carta al Sr. Daniel Ortega S. Presidente de la República de Nicaragua y a la Sra. Rosario Murillo Coordinadora del Poder Ciudadano y Primera Dama de Nicaragua," (2012).

People are not ready for independence here in La Mosquitia [...] for us to fight for independence means we need to return to the times of insurgency and bloodshed. As a Christian preacher and reverend, I refuse to take my people down that track. I believe the only way to achieve autonomy is by working on new solutions and alternatives in the United Nations and negotiating with the Nicaraguan government.<sup>345</sup>

His statement is not only in conflict with but utterly contradicts the indigenous revolutionary ideology upheld by the Council of Elders, one which targets all Eurocentric systems of belief and symbols of oppression, both cultural and spiritual. The Wihta Tara's primary identity as a Christian reverend runs counter to the efforts by the peoples of the region to liberate and de-colonize their lore and culture. In addition, throughout the interview, the Wihta Tara constantly made reference to the role of the Moravian Church in building schools and providing medical aid, but above all, he praised the efforts of this institution in "preaching the word of God to the communities of La Mosquitia [which] are now united under the protection of God."<sup>346</sup>

In contrast to the Wihta Tara's declaration, according to the Council of Elders' declarations, documents and conventions, the movement intends to decolonize, recover and revitalize some of the pre-Christian and animistic practices that have been banned, marginalized or supplanted by Christian rituals and conventions. Such is the case of paying a visit to the local *sukya* for spiritual healing or the practice of the traditional dance *tambakus*.<sup>347</sup> In this

---

<sup>345</sup> "Personal interview by the author with Miskito leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams," (Bilwi2012). *Translation mine.*

<sup>346</sup> Ibid. *Translation mine.*

<sup>347</sup> *Sukya* or *Sukia* is the traditional healer or shaman for indigenous peoples in the region. The *tambakus* is a Miskito dance celebration.

context, it is important to highlight that unlike Latin American liberation theology, the Moravian Church's new evangelical reformation—like traditionalist branches—has largely remained conservative and oblivious to the voices that demand liberation from cultural, political and economic oppression by the Nicaraguan state.<sup>348</sup> In this sense, the Wihta Tara's primary identity as a Christian preacher rather than a Miskitu leader reveals the existence of a conflicting ideological faction within the Council of Elders that prioritizes Western religious principles and values over indigenous cultural revitalization. As became evident during fieldwork, this faction is represented and driven by the leadership of the Wihta Tara figure. Personifying the opposite section of the movement is Hodgson's anti-colonial, anti-Western, anti-capitalist, and non-leftist culturalist figure. Despite their discrepancies, however, these two divergent political positions co-exist in the Council of Elders.

This rising factionalism within the Council of Elders illustrates the complexity and multi-faceted essence of their struggle for autonomy. Central to this diversity within the movement is the Wihta Tara's interpretation of autonomy. For him, autonomy implies neither the outright rejection of the Nicaraguan state nor the total revindication of the original territory. Instead, for him, negotiation between indigenous and ethnic peoples of Mosquitia and the Nicaraguan government is the "most appropriate political strategy to seize a *new form of autonomy*".<sup>349</sup> When asked about this political strategy, he disclosed;

We can walk together with the  
Nicaraguan government for the betterment

---

<sup>348</sup> The Moravian Church in the region has faced several internal discrepancies, which have led to a split into *reformist* and *traditionalist* congregations. Other religious institutions such as the Catholic Church, Baptist Church and the Church of God have had lesser influence in the peoples of La Mosquitia.

<sup>349</sup> "Personal interview by the author with Miskito leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams." *Translation and emphasis mine.*

of our living conditions, not just for today but for the future generations. We have been part of the Nicaraguan state for 118 years but we have yet to be guided towards the path of development [...] we have our own necessities: we need education, hospitals and employment [...] we have great expenses but insufficient revenues. When we speak of revindication, we picture the government holding our hands as if we were small children, supporting us economically and politically until we can walk by ourselves. For us to seize real autonomy we need assistance and support from the Nicaraguan government.<sup>350</sup>

Clearly, for the *Wihta Tara*, negotiation is a necessary condition and instrument for the implementation of grassroots autonomy. Through an analysis of the conversations with this political leader, it became apparent that he confines the means to achieve autonomy to negotiation and interaction with official non-indigenous entities, such as state institutions and the United Nations. In this way, he excludes and marginalizes all other forms of political mobilization that lie outside of this framework, such as the more confrontational measures upheld by Hodgson's faction. In addition, he calls for further governmental intervention in Mosquitia as a way to push the region towards development and economic growth. He asserts:

One of our major desires is to control the management of our natural resources but to achieve that we need assistance from Managua [...] our people are unemployed and our children are malnourished. The

---

<sup>350</sup>Ibid. *Translation mine.*

autonomous regime has only impoverished our region.<sup>351</sup>

At first glance, these statements by the Wihta Tara come across as a testimony in favor of indigenous liberation, self-government, and self-management of their resources. However, a critical examination and interpretation of these utterances and the juxtaposition of the two distinct political positions within the movement, suggests that the utilization of the language of autonomy, by the Wihta Tara, is a political tactic to legitimate and authenticate his position as political leader. But this political strategy, which also coincidentally parallels the whitewashing of previous ideas surrounding autonomy, allows the positioning of the Council of Elders as a legitimate political organization in the eyes of Western international actors. As illustrated in Chapter I and II of this thesis, Western notions of indigenous mobilization privilege groups who promote national reconciliation, political inclusion and at most, arrangements for regional autonomy within the confines of state citizenship. In this sense, the Wihta Tara's strategy, by meeting international governmental standards and expectations of indigenous mobilization, gains greater attention from journalists, advocates and especially, international NGOs.<sup>352</sup>

This attempt by the Wihta Tara to amass popular support and build legitimacy has proved effective in gaining backing from one of the largest and most important NGOs in Nicaragua: the "Development Institute of the Moravian Church in Nicaragua" (IDSIM for its Spanish acronym). In the words of the Wihta Tara,

---

<sup>351</sup> Ibid. *Translation mine.*

<sup>352</sup> This tactical deployment is highly desirable for indigenous movements and organizations in most of Central America since the great majority of these groups have seldom received international media attention in comparison to its Mesoamerican and South American parts. This is partly explained by the fact that most native nations in Central America do not wear native costumes and therefore are quite often perceived as "less" indigenous than their counterparts in Guatemala, Mexico or Colombia, where indigenous groups play off symbolic constructs of indigenous identity.

[...] the [Moravian] church has walked with us in our struggle against the unmeasured extraction of natural resources in La Mosquitia [...] they have established schools, health clinics and training colleges even in our most remote communities [...] they have supported the region in our struggle for genuine self-determination.<sup>353</sup>

Nevertheless, the Moravian Church's orthodox position on cultural and political revitalization as well as the means of seizing autonomy, hardly runs parallel to the Council of Elders' political, economic and territorial demands. Amidst these internal discrepancies, however, both factions of the movement evoke support and sympathy amongst indigenous peoples in the region. The difference is in their respective approaches to indigenous identity. While Hodgson defends a return to a pure indigenous society, the Wihta Tara looks for less authentic forms of indigeneity. The implications for the movement overall remain to be seen. At the present time, their unity as a movement relies on their ability to devise adequate mechanisms for internal dialogue and the resolution of discrepancies. Above all, the issue of authenticity appears to be at the heart of the recent fractionalization.

## Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that the Council of Elders aims to re-establish a form of autonomy that, so far, has eluded Western conceptualization. Advocating for a complete separation from the colonial state, in 2009 the movement declared independence,

---

<sup>353</sup> "Personal interview by the author with Miskito leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams." *Translation mine.*

sparking outrage and fear from the Nicaraguan government, media and citizenry alike. But far from espousing a secessionist agenda, the Council of Elders utterly rejects the Western notion of nation-state and, instead, envisions the liberation of the peoples of Mosquitia via a total territorial revindication accompanied by an expulsion of all Western imposed systems of government, socio-politico frameworks and economic models. In this sense, it articulates a form of autonomy that is inherently anti-colonial, anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-systemic, anti-statist and non-leftist.

For the Council of Elders, as this chapter demonstrated, the renaissance and resurrection of purely Mosquitian cosmovisions and cosmogonies as well as a return to the golden times of autonomy during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is not a hard task to materialize. In the political imaginary of the peoples of the region still survives that memory of freedom and political independence that dates back only two hundred years. In practice, the Council of Elders has started a reconscientization campaign in the region, one that aims to re-educate indigenous peoples in the values of *Asla*, *Yawan Nani* and *Talia Mana*. The gradual social recognition of these principles, in the eyes of the Council, will lead to decolonization and the re-establishment of indigenous communitarianism as a challenge to Western frameworks and as a fundamental instrument in exercising real grassroots autonomy.

Nevertheless, the chapter also demonstrated that in the case of the Council of Elders, the road to autonomy also encounters internal discrepancies and, at times, fragmentation. As elucidated in the last section of the chapter, there are two distinct camps of autonomy even *within* the Council of Elders. The symbolic battle between Hodgson and the Wihta Tara, the old and the new, the essentialist and the hybrid, the radical and the conciliatory plays a fundamental role in the materialization of autonomy. These

divergences, however, far from disintegrating the movement, have pushed the Council of Elders to engage, in the words of Hodgson, in a “healthy democratic interplay” which further reinforces the consciousness and politicized struggle of the community.



## **Chapter IV: Mapuche Autonomy in Chile**

### **Introduction**

Remarkably like the Council of Miskito Elders in Nicaragua, the Arauco Malleco Coordinating Committee (CAM) of Mapuche in Chile also puts forward a definition of autonomy that falls within the “alternative autonomies” categorization explored in Chapter I. As seen with the case of the Miskito in Nicaragua, under the umbrella of what this thesis conceptualizes as revindicative autonomism, these movements challenge their subordinate relationship with the state, claim legal rights to the revindication of their territory as a whole and advocate for the restoration of pre-colonial governing structures and sociocultural frameworks. Therefore, with the aim of further uncovering and unraveling the rhetorics and the practices at stake in this form of autonomism, this chapter provides an in-depth study of the Mapuche organization CAM in Chile.

The Mapuche nation, divided today between Chile and Argentina, currently faces one of the most predatory forms of neoliberal politics in the region. The southern regions of Chile, in particular the VIII, IX and X regions of Bio-Bio, Araucania and Los Lagos respectively are bearing the burden of Chile's economic growth. The Mapuche region, known by its inhabitants as Wallmapu, has since General Augusto Pinochet's dictatorship experienced a series of incursions and land grabbing projects at the hand of national and multinational forestry, mining, hydroelectric and agribusiness giants. The agrarian reform initiated by Eduardo Frei and followed by Salvador Allende was overturned by Pinochet's counter-agrarian reform, which brought to an end the collective ownership of land, leaving the Mapuche with only 300,000 hectares. These and other destructuration processes for Mapuche communities continued under the democratic coalition governments post-1990s. It is within this

context of widespread land usurpation and the lack of mechanisms for negotiation and dialogue that CAM emerged in the late 1990s.

To trace the trajectory of this movement and uncover its ideological postulations vis-à-vis autonomy (as well as its dynamics, strategies and internal formation), this chapter first provides an account of the history of Mapuche autonomy. As evidenced by the analysis of the Miskito movement in Nicaragua in the previous chapter, understanding the emergence of this more radical and confrontational form of autonomism requires exploring and examining the *sui generis* encounter of the Mapuche nation with colonial forces during the early colonial period. Accordingly, the first section is divided into two sub-units. The first one investigates the state of Mapuche autonomy from the first expedition of Diego de Almagro up until the formation of the first parliament, which signified the inauguration of a peace process between Spanish and Mapuche forces. The second sub-unit of the section then studies the processes and events leading up to the loss of Mapuche autonomy with the formation of the Chilean state and the military campaigns of the late 1800s. In addition and most importantly, the second section of the chapter studies the Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee by first exploring its formation within a context of changing politics and discourses in Chile. The section relies on an in-depth study of the organization's literature, including its political project, manifesto, political declarations and communiqués. Finally the chapter further examines CAM's autonomist struggle for the revindication of Wallmapu by drawing from first-hand information gathered during a series of personal interviews and other fieldwork conducted in the region with CAM's currently jailed leader Héctor Llaitul and other CAM political prisoners including Ramón Llanquileo.

## A Genealogy of Mapuche Autonomy

### Mapuche Autonomy: from Almagro to the last Parliament

In contrast to the great majority of indigenous peoples in Latin America, the Mapuche nation was never, as a whole, conquered, colonized or subjected to Spanish dominion. Essentially, they remained socially, politically, economically and most importantly, territorially autonomous up until the late nineteenth century<sup>354</sup>. The first Spanish expeditions to what was then denominated ‘southern Peruvian lands’—in reality, the Wallmapu (‘Mapuche country’ in Mapudungun language<sup>355</sup>)—date back to 1535. From the Viceroyalty of Peru, Diego de Almagro launched an expedition to explore the riches and evangelize the peoples inhabiting the south. His army of five hundred Spaniards and fifteen hundred natives reached as far as the valleys of the Copiapó River in today’s northern Chile. Shortly after, however, the expedition was roundly defeated, forcing him to withdraw from the region as early as 1536. Almagro’s expedition marks the start of a precarious and bellicose invasion of Wallmapu.

Nevertheless, it was Pedro de Valdivia, one of Francisco Pizarro’s most praised captains, who succeeded in his first venture to ‘pacify’ the south. Valdivia left Peru in 1540 and after a year of long and arduous travel through the Andean mountains

---

<sup>354</sup> The Mapuche also resisted the mid fifteenth century Incan invasion and occupation of their territory. First under Túpac Yupanqui and then Huaina Cápac, the Incas invaded and settled in lands as far as the Maule River (VII Maule Region in Chile). The occupation lasted no more than seventy years. Gerardo Larraín Valdés, *Dios, Sol y Oro: Diego de Almagro y el Descubrimiento de Chile* (Santiago: Editorial Andrés Bello, 1987). 204-05.

<sup>355</sup> Wallmapu from Mapudungun *wall* which means universe and *mapu* which means land. Wallmapu or Meli Wixan Mapu is the concept coined historically by the Mapuche to refer to the totality of their territory, including its four distinct territorial identities: i) Puel Mapu, the Eastern lands ii) Willi Mapu, the southern lands iii) Lafken Mapu, the Western lands and iv) Piku Mapu, the northern lands. More recently, since the invasion of Chilean and Argentinian colonial forces, the concepts of Gulumapu and Puelmapu are most used in referring to the Mapuche territories in Chile and Argentina respectively. Elicura Chihuailaf, *Recado confidencial a los chilenos* (Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 1999). 36-37.

and the Atacama Desert, ordered his troops to settle in what he perceived to be the wealthiest valley, today's central Chile. There, in 1541, he founded the City of Santiago de Nueva Extremadura.<sup>356</sup> It was this particular event that led to a long series of Mapuche uprisings and rebellions that lasted for over three hundred years. This period of war and conflict between the Spaniards and Mapuche is today commonly referred to as the 'Arauco Wars'. The first of these wars took place that same year when the 'Picunche' people<sup>357</sup> rebelled against Spanish domination. An organized resistance that started in the mining area of Malgamalga quickly extended not only to the extensive valleys of Quillota and Aconcagua but also to the western and southern areas of Santiago.<sup>358</sup> Commanded first by Trang-lonko and then Michima-lonko, the insurrection burned down and destroyed the city of Santiago.<sup>359</sup>

But despite his defeat, Valdivia did not abandon his desire to explore and conquer further south. After settling in the Maule River valley, he commanded his forces of fifty horsemen and a great number of natives to advance to the Itata River in early 1546. However, while encamped at a place called Quilacura they were severely attacked by Mapuche warriors and forced to retreat

---

<sup>356</sup> The city was named after Santiago or Santiago de Matamoros, the patron saint of Spain. Santiago de Matamoros, translates as Santiago Moor Killer, due to his intervention in a battle to drive off the Moors from the Iberian peninsula. The city was also named Extremadura after Valdivia's natal city. Greg Grandin, *The Empire of necessity: Slavery, Freedom, and Deception in the New World* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2014). 12.

<sup>357</sup> The Picunche are the Mapuche inhabiting the *Piku Mapu* or 'Northern Land'. According to historical accounts, the Picunche were less numerous than other Mapuche. These accounts claim that at the time of Spanish conquest, the Picunche were experiencing an accelerated process of cultural change due to the dregs of Incan invasion. José Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche* (Santiago: Editorial LOM, 2000). 20. Refer to footnote 2 of this section for a more elaborated account of Mapuche territorial identities.

<sup>358</sup> Diego Barros Arana, *Historia General de Chile I* (Linkgua Digital, 2012). 203-05.

<sup>359</sup> Don Pedro Mariño de Lovera, *Colección de Historiadores de Chile y Documentos Relativos a la Historia Nacional Tomo VI. Crónica del Reino de Chile, escrita por el Capital Don Pedro Mariño de Lovera* (Santiago: Imprenta del Ferrocarril 1865). 54-63.

back north.<sup>360</sup> Similarly, in January 1550 Valdivia launched another expedition with the aim of settling the further southern valleys of the Bio-Bio River but once again was defeated by Mapuche warriors in a battle deemed as disastrous for the Spaniards. Valdivia himself describes the battle in his Letter to Charles V "[...] in the thirty years that I have served Your Majesty and fought against many nations, never have I witnessed people fight like these Indians fought against us."<sup>361</sup> However, despite this victory, after a short period the Spanish forces gained more ground by reinforcing their numbers. Valdivia's consequent victory in the Battle of Andalién and the Battle of Penco in February and March 1550 respectively, allowed, for the first time, the settling and foundation of colonial forts and cities including Concepción, Tucapel, Purén, Angol, Imperial, Villarica, Valdivia, and Osorno.<sup>362</sup> This was the first time that Mapuche independence in the territory south of the Bio-Bio River was disrupted.

Nonetheless, the Spanish colonial endeavor was unexpectedly derailed in 1554 after the capture and killing of Valdivia in the Battle of Tucapel by the forces of the Mapuche leaders Lonko Lautaro, Lonko Caupolicán and Lonko Colo Colo. This battle led to the retreat of the Spanish army almost permanently from Wallmapu. In like manner, the Mapuche victory over Spanish forces in the Battle of Curabala in 1598 led to the assassination of Governor Martín García Oñez de Loyola, setting back the Spanish aspiration for colonizing the Mapuche region once again. These two military victories were crucial in the survival of Mapuche socio-politico and territorial autonomy up until the creation of the Chilean nation-state. Particularly, the Battle of Curalaba played a major role in the abandonment of military expeditions and

---

<sup>360</sup> Don Domingo Joseph, ed. *Compendio de la Historia Geográfica, Natural y Civil del Reyno de Chile Escrito en Italiano por el Abate Don Juan Ignacio Molina* (Madrid: 1788), 48.

<sup>361</sup> Pedro de Valdivia, "Carta al Emperador Carlos V. 15 de Octubre de 1550," (Concepción del Nuevo Extremo 1550). Translation mine.

<sup>362</sup> Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 34.

colonial endeavors to the Mapuche territory south of the Bio-Bio River. In addition, this battle led to a wave of insurrections led by the Mapuche Toki<sup>363</sup> Pelantarú, which eradicated all signs of Spanish presence in Wallmapu by 1598. This included the destruction of colonial settlements and forts like those of Valdivia (1599), Angol (1599), Imperial (1600) and Villarica (1602).<sup>364</sup> For the most part, these cities remained abandoned and until the late nineteenth century when the Chilean state occupied the Mapuche territory in its totality.

Indeed, the Victory of Curalaba not only brought to an end the Spanish military occupation of Wallmapu but, most importantly, it also symbolized the *de facto* recognition of Mapuche autonomy and sovereignty. After almost a century of war between the Spaniards and the Mapuche, the Parliament of Quilín,<sup>365</sup> in 1641, laid the foundations of the *de jure* Spanish recognition of Mapuche's territory. This Parliament established the Bio-Bio River as the official border between Spanish and Mapuche dominions. In addition, without legal reservation, the treaty recognized Mapuche independence and sovereignty south of the new border.<sup>366</sup> Signed by the Governor of Chile, Marquis of Baides on behalf of Spain and the National Lonko Council on behalf of the Mapuche Nation in 1641, it was then ratified and given full

---

<sup>363</sup> *Toki* or *Toqui* is a title conferred by the Mapuche to war chiefs. In Mapudungun, it derives from *toqui*, which means axe. In this sense, a literal translation would be axe-bearer.

<sup>364</sup> These events are commonly referred as *Destrucción de las Siete Ciudades* (Destruction of the Seven Cities). Santa Cruz de Coya, San Mateo de Osorno and San Felipe de Araucan were destroyed in 1599, 1603 and 1604 respectively.

<sup>365</sup> Referred in Mapudungun as 'Winka Kollog de Kullen' from the term *winka* that means non-Mapuche and *kollog*, which denotes council, assembly or parliament.

<sup>366</sup> Joseph-Antonio de-Abreu y Bertodano, "Colección de los Tratados de Paz, Alianza, Neutralidad, Garantía, Protección, Tregua, Mediación, Accesión, Reglamento de Límites, Comercio, Navegación, &c. Hechos por los Pueblos, Reyes y Príncipes de España con los Pueblos, Reyes, Príncipes, Repúblicas y demás Potencias de Europa y Otras partes del Mundo," ed. Diego Peralta, Antonio Marin, and Juan de Zúñiga (Madrid1740). José Bengoa, *El Tratado de Quilín* (Santiago: Editorial Catalonia, 2003).

recognition by King Phillip IV of Spain in 1643.<sup>367</sup> It was then that for the first time in the history of Spanish colonization in the Americas, a territory was formally recognized as fully independent from the Spanish Crown. It is precisely in this historical juncture that Wallmapu engenders a *sui generis* case of autonomy in the region.

The peace achieved in 1641, however, was only ephemeral. Forced labor and the spread of disease had decimated the Picunche by the early seventeenth century. In addition, waves of Picunche had migrated from the northern settled lands to the independent territory south of the Bio-Bio River seeking refuge from slavery, oppression and religious indoctrination. This depopulation of Mapuche in the settled territories became a rising concern not only for “private” colonizers but also for colonial officials and the Spanish Crown since it rendered the systems of *encomienda*<sup>368</sup> and later, *hacienda*, unsustainable. With an ever-increasing reduction of native labor, *encomenderos* and *hacendados* witnessed with fear the imminent downfall of their productive structures, profits, wealth and the overall colonial enterprise. This anxiety is most evident in the words of Governor Francisco Ibañez de Peralta,

The number of Indians that are left in  
the encomienda is so little that if it was not  
for Marques de Pica's encomienda which

---

<sup>367</sup> Julio Paillalef Lefinao, *Los Mapuche y el Proceso que los Convirtió en Indios: Psicología de la Discriminación* (Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, 2003). 181.

<sup>368</sup> The *encomienda* was a system of forced native labor first implemented in Hispaniola (today's Haiti and Dominican Republic) where in theory the natives, like the Spaniards, were free vassals of the Royal Crown. However, in praxis, it was an institutionalized system of slavery that assigned a certain number of natives to an *encomendero*, who was in charge of foreseeing their religious indoctrination into Christianity. In exchange, the natives, now *encomendados*, were required to pay the *encomendero* for his work with their labor. According to Anthony Pagden, “this system of enforced labor first came into being as a means to evade the laws against slavery. It was essentially a compromise by the Crown, which was torn between its Christian conscience on the one hand and economic pressures on the other” Pagden, *Hernan Cortes: Letters from Mexico*, 458.

has eighty to ninety tributary Indians, there are none in the whole kingdom which has even fifty of them [...] they now have only up to twenty Indians, [and] every year we experience a reduction in these numbers *due to the flight of Indians [...]*.<sup>369</sup>

This “flight of Indians” across the border, in turn, ignited a new wave of Spanish ventures to the southern territory, regardless of what was accorded in Quilín. For the most part, these invasions aimed to capture natives and trade them as slaves back to the north<sup>370</sup> to fulfill the insatiable demand for labor in mines, construction sites and plantations. These constant interventions also brought along widespread theft, rape and the further plundering of Mapuche lands and resources. But the insurrections led by Lonko Ayllakuriche in 1673 and Ñgidol Toki Vilumilla in 1723 against these invasions succeeded in safeguarding Mapuche independence once again.<sup>371</sup> Nonetheless, the infringement of the Quilín Accords had already inaugurated a new bellicose period between Spanish and Mapuche forces that would last until the Chilean independence war.

This period, in turn, was characterized by continuous attempts at peace negotiations between the parties via a series of parliaments convened from 1647 to 1803. The second and third Parliament of Quilín (1647 and 1649), the Parliaments of Tapihue (1716, 1721, 1724, 1735, 1738, 1746, 1774, 1775 and 1777), the Parliaments of Santiago (1760, 1772 and 1774) and the Parliaments of Negrete (1726, 1739, 1771, 1791, 1792, 1793 and 1803), are only a few amongst the more than forty accords

---

<sup>369</sup> Arana, *Historia General de Chile I*: 490. Translation mine, italics in original.

<sup>370</sup> Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 38.

<sup>371</sup> Jorge Calbacura, Carlos Contreras Painemal, and Reynaldo Mariqueo, "Líderes Mapuche y su Rol en el Desarrollo de los Sucesos Históricos," Enlace Mapuche Internacional, <http://www.mapuche-nation.org/espanol/html/documentos/doc-93.htm>.

celebrated between Mapuche people and the Spanish Crown.<sup>372</sup> As early as 1726, the Mapuche had declared themselves vassals of the Royal Crown, agreed to the free passage of Christian missionaries to their territory, established commercial relations with the Spaniards and acquiesced to protect and defend the Crown against imminent enemies. In exchange, the Mapuche fully retained their territorial sovereignty and secured the social space to preserve their socio-politico and economic cosmovisions.<sup>373</sup> Unlike other indigenous nations in the Americas, the Mapuche were regarded, by the Spanish Crown, as neither tribute-paying communities subordinated to the King (*Indios cristianos*)—like most indigenous nations in the Americas—nor outcast societies subjected to punitive campaigns (*Indios salvajes*)—like the Comanche in southwestern North America.<sup>374</sup> Instead, they were officially recognized as a nation with the concomitant rights to sovereignty and independence.

#### The End of Autonomy: from independence to Saveedra's campaign

After the Parliament of Chillán in 1813 and in line with the First Accords of Negrete (1726), the Mapuche took up arms against the *criollos* to defend the dominions of the Spanish Crown in the Chilean War of Independence (1810-1821).<sup>375</sup> Having seized liberation for the ‘Chileans’ from the Spanish Crown, in 1819, the

---

<sup>372</sup> Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile, "Tratados y Acuerdos Históricos en la Cuestión Mapuche," (Santiago: Congreso Nacional de Chile, 2013), 10-12.

<sup>373</sup> This of course, does not deny the cultural transformation of the Mapuche throughout this period. By early nineteenth century, the Mapuche had largely replaced their early sixteenth century hunting, fishing, and small-scale agricultural activities with a larger agricultural and ranching industry. Patricia Richards, *Race and the Chilean miracle: neoliberalism, democracy and indigenous rights* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013). 35-36. In the words of Bengoa “La sociedad Mapuche se enriquece en la paz, transforma sus costumbres y se enseñorea de un gran territorio. El cazador recolector ha dado paso al ganadero montado en brioso corcel engalanado con aperos de plata.” Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 45.

<sup>374</sup> Richards, *Race and the Chilean miracle: neoliberalism, democracy and indigenous rights*: 35.

<sup>375</sup> According to Bengoa, families such as those of Colipí and Coñoepán joined forced with the Chilean *criollo* independence front. Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 147.

Chilean Supreme Director and independence leader, Bernardo O'Higgins Riquelme, recognized the independence of the Mapuche territory located south of the Bio-Bio River. In a letter addressed to Mapuche authorities in 1819, he declared:

[...]brave tribes of Arauco, and other indigenous groups from the south, you shed your blood for more than three centuries to defend your freedom against who today is our same enemy [...] With blood, we pledged and acquired that independence which you have preserved at the same price. Being our cause identical in nature, we know no other enemy [...] than the Spaniard. [...] Araucanos, cunchos, huiliches and all other indigenous austral tribes: here speaks to you a President who is no longer a vassal of the King of Spain [...] this is now the head of a free and sovereign people that recognizes your independence.<sup>376</sup>

In addition to this recognition by O'Higgins, the Parliament of Tapihue, celebrated between Chilean government and the Mapuche nation in January 1825, formally recognized the Bio-Bio River as the territorial border between the two independent nations.<sup>377</sup> In Article 18, it stipulated, "after the ratification of these treaties, neither gobernadores nor caciques will allow any Chilean to live in the [...southern] territories in order to safeguard the establishment of peace." This explicitly banned colonial projects by Chileans to the Mapuche southern lands. Likewise, Article 22 mandates the possession of an official passport as a legal requirement to cross the border to either side.<sup>378</sup> This way,

---

<sup>376</sup> Bernardo O'Higgins R., 13 of March 1819. *Translation mine.*

<sup>377</sup> Article 20.

<sup>378</sup> "Tratados celebrados y firmados entre el Coronel graduado de los ejércitos de la República Comandante de alta frontera, y Delegado de la Ciudad de Los Angeles Pedro

the treaty recognized in its entirety the Mapuche jurisdiction over the southern territory. These mechanisms of border control were utilized by the Chilean government partly as a way to gain support from dissident Mapuche sections, which continued to honor the treaties celebrated with the Spanish Crown. The Parliament of Tapihue, signed by Pedro Barnachea, Delegate of Los Angeles, on behalf of Chile and Lonko Francisco Mariluan on behalf of the Butalmapus (Mapuche districts),<sup>379</sup> formally brought to an end twelve years of war between the parties.

In regards to these accords, Horacio Lara, chronicler of the nineteenth century events in “Araucanía” (Spanish denomination of Wallmapu), asserted that it was only then, in 1825, that for the first time the denomination “Chile” was employed to refer to the new republic as a whole. Previously, according to Lara, the word “Chile” only denoted the areas of the Aconcagua Valley and the lands located north of the Maule River. He contends in this sense that the “southern region was considered by its inhabitants [...] an independent state from the north; and with good reason as Araucanía, the great southern center, remained fully liberated since the previous century.”<sup>380</sup>

Nonetheless, the Parliament of Tapihue, in practice, did not prevent Chilean colonists from settling and developing agricultural industries in Wallmapu via the private purchase of Mapuche lands. Between 1840 and 1860, the lands between the Bio-Bio and Malleco Rivers had, for the most part, been purchased, occupied and expropriated.<sup>381</sup> The methods utilized by

---

Barnachea, autorizado por el señor Brigadier de los ejércitos de Chile Gobernador Intendente de la Provincia de Concepción para tratar con los naturales de ultra Biobío y don Francisco Mariluán Gobernador de 14 Reducciones, contenidos en los artículos siguientes," ed. Congreso Nacional de Chile (Biblioteca Nacional del Congreso, 1825).

<sup>379</sup> Pablo Marimán Quemenado, *Parlamento y Territorio Mapuche* (Concepción: Ediciones Escaparate, 2002). 103-06.

<sup>380</sup> Horacio Lara, *Crónica de la Araucanía* (Santiago: Imprenta de El Progreso, 1889). 180-82. *Translation mine.*

<sup>381</sup> Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 157-59.

the Chileans in dealing with Mapuche Longkos are still vivid in the collective memory of Mapuche communities, who narrate systematic accounts of fraudulent acquisition, extortion, torture and usurpation of lands in an array of regions.<sup>382</sup> In addition, despite the Tapihue Accords, from 1850 onwards, waves of Chileans crossed the border of the Bio-Bio River to settle and occupy Mapuche lands. With the complicity of Chilean authorities, these migrants illegally appropriated great extensions of land, paving the way for the establishment of the conflictive contemporary *fundos*. This process of so-called ‘spontaneous colonization’ led to the first wave of dispossession and relocation of Mapuche people in southern Wallmapu.<sup>383</sup> By 1856, there were already recorded thirteen thousand non-Mapuche people inhabiting the lands bordered by the Bio-Bio to the North, the Malleco River to the south, the Andean Mountains to the East and the Nahuelbuta to the West.<sup>384</sup>

In this context, the insurrection of Ñgidol Toki Kilapan in Malleco and Collipulli in 1859 aimed to counter this slow but steady fragmentation and the widespread usurpation of the Mapuche territory. Other uprisings like those of Toki Calbucoy, Toki Huenul and Toki Anticheo also confronted the illegal occupation of their lands. But, once the war with the Peruvian-Bolivian Confederation had ended in 1839 and the conservative

---

<sup>382</sup> Arauco, Nacimiento, Mulchen and Angol were some of the regions subjected to this commonplace fraudulent acquisition of lands. Comisión de Trabajo Autónomo Mapuche, "Informe de la Comisión Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato," (Santiago: Grupo de Trabajo Legislación e Institucionalidad, 2003), 859. Elicura Chihuailaf also mentions this illegal appropriation of lands. Chihuailaf, *Recado confidencial a los chilenos*: 71-74.

<sup>383</sup> In addition, towards 1850, the Chilean government encouraged the migration and settling of ethnic Germans to colonize the southern areas of Valdivia, Osorno, Puerto Montt and LLanquihue. This project was meant to develop the vast ‘unutilized’ lands of the far south. In contrast to other areas, these territories had been inherited by the Chilean state from the Spanish Crown *ab initio*. The defeat of the Mapuche rebellion in 1792 in the Bueno River set into motion a re-conquest of Pilmaiquen, La Unión, Osorno, the tropical plains of Valdivia and the areas of the Ranco Lake. In like manner, Chile took possession of the Chiloé Island in 1826 after the signature of the Treaty of Tantauco with the Spanish Crown. Comisión de Trabajo Autónomo Mapuche, "Informe de la Comisión Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato," 850-51.

<sup>384</sup> Arturo Leiva, *El primer avance a la Araucanía: Angol 1862* (Temuco: Ediciones Universidad de la Frontera Temuco, 1984). 30.

government of Manuel Montt had crushed the internal liberal revolutions of 1851 and 1859, the migration of colonists to Wallmapu was formally backed by the government via a series of policies and legislations that ultimately aimed to annex the Mapuche territory to the Chilean nation-state. In this context, General José María Pinto proposed a plan that prescribed the total extermination of Mapuche people in the south. The proposal justified the use of force against the Mapuche based on the notions of the Mapuche as rebellious and savage embedded in the political discourse of the time. It followed that after decades of war and insurrection by the Mapuche in Araucanía, the Chilean government needed to 'pacify' the south. Despite the popularity of Pinto's proposal, a less controversial approach was embraced instead. In 1861, Coronel Cornelio Saavedra presented to the National Congress a strategic military plan to occupy the Araucanía region.<sup>385</sup> He declared, "the pacification of Araucania Mr. President has cost us a lot of alcohol, a lot of music and little gunpowder."<sup>386</sup> Thereby, the foundations for the military occupation of the so far independent Wallampu were put in place.

In 1866, the same year in which Saavedra was named General Commander of the campaign, a new law was enacted, which declared all lands in 'Araucanía' national lands and consequently subjected them to fiscal policy like the rest of the Chilean territories and provinces. In addition, this law enforced the titling and demarcation of Mapuche lands to pave the way for the long-desired economic development of the region. This was the first time in the history of southern Gulumapu that Mapuche communities were stripped from the ownership of their lands. In the same year, Chile advanced the border to the Malleco River from the north and strategically commanded the advancement of

---

<sup>385</sup> Richards, *Race and the Chilean miracle: neoliberalism, democracy and indigenous rights*: 39.

<sup>386</sup> José Bengoa, ed. *La Memoria Olvidada. Historia de los Pueblos Indígenas de Chile* (Santiago: Publicaciones del Bicentenario 2004), 335.

the Chilean border from the south via the deployment of forces in Osorno and Valdivia. For its most part, the strategy of occupation up to 1868 relied on forts to secure the conquered regions. By then, Angol, Malleco and the coastal straight between Lebu and Queule had already been fortified.<sup>387</sup> In addition, the establishment of the forts of Huequen, Lolenco, Chihuahue, Collipulli, Perasco and Curacao consolidated the Chilean military occupation from the Bio-Bio to the Malleco River.<sup>388</sup>

Nonetheless, Mapuche resistance was ignited once again. This time, the Mapuche offensive united the military forces of Gulumapu (Mapuche territory in Chile) and Puelmapu (Mapuche territory in Argentina) to contain the advancement of the Chileans through the Andean Mountains. By 1867, the alliance of Toki Kilapan (Gulumapu) and Calfucura (Puelmapu) had been consolidated and only one year after, this offensive defeated the Chilean military forces commanded by Coronel Pedro Lagos in Quechereguá. Soon after, however, Saavedra strategically appointed Pinto as General Commander in charge of Malleco. This political maneuver was disastrous for Mapuche autonomy since it converted the so-called “Pacification Campaign” into what Bengoa a century later termed a “War of Extermination.” This, the darkest episode in Chilean history, was a war waged against Mapuche civilians. The Chilean forces burned down entire Mapuche communities, plundered their lands, massacred women and children and captured whoever was left alive.<sup>389</sup> In addition, a new lucrative enterprise had been set into motion; the trade of women and children, who pejoratively were denominated “chinitos,” to be exploited as servants in the haciendas of Chillán and surrounding regions.<sup>390</sup>

---

<sup>387</sup> Comisión de Trabajo Autónomo Mapuche, "Informe de la Comisión Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato," 863-64.

<sup>388</sup> Ibid., 875.

<sup>389</sup> Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 210. Richards, *Race and the Chilean miracle: neoliberalism, democracy and indigenous rights*: 39-40.

<sup>390</sup> Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 220.

By the end of the “Occupation of Araucania” campaign, the Mapuche had been confined to reservation-like territories called *reducciones*. Their land was divided and auctioned to the Chileans, Germans, and Swiss who had already populated the Valdivia region.<sup>391</sup> In these auctions, preferential advantage was given to single individuals willing to purchase five hundred hectares of land or more so that vast territories would be in the hands of a single owner<sup>392</sup>: a *latinfundista*. By 1883, the Mapuche had lost their independence, territorial sovereignty, and all traces of political, social and cultural autonomy. The Wallmapu, which was defended for three-hundred years against Spanish colonial ventures and safeguarded for over six decades against the Chileans, had now been annexed to the colonial Chilean nation-state. Of the ten million hectares of land in the possession of the Mapuche in the 1860s, only between 475,000-500,000 remained in Mapuche hands<sup>393</sup> via the *títulos de merced* granted to Lonkos by the end of the military campaign<sup>394</sup> from 1884 onwards.<sup>395</sup> The great majority of Mapuche communities were forced to relocate to alien and scattered areas, where in most cases they were deprived of suitable arable land. The wealthy Mapuche nation of the 1850s and 1860s was now highly vulnerable and dependent on government handouts. This was the start of a zealous policy of

---

<sup>391</sup> Refer to note 31 of this section.

<sup>392</sup> Comisión de Trabajo Autónomo Mapuche, "Informe de la Comisión Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato," 866-67.

<sup>393</sup> Elicura Chihuailaf et al., eds., *El despertar del pueblo mapuche: nuevos conflictos, viejas demandas* (Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2004), 32.

<sup>394</sup> A simultaneous campaign by the Argentinian government, namely the “Conquest of the Desert” was launched in 1878 to annex the independent Mapuche territory. The end of the “Occupation of Araucania” and the “Conquest of the Desert” facilitated the splitting of the Mapuche territory into two states. The new borders between Chile and Argentina were accorded in the Boundary Treaty of 1881. Comisión de Trabajo Autónomo Mapuche, "Informe de la Comisión Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato," 876.

<sup>395</sup> The *Títulos de Merced* were legally founded on the national law enacted in 1866 by the Chilean state. The process of granting these land titles spanned from 1884 to 1929. Bengoa estimates that these titles confined 78,000 Mapuche people to only 475,000 hectares of land. Official state institutions like CONADI estimate the number of hectares to be 500,000. Bengoa, *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*: 354-55. Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación la Ciencia y la Cultura, "Registro de América Latina y el Caribe de Memoria del Mundo de la UNESCO reconoce documentos sobre historia del pueblo mapuche," (Santiago: UNESCO Office in Santiago, 2013).

cultural assimilation and the inauguration of an era of poverty and misery for the Mapuche nation. These living conditions, however, were by the end of the twentieth century to spark the greatest wave of Mapuche resistance since the loss of independence.

### **Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco (CAM)**

#### Historical background

After seizing power in 1973 via a military coup, General Augusto Pinochet decreed Law 701 in 1974. This law sought to incorporate the vast “undeveloped” areas of native forests in southern Chile into the global economic market. By subsidizing private-sector profits, removing legal protections for previously protected parks and reforested areas, and incentivizing cellulose production in Chile, this law promoted a further wave of land appropriations by national and international capitalist actors of whatever was remaining of Mapuche lands. From 1975 to 1985, more than 100,000 hectares of native forest were lost in the Mapuche region. Replacing the native landscape with the quickly-growing radiata pine and eucalyptus species, Pinochet’s rule introduced a large-scale monoculture plantation industry in Chile. Similarly, Pinochet’s Decree Law 2568 (1978) brought to an end the collective ownership of land granted by the 1884 *títulos de merced* to Mapuche families.<sup>396</sup> This privatization of previously communally-owned lands led to further encroachment and appropriation of the Mapuche territory for it allowed and promoted the legal invasion of forestry companies and colonists to Wallmapu either via ninety-nine-year long ‘lease agreements’ or the full sale of the now private and individually-owned

---

<sup>396</sup> Ministerio de Agricultura de Chile, "Decreto Ley 2568 Modifica Ley no. 17 729 sobre Protección de Indígenas y Radica Funciones del Instituto de Desarrollo Indígena en el Instituto de Desarrollo Agropecuario," ed. Ministerio de Agricultura (Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile, 1979).

Mapuche lands. It was this new colonization of Wallmapu that provided the impetus for the ubiquitous re-emergence of Mapuche resistance by the end of the twentieth century.

Along with the new artificial plantations of the 1970s was also growing a generation of Mapuche children who witnessed the encroachment of their communities by forestry companies, the dispossession of their lands, the further impoverishment of their *lofs* and, in many cases, the forced migration of their families to the urban areas of Santiago and Concepción. Historian Fernando Pairicán argues that by the time the eucalyptus plantations were ready to be cleared and processed in the 1990s, the Mapuche children had also grown into 20-25 year old politically active adults, seeking a solution to the problems marring their communities and families.<sup>397</sup> Amongst other issues, the industrial plantation of eucalyptus exacerbated droughts, caused previously unobserved large wildfires, dried out Mapuche wells and polluted the few available water resources needed for farming. Discontent was growing amongst Mapuche communities, albeit without an umbrella organization to represent their concerns.

The international context of the 1990s and the regional developments in regards to indigenous activism in Latin America accelerated the consolidation of Mapuche resistance into a united and regional movement. On the one hand, the inflow of news on the national struggles of Kurdistan, Bosnia, Palestine and Chechnya and on the other, the rise of the Zapatista movement in Mexico, the struggle of the Aymaras in Bolivia, and the mobilization of indigenous peoples in Ecuador in the 1990s played a significant role in strengthening the Mapuche movement.<sup>398</sup> In addition, as Pairicán asserts, in the early 1990s

---

<sup>397</sup> Fernando Pairicán and Rolando Álvarez, "La Nueva Guerra de Arauco: la Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco y los nuevos movimientos de resistencia mapuche en el Chile de la Concertación," *Revista Izquierdas Chile*, 10 of August 2011, 70.

<sup>398</sup> Ibid., 71.

the first post-dictatorship democratic Concertación government (Concert of Parties for Democracy) approved the construction of the Ralco Hydroelectric Dam in the Bio-Bio River. This approval controversially violated both indigenous rights and the environmental legislation enacted in the 1993 Indigenous Development Law 19253.<sup>399</sup> The Ralco Hydroelectric Dam would flood at least 3,500 hectares of land, including a ceremonial burial ground of great religious significance for the Mapuche. The Mapuche nation, who had been severely affected by the dictatorship of Pinochet, had by now become disenchanted with the so-called democratic governments of the 1990s as these governments continued to pursue a politics of resource extractivism in the Mapuche region.

The forerunner of the Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee-CAM was the Lafkenche Territorial Committee-CLT (for its Spanish acronym), founded in 1996. Alongside other organizations such as Consejo de Todas las Tierras-CTT and Asociación Ñancucheo de Lumaco-AÑL, they formed the Mapuche political movement of the 1990s.<sup>400</sup> Up until 1997, this movement embraced a strategy where mass Mapuche mobilizations and the symbolic occupation of *fundos* were the matrix of its resistance against the occupation of their lands. This movement also demanded self-determination for the territory south of the Bio-Bio River as well as the establishment of self-government arrangements in the region.<sup>401</sup> Amidst the ideological discrepancies between CLT, CTT and AÑL, these movements put forward a discourse of autonomy previously non-existent in Chilean national politics. In addition, these organizations were to

---

<sup>399</sup> Comité de Difusión del Sistema Integral de Información y Atención al Ciudadano(a) SIAC de la Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena CONADI, "Ley Indígena No. 19.253 Establece Normas Sobre Protección, Fomento y Desarrollo de los Indígenas, y Crea la Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena," ed. CONADI (CONADI, 2011).

<sup>400</sup> Pairicán and Álvarez, "La Nueva Guerra de Arauco: la Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco y los nuevos movimientos de resistencia mapuche en el Chile de la Concertación," 72-75.

<sup>401</sup> Tito Tricot, *Autonomía: El Movimiento Mapuche de Resistencia* (Santiago: Ceibo Ediciones, 2013). 174.

set the ideological foundations for the present-day Mapuche autonomist resistance.

On the 1st of December 1997, however, three trucks loaded with timber, owned by forestry giant Forestal Bosques Arauco were attacked and set on fire by a group of Mapuche in Lumaco. This event led to the split of CLT into two movements due to their antagonistic views on the use of violence as a strategy for the recovery of usurped lands.<sup>402</sup> On the one hand, Identidad Territorial Lafkenche-ITL, established in mid-1998 in Tirúa, narrowed-down its former ambitions and proposed instead an autonomous plan aimed only at the Lafkenche people (coastal Mapuche).<sup>403</sup> As part of its autonomist project, ITL called for the establishment of a council and a territorial assembly to fulfill its right to self-government within the Province of Arauco.<sup>404</sup> In addition, this organization proposed the utilization of the Indigenous Development Law to open the way for Mapuche communities to take charge of and manage their own resource extraction projects in the region.<sup>405</sup>

For its part, the foundation of CAM by the end of 1998 set into motion a revolutionary transformation of the Mapuche movement. Moving away from the calls for cultural recognition, demands for co-government and the symbolic occupation of lands that characterized the Mapuche movement of the 1990s, Mapuche leaders Victor Ancalaf, José Huenchunao, Pedro Cayoqueo, Héctor Llaitul and Aliwén Antileo, via grassroots mobilization in the communities, reconfigured the hitherto paternalistic interaction

---

<sup>402</sup> Pairicán and Álvarez, "La Nueva Guerra de Arauco: la Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco y los nuevos movimientos de resistencia mapuche en el Chile de la Concertación," 71.

<sup>403</sup> Prensa Lafkenche, "Quiénes Somos," Identidad Lafkenche, [http://www.identidadlafkenche.cl/laf/?page\\_id=2](http://www.identidadlafkenche.cl/laf/?page_id=2).

<sup>404</sup> Pairicán and Álvarez, "La Nueva Guerra de Arauco: la Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco y los nuevos movimientos de resistencia mapuche en el Chile de la Concertación," 70-71.

<sup>405</sup> Prensa Lafkenche, "Quiénes Somos". Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, "Antecedentes Generales," *Weftun: Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto*, no. 1 (2001), <http://www.nodo50.org/weftun/publicacion/kom1.htm>.

between the Chilean government and Mapuche communities. More than marking the re-emergence of widespread resistance in Wallmapu, the attacks of Lumaco signified the renaissance of the Mapuche world as it was preserved in the collective memory of its members. In the words of Huenchunao, the attacks in Lumaco:

[...] raised the morals of many Mapuche people. [They] also allowed a clarification in regards to where the *Mapuche Movement* was heading. For instance, it became clear that the movement was subordinated only to the Mapuche people [...]. In addition, leftist sectors were in disbelief that the Mapuche people could generate [by themselves] such a prominent action [...] Lumako is extremely important to impel the struggle we are living.<sup>406</sup>

This transformation of Mapuche discontent and frustration into organized collective action ignited a new process of national re-signification amongst the Mapuche people. According to CAM, this required a process of reconscientization of the communities most affected by the usurpation of land. In this sense, in contrast to other Mapuche organizations which were led by Mapuches in the urban centers of Santiago,<sup>407</sup> CAM was first and foremost formed by Mapuche families inhabiting the provinces of Arauco and Malleco. As early as 1999, the communities of Rukañanco, Kuyinco, Tranicura, Choque, Colcuma, El Malo, Miquiwe, Coiiwinka Tori and Temulemu, amongst others,<sup>408</sup> had joined CAM in the struggle against the new colonization of Wallmapu.

---

<sup>406</sup> Huenchunao in Tricot, *Autonomía: El Movimiento Mapuche de Resistencia*: 185. Translation mine.

<sup>407</sup> These include Meli Wixan Mapu and Folilche Aflaiai.

<sup>408</sup> Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, "Conversaciones en Torno a las Movilizaciones del Pueblo Mapuche," Weftun: Voz de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, <http://www.nodo50.org/weftun/>.

Based on a strategy of re-occupation and re-appropriation of usurped lands, CAM declared war on the capitalist structures operating in Wallmapu—a declaration that consequently saw the Chilean militarization of the Mapuche territory, the creation and funding of paramilitaries, like the Comando Hernán Trizano, and the utilization of public funds for the protection of corporate interests in the region. By 1999, the Chilean Army had branded the “Mapuche issue” as a major concern to national security and as one of the most menacing conflicts in the country.<sup>409</sup> CAM’s mobilization had by now led the Chilean government to reinstate Pinochet’s 1984 Anti-Terrorist Law 18314 to surveil, criminalize and prosecute Mapuche leaders.

This bellicose period, lasting from the late twentieth century up to the present day, is now commonly alluded as the “New Arauco War.”<sup>410</sup> This period saw the state cooptation of the other two main Mapuche autonomist organizations, CTT and AÑL, via the establishment in 2003 of a Commission on Historic Truth and New Relationship with Indigenous Peoples.<sup>411</sup> This, in turn, solidified CAM’s role in the struggle for autonomy and positioned it as the most salient Mapuche autonomist organization in Chile. The next section explores the ideological foundations of this movement and examines its autonomist project via a series of texts and interviews gathered during fieldwork in the region.

### CAM: Autonomy in Wallmapu

The latest prison writings of CAM’s leader, Héctor Llaitul, gifted to me while conducting an unauthorized personal interview in the

---

<sup>409</sup> Chihuailaf, *Recado confidencial a los chilenos*: 123.

<sup>410</sup> Pairicán and Álvarez, "La Nueva Guerra de Arauco: la Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco y los nuevos movimientos de resistencia mapuche en el Chile de la Concertación."

<sup>411</sup> Ibid., 77-78. According to CAM, these organizations were also co-opted by the Socialist Party (PS for its Spanish acronym) and the Party for Democracy (PPD for its Spanish acronym).

Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, "Antecedentes Generales".

maximum-security prison El Manzano in the City of Concepción in late October 2013,<sup>412</sup> define CAM as an anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-statist, anti-systemic, anti-oligarchic, anti-Western and non-leftist Mapuche revolutionary autonomist movement.<sup>413</sup> The autonomist organization declares war on both, the capitalist structures operating in Wallmapu (mainly forestry, mining and hydroelectric companies but also including the *latifundistas*) and the Chilean nation-state. It does so by framing this war within a *sui generis* liberation philosophy denominated *Mapuchista* to denote the national, cultural and historical character of the struggle.

Like the Council of Miskito Elders of La Moskitia and unlike Zapatismo and other indigenous organizations and movements in Latin America, CAM moves away from leftist and socialist approaches to liberation (Marxism, Maoism, Anarchism, etc.) for it considers that they subordinate the historic Mapuche national autonomist struggle to another, albeit less colonialist, Western-centric framework. In this sense, for Llaitul, CAM's political project needs to be differentiated from other struggles in the region since it embraces a unique "*Indianista-anti-capitalista*"<sup>414</sup> framework that counters and overturns the oppressive economic system that is presently "condemning the Mapuche to extermination."

In addition, via this Indianista-anti-capitalista politics, CAM aims to revitalize and reconstruct the Mapuche nation as a whole. Central then to this concomitantly *Mapuchista* and *Indianista* approach to national liberation is the notion of autonomy, which CAM reappropriates and redefines as "complete independence

---

<sup>412</sup> Mapuche CAM leaders Héctor Llaitul and Ramón Llanquileo are currently serving jail time for arson attacks and the intellectual planning of

<sup>413</sup> Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca, "El Pensamiento Emancipatorio de la Coordinadora Arauco Malleco: una estrategia de Liberación Nacional," ed. Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco (Concepción 2013), 14-17.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid., 15.

from the state, NGOs [and] political parties."<sup>415</sup> In this sense, CAM's *Indianismo* closely resembles the autonomist notions embedded in the Fanonian Katarista-Indianismo of the late Aymara *Amauta* Fausto Reinaga and *El Mallku* Felipe Quispe in today's Bolivian Andes. Llaitul himself has publicly proclaimed his respect and solidarity for Aymara Indianismo by declaring "[...] the best example of the recuperation of Indianness [in Latin America] is Felipe Quispe in Bolivia [and] like Quispe, I am Indianista myself."<sup>416</sup> Nevertheless, while drawing on Aymara Indianismo, CAM *mapuchicizes* the Mapuche struggle via articulating a conceptualization of autonomy suited to the particular colonial history and the contemporary state of affairs in Wallmapu.

For CAM, the notion of autonomy fundamentally differs from those articulations voiced by "so-called [other] independent or autonomous Mapuche organizations," which have recently engaged in debates and negotiations with Chilean institutions and political parties. In contrast, for CAM, autonomy "signifies the rejection of the political subordination of the Mapuche to the winka [non-Mapuche Westerner]. It signifies insubordination and rebelliousness, but above all, collective resistance."<sup>417</sup> Through this self-proclaimed "radical" redefinition of autonomy, CAM calls for both the liberation of the Mapuche from the current colonialist system of oppression and the ignition of a process of self-affirmation of the Mapuche "as a people, as a nation."<sup>418</sup> Llaitul summarizes CAM's articulation of autonomy, for him:

CAM recognizes three distinct  
dimensions in regards to autonomy:

---

<sup>415</sup> Ibid., 6. *Translation mine.*

<sup>416</sup> Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca and Jorge Arrate, eds., *Weichan: Conversaciones con un weycheafe en la prisión política* (Santiago: Ceibo Ediciones, 2012), 276.

<sup>417</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca," (Concepción 2013).

<sup>418</sup> Llaitul-Carrillanca, "El Pensamiento Emancipatorio de la Coordinadora Arauco Malleco: una estrategia de Liberación Nacional," 7. *Translation mine.*

political and organizational independence, identitarian self-affirmation and freedom of thought [...] founded upon the development of a process of ideological decolonization. Autonomy, for our organization, is thinking and acting based on our own criterion [...] autonomy as independence, autonomy as self-affirmation and autonomy as ideological decolonization are then, in synthesis, the most significant elements of the emancipatory philosophy of CAM.<sup>419</sup>

In this sense, CAM refuses to accept, sublate and internalize the institutional approaches of the Chilean state in addressing the overall Mapuche demands for autonomy. Since its inception in 1993, the National Corporation for Indigenous Development (CONADI) has aimed to promote economic development for indigenous Mapuche communities as well as demarcate and title Mapuche lands. From 1999 onwards, it adopted a stronger policy of redistribution of land and aimed to fulfill by 2014 the territorial demands of the Mapuche in the southern Chilean regions of Bío-Bío, Araucanía and Los Lagos. But marred by corruption, lack of funds, poor logistics and strong bureaucratization, CONADI is currently far from reaching its target.<sup>420</sup> Nevertheless, notwithstanding these failures, CAM perceives this policy of purchasing lands from colonial *latifundistas* and redistributing this land amongst Mapuche families as just another top-down, paternalizing and co-optive approach to autonomy.<sup>421</sup>

---

<sup>419</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>420</sup> Centro de Estudios e Investigación que Promueve los Valores y Principios de una Sociedad Libre, "Denuncia de Irregularidades en Compra de Tierras," (Libertad y Desarrollo, 2014); Contraloría General de la República de Chile, Contraloría Regional de la Araucanía, and Unidad de Auditoría e Inspección, "Informe Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena," (Temuco: Contraloría General de la República de Chile,, 2011). Centro de Estudios e Investigación que Promueve los Valores y Principios de una Sociedad Libre, "Denuncia de Irregularidades en Compra de Tierras."

<sup>421</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca."

Accordingly, for CAM, the Mapuche autonomist struggle can only be executed outside of the Western statist institutional apparatus.

Inextricable from this practicization of autonomy is the notion of territory. In praxis, CAM's resistance seeks to recover the totality of the never-fully colonized Mapuche territory, which lies between the Bio-Bio River to the north and the Toltén River to the south. According to CAM, this territory has not only been illegally invaded and appropriated by the Chilean state and its sponsored Chilean, Swiss and German immigrants since the late nineteenth century, but from 1974 onwards it has also "suffered abhorrent depredation and destruction at the hands of forestry giants."<sup>422</sup> I personally witnessed the extent and power of the forestry industry while conducting fieldwork in the Province of Araucania. Soon after leaving the increasingly *chilenized* and commercialized city of Temuco, I encountered dozens of kilometers of inhospitable and lifeless monoculture plantations. Within this artificial landscape, only a few scattered and encroached Mapuche *rucas* (houses) were discernible. This reduction of Mapuche lands to minuscule, uninhabitable physical spaces became even more undeniable after witnessing the almost 300km of highway from Temuco to Concepcion, filled with logging plantations as well as the stream of heavy traffic produced by the trucks loaded with timber, passing by every few minutes.

In denouncing this occupation and usurpation of Wallmapu, Llaitul foregrounds the centrality of territory to CAM's struggle:

The presence of forestry companies has been in all senses devastating for our people, [...] it has implied the destruction of the Mapuche world in its most fundamental dimensions [...] their further expansion

---

<sup>422</sup> Ibid. *Translation mine.*

through Wallmapu could mean the final destracturation of our people. The forestry invasion limits the possibility of accessing the larger territorial spaces demanded by Mapuche communities, thereby altering and negatively affecting the physical, social and human geography of Wallmapu.<sup>423</sup>

Therefore, for CAM, if the Mapuche are to halt and reverse the “ethnocide” they currently face, then recovering and revindicating their territory is the first task in the list.<sup>424</sup> In this sense, the destruction of native forests, the culling of native species (now deemed pests), and the extensive use of pesticides and toxic chemicals to protect forestry plantations, have led to further displacement and relocation of Mapuche communities. The desiccation of lakes, rivers, creeks and wells, the pollution of water resources, the degradation of soil, the loss of suitable land and the disruption of the physical and natural environment where the Mapuche live are the motor that today drives CAM’s resistance. During my visit to the region, I corroborated first hand the contaminated water problem. Mapuche community members spoke of the continuous pollution of water resources produced by the heavily toxic pesticides utilized by forestry companies. There was not a single Mapuche person I interviewed in the provinces of Arauco and Malleco who did not mention the pollution of water as one of the main physical threats posed by the forestry industry. Also in regards to water, other Mapuche families spoke of the desiccation of historically-owned wells, which for generations had supplied entire communities with fresh and clean water. Today, these very communities rely on expensive emergency water tankers for the supply of potable water for their survival. It became clear then that the Water Code enacted by the Chilean

---

<sup>423</sup> Llaitul-Carrillanca and Arrate, *Weichan: Conversaciones con un weycheafe en la prisión política*, 190-91. Translation mine.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid., 192. Translation mine.

government in 1981<sup>425</sup> to regulate the use and supply of fresh water has been manipulated in favor of forestry and hydroelectric conglomerates.

The centrality of the theme of territorial autonomy for CAM sets it further apart from the ideological framework and the political strategies of other Mapuche organizations and movements like Consejo de Todas las Tierras (Council of All Lands) and Wallmapuche. For CAM, these organizations aim, at best, to pluralize the still homogenous fabric of Chilean society and exercise self-determination and autonomy through establishing a regional government within the confines of Chilean state and citizenship. They privilege political participation in Western structures and institutions and embrace Western forms of government, modes of socio-politico organization, administrative units and ideas of progress over Mapuche local ontologies and systems of knowledge. CAM condemns these approaches as “unable to achieve anything more than a symbolic, cultural and folkloric form of autonomy, which is in fact, only functional for the system of domination [...] thereby further condemning us to physical and ideological disappearance.” In this sense, tangible autonomy, for CAM, can only be achieved via the territorial recovery of Wallmapu and its re-establishment as a *de facto* independent, autonomous and self-governing entity outside of the borders of any Western nation-state *yet* without constituting a nation-state in itself.<sup>426</sup>

---

<sup>425</sup> After the enactment of the Water Code, indigenous Mapuche communities remained, for the most part, misinformed and unaware of the crucial need to register their water supplies before the federal government. In praxis, the code brought along a structure of limited water rights that affected most indigenous communities. Barbara van Koppen, Mark Giordano, and John Butterworth, eds., *Community-based water law and water resource management reform in developing countries* (Cambridge: CAB International, 2007). Axel Douroujeanni and Andrei Jouravlev, "El Código de Aguas de Chile: entre la ideología y la realidad," ed. CEPAL Recursos naturales e infraestructura (Santiago de Chile: Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe CEPAL, 1999).

<sup>426</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca."

To that end, CAM proposes a distinctive offensive and strategic road to autonomy. In the words of Llaitul, “autonomy needs to be conquered, needs to be battled over, it cannot be achieved neither by concession nor negotiation.”<sup>427</sup> That being the case, autonomy, for CAM, requires Mapuche grassroots collective action as well as a plan for national reconstruction. The first step in this bottom-up approach towards autonomy is what CAM denominates *control territorial* or territorial control, whereby certain nodes within the movement seek to re-occupy a *fundo* in order to re-appropriate it and recover it as one of the many territorial components of Wallmapu. It is via this gradual recovery of *fundos* that CAM expects to re-found and reestablish Wallmapu as whole. In other words, CAM’s rationale is that only via the recovery of Mapuche lands and overall territory can Mapuche families and communities begin to practice the second step in their autonomist project: to re-ignite Mapuche political, social and economic structures embedded in *Admapu ka Admongen*—a system that lays down the Mapuche cosmological vision for a better and more balanced world.<sup>428</sup>

To re-occupy “private” lands or *fundos*, CAM has created what they call *órganos de resistencia territorial* (ORT) or territorial control units. These nodes within the movement are composed exclusively of Mapuche leaders, authorities and other members of the Mapuche social structure. In fact, it is their traditional forms of authority like the Lonko (chief), the Machi (spiritual leader), the Werken (messenger), the Kona (soldier), the Wewpife (historian) and the Weichafe (warrior), amongst others, who collectively work for the re-occupation and recovery of these *fundos*. The first step in this process is to collectively enter a private plot of land which is usually at the hand of three main forestry conglomerates

---

<sup>427</sup> Llaitul-Carrillanca, "El Pensamiento Emancipatorio de la Coordinadora Arauco Malleco: una estrategia de Liberación Nacional." *Translation mine.*

<sup>428</sup> ———, "Ante las Medidas Estatales la Lucha por el Territorio y la Autonomía," (Concepción: Presos Políticos Mapuche CAM Wican, 2014).

(Empresas Arauco, CMPC-Forestal Mininco and Masisa) or occupied by Chilean and foreign colonialists—those who were given Mapuche lands pre and post Pacificación de la Araucanía by the Chilean state.

Pine and eucalyptus plantations in Chile today amount to more than 2.8 million hectares,<sup>429</sup> led by the three main forestry conglomerates, whose property stands at more than 1.3 million hectares alone in the Mapuche territory. Bosques Arauco by itself has in its possession more than 700,000 hectares while CMPC-Forestal Mininco possesses approximately 500,000 hectares.<sup>430</sup> Individually, each of these two conglomerates control more land than the whole Mapuche population of Chile. It is precisely these occupied territories which ORT targets in its operations. They first engage in activities to destroy the imposed monoculture plantations and the crops of latifundistas. This operation includes but is not limited to destroying and burning large areas of eucalyptus and radiata pine plantations as well as burning houses, warehouses and machinery belonging to these forestry companies and latifundistas.<sup>431</sup>

As was briefly introduced in the previous section, it was precisely this “radicalization” of the Mapuche struggle that led to the isolation and ostracization of CAM within the wider Mapuche movement. Nevertheless, CAM has defended its offensive strategy against other Mapuche organizations’ institutional means to seize autonomy. In its National Liberation Project, CAM declares, “our territorial recovery operations evince a direct project against the further plundering of Wallmapu and towards national Mapuche

---

<sup>429</sup> Organización Internacional del Trabajo, "El Trabajo Decente en la Industria Forestal en Chile," (Santiago: Organización Internacional del Trabajo, 2012), 73-76.

<sup>430</sup> Cristián Frene Conget, Mariela Núñez Ávila, and Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo, "Hacia un nuevo Modelo Forestal en Chile," *Revista Bosque Nativo* 2010, 27-28.

<sup>431</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca."

liberation."<sup>432</sup> The next step in this process of Mapuche liberation is *siembra productiva* or productive sowing whereby members of Mapuche communities, including women and children, enter the newly-recovered *fundo*. Once the imposed plantations have been destroyed, this node within CAM is in charge of sowing potato, tomato, wheat and other elements of the Mapuche traditional diet as well as re-planting native trees vital for Mapuche cosmovision and medicine such as *foye*, *temu*, *luma* and *pewen*, building *rucas* and other Mapuche infrastructure and demarcate, establish and prepare the physical spaces for the celebration of Mapuche religious ceremonies and other cultural activities.

Via these series of actions, CAM communities encounter the first tangible form of socio-cultural autonomy. In the words of Llaitul, these *recuperaciones de tierra y territorio* "allow an identitarian recomposition of the Mapuche to emerge via allowing the revitalization of Mapuche culture and religion."<sup>433</sup> The recuperation of the vital spiritual spaces of the *Tren-tren Hills*, *menoko* (wetlands), *mawida* (forests), *eltun* (place of rest/burial grounds), *trayeko* (slopes), *paliwe* (playing ground) and *nguillatuwe* (collective altar) consequently allows Mapuche religious ceremonies like the *Nguillatún* and *Machitún* as well as cultural and recreational activities like the *Palín* to be formally re-established in the society. This is how Mapuche communities in *fundos* seized by ORT are now able to practice these ceremonies as part of their everyday life, without being subject to further territorial encroachment by forestry companies and *latifundistas*.

Thus, territorial recovery and its subsequent cultural revitalization process paves the way for the third step toward

---

<sup>432</sup> Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, "Parte 2 La Práctica Política del Proyecto de Liberación Nacional Mapuche. Estrategia y Táctica de la CAM," (WEFTUN Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, 2013). *Translation mine*.

<sup>433</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca."

national liberation: political autonomy. Here, the re-establishment of Mapuche socio-politico spaces and administrative units like the foundational *Lof*, the broader *Rewe* and the greater *Aillarewe* kindles the reconstruction of the Mapuche nation as a whole. For the Mapuche, *Lof* is the basic social organizational unit, led by a *Longko*; several *Lofs* are grouped into a *Rewe* and several *Rewes* (usually nine of them) constitute a broader communal institution denominated *Aillarewe*. Each of the *Rewes* was territorially and politically independent.<sup>434</sup> In addition to the revitalization of these institutions, CAM pushes for the revivification and institutionalization of the *trawun* or parliament as the most significant form of traditional political organization for Mapuche communities. Within this newly organized Mapuche societal framework, political and cultural figures like those of *Longko*, *Werken*, *Machi*, *Wewpife*, *Kona*, *Weichafe*, *Dugunmachife* (spiritual interpreter) and *Ngenpin* (ritual organizer) are able to exercise functionally their roles in the community, revive traditional practices and knowledges and further strengthen and develop the Mapuche organizational structure.<sup>435</sup>

It is precisely, to borrow from Llaitul, this “conquering of autonomy”<sup>436</sup> on the ground that has earned CAM widespread respect and support from communities in the provinces of Arauco and Malleco in the VIII and IX regions of Bio-Bio and Araucania respectively. The territorial recovery operations of occupied Mapuche lands such as those conducted in Didaico, Ercilla and Chequenco in regards to the *predios* and *fundos* Santa Rosa and Chorrillos, Santa Alicia and Chiguayhue respectively,<sup>437</sup> amongst

---

<sup>434</sup> Chihuailaf et al., *El despertar del pueblo mapuche: nuevos conflictos, viejas demandas*, 30.

<sup>435</sup> Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, “El pensamiento emancipatorio de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto,” (WEFTUN Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, 2013).

<sup>436</sup> Llaitul-Carrillanca, “El Pensamiento Emancipatorio de la Coordinadora Arauco Malleco: una estrategia de Liberación Nacional,” 23.

<sup>437</sup> Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, “Inchin Taiñ Dugu,” in *Weftun Página Oficial CAM*, ed. Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco (2003).

many others, have set into motion on-going battles for the revindication of other occupied *fundos* in the region. This imminent success has led other non-CAM nodes within the overall Mapuche national movement to imitate this strategy. By occupying private lands and “provoking conflict,” these nodes, according to CAM’s *Weichafe* Ramón Llanquileo Pilquimán, act deceptively and self-interestedly by aiming only to push the federal government to negotiate the meager distribution of lands in the region via CONADI. In the words of Llanquileo:

[.w}e should not hold any illusions in regards to the ‘battles’ fought by certain groups in our society, who only act opportunistically when the political situation favors their demands. They thrive to create conflict to see what they can get in exchange from the government. That is, sometimes they get a couple of hectares of land, infrastructural, agricultural, pine plantations and other capitalist projects to silence and pacify their demands [...] their occupation of *fundos* is temporary only.<sup>438</sup>

In contrast, Llanquileo asserts that CAM’s operations of territorial control are both permanent and intertwined with a political project for decolonization and national re-construction. In this sense, CAM has declared that the defensive and revindicative actions conducted by ORTs remain legitimate and

---

<sup>438</sup> Ramón Llanquileo-Pilquimán, "La Disputa del Fundo El Canelo," (El Manzano Concepción: Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco Malleco, 2014). "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's weichafe Ramón Llanquileo Pilquimán," (El Manzano Concepción 2013). In this instance, Llanquileo was referring to the series of events that occurred during the contested battle for the revindication of the *fundo* El Canelo in Tranaquepe. Here, whilst CAM leaders Choque and Miquihue for years executed operations for territorial control, after they were jailed other Mapuches, led by Adolfo Millabur and José Huenchunao, acted opportunistically. This led CONADI to grant them official ownership of the area after forestry company Volterra decided to sell the *fundo*, pressured by the territorial occupations ignited by Choque’s and Miquihue’s operations.

"will continue to operate as long as the structural problems that affect the Mapuche nation are not resolved."<sup>439</sup> In recent years, these revindicative operations have encountered fierce oppression by both the Chilean state and the corporate conglomerates. This, in turn, has led to the revival of Pinochet's Anti-Terrorist Law of 1984 as well as the creation and funding of paramilitaries in the southern Chilean region.

But the original Anti-Terrorist Law enacted during the dictatorship did not contemplate arson as a terrorist offense for setting fire to uninhabited buildings and fields, it was argued, did not directly threaten the life and physical integrity of individuals *per se*. Besides, the law was first and foremost directed at targeting and quelling the more "direct" actions of leftist urban guerrillas in the 1980s<sup>440</sup>. Accordingly, the amendments to this law were passed by the Chilean Congress only after the restoration of democracy post-1990s—precisely at a time when Mapuche communities began mobilizing against the further encroachment of their territory. In particular, since 2003, the Anti-Terrorist Law has worked concomitantly with a series of national policies that have jointly led to the legalized systematic surveillance of Mapuche communities as well as the to militarization of the Mapuche region. Specializing in counter-terrorism operations, the carabinero police forces are now a permanent element of the landscape in Wallmapu.

I myself witnessed this militarization while travelling across the region to visit communities not far from Temuco. Permanently stationed on the road leading to what they perceive are terrorist-supporting communities, and also positioned outside latifundistas and forestry warehouses, the carabinero forces, with their

---

<sup>439</sup> Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, "Parte 2 La Práctica Política del Proyecto de Liberación Nacional Mapuche. Estrategia y Táctica de la CAM." *Translation mine*.

<sup>440</sup> Human Rights Watch, "Undue process: terrorism trials, military courts, and the Mapuche in southern Chile," in *Human Rights Watch* (2004), 24.

military tanks, riot gear and water cannons, undoubtedly instigated fear amongst Mapuche communities, in particular women and children. Dressed in their traditional green uniform and being, for the most part, of European ancestry, the carabinero personnel reminded me of Hernán Cortés, Francisco Pizarro and Pedro de Valdivia and their military checkpoints guarding the colonial centers of Tenochtitlán, Cuzco and the Valley of the Mapocho against resistance from the natives in México, Peru and Chile respectively. The multiple checkpoints in Wallmapu, guarded by the carabineros across the region, required all commuters, whether local or foreign, to identity themselves and to routinely answer a long series of unwelcoming questions.

Not long after interviewing a member of the Mapuche community of Temucuicui in Ercilla in October 2013, the entire community was raided by carabineros who utilized their “usual” tear gas bombs and rubber bullets against community members in their search for “potential terrorist weapons” amongst the people of Temucuicui. My contact with Temucuicui, who prefers to remain unidentified, informed me later that evening that the raiding police showed no search warrant and that several women and children were injured after being exposed to gas bombs without any warning. A few days later, I was told by the representative of the Mapuche Political Prisoners (PPM), Guacolda Chicahual, that these practices “constitute part of the communities’ everyday life.”<sup>441</sup>

In addition to *control territorial* and revindicative actions, CAM engages in two other main operations: *acciones de autodefensa* (self-defense operations) and *acciones de resistencia* (resistance actions). On the one hand, *acciones de autodefensa*, are an attempt to respond to the systematic and violent action by both state agents and paramilitary groups. These self-defense operations

---

<sup>441</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with Mapuche Political Prisoners' Representative Guacolda Chicahual," (Santiago2013).

legitimize the use of violence on behalf of communities by arguing this is the only means to counter the fear and violence inflicted by carabineros in the region. On the other hand, *acciones de resistencia*, are more concerned with arson attacks against the private property of *latifundistas* as well as forestry warehouses, trucks, machinery, etc. Here, in contrast to the revindicative operations analyzed earlier, these actions do not target one *fundo* proprietor in particular but are aimed instead at driving the *latifundistas* and forestry giants away from Wallmapu.

The *acciones de resistencia*, according to CAM, seek to inflict an economic loss on the capitalist agents operating in Wallmapu. They intend to bring to an end the capitalist productive cycle in the region, which directly affects and harms the Mapuche livelihood, its cosmovision and the environment. In my interview with Llaitul, he referred to these self-defensive actions as *Chem*, which he translated as a *quehacer* into Spanish,<sup>442</sup> a “duty”, a “task.” Furthermore, CAM argues that the fact that these particular actions are devised and carried out by the collective Mapuche whole means they are pursued as a legitimate and just strategy to counter the ever-increasing encroachment of their territory by these economic agents. Nevertheless, violence as self-defense and *Chem* as such, for CAM, aim only to inflict harm and loss to economic agents for CAM does not aim to “execute actions against any individual whether that it is a farmer, driver or security guard.”<sup>443</sup>

In addition to these actions, the revindication of Wallmapu, for CAM, can only be achieved via the practicization of *Chem*. The actions embedded in this concept, for CAM, entail a broader process of cultural and religious re-signification as well as the

---

<sup>442</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca."

<sup>443</sup> Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, "Parte 2 La Práctica Política del Proyecto de Liberación Nacional Mapuche. Estrategia y Táctica de la CAM."

revival of Mapuche cosmovision. Through its symbolic dimension, *Chem* also paves the way for *ta iñ kuifike kimun con ta iñ we rakiduam* or the fusion and convergence between Mapuche ancient philosophy and today's generative and dynamic knowledges. Moreover, it is through *Chem* that some Mapuche activists, those that are the most committed to the liberation of Wallmapu, grow and evolve into *Weychafe* (warriors). This resurrection of the figure of the *Weychafe* goes hand in hand with the philosophical foundations of *Chem*. In the words of Llaitul, resurrecting the *Weychafe* "requires thinking about both the past and the present and connecting them together."<sup>444</sup> In addition, drawing from the life of Leftraru—Mapuche captive and servant of the colonizers who learned the skills and military stratagems of the Spanish army and then led the Mapuche to defeat the colonizers in one of the most disastrous battles for the colony—CAM postulates that today's Western culture and social environment are also significant spaces where Mapuche communities can borrow certain elements and acquire distinct skills that would further strengthen the Mapuche struggle for liberation.<sup>445</sup>

Nevertheless, this resurrection of the figure of the *Weychafe* is an on-going process, one that still is being discussed and debated amongst CAM Mapuche communities. How exactly should the *Weychafe* be defined? How should the contemporary Mapuche understand the role of this figure in the broader aim of recovering Wallmapu? What attributes must he possess? And most importantly, how can the *Weychafe* of the eighteenth or even fifteenth century be molded and adapted to a contemporary environment and the new threats that it brings along? These are some of the key questions at the core of the Mapuche debate vis-à-

---

<sup>444</sup> Llaitul-Carrillanca and Arrate, *Weichan: Conversaciones con un weychafe en la prisión política*, 61. Translation mine.

<sup>445</sup> Ibid.

vis the *Weychafe*, central figure in this new articulation of autonomy by CAM.

Overall, CAM has pushed the orthodoxic definitions of liberal political participation, capitalist development and progress, but most importantly, autonomy as they claim their right as a nation to define the terms of their collective existence without paternalistic Western intervention. It is only via the complete recovery and revindication of Wallmapu, as a territory, that CAM envisions the setting into motion of a broader process of cultural, political and economic revitalization. Through the practicization of the *recuperaciones de tierras, control territorial, acciones de auto-defensa* and *acciones de resistencia* CAM seeks to re-construct the Wallmapu as both a physical and social space for the Mapuche.

## Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that CAM, setting itself apart from most indigenous movements in contemporary Latin America, seeks to re-appropriate the notion of autonomy, *mapuchicize* it and redefine it as a complete separation from the nation-state. Antithetical to the models that advocate multiculturalism or regional autonomy within the nation-state, proposed by liberal scholars in chapter two, CAM struggles to liberate the Mapuche nation via the total revindication of their traditional territory. It aims to seize autonomy via an anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-systemic, anti-statist and non-leftist but uniquely indigenous Mapuche path to liberation.

In addition, this chapter has also shown that CAM's re-conceptualization of orthodox interpretations of autonomy entails first and foremost a process of ideological decolonization that is itself accompanied by an on-going struggle for political independence as well as self-affirmation of the Mapuche as a

people and as a nation. Via the analysis of CAM's literature as well as the conduction of personal interviews in the region, this chapter exposed that the notion of territory is inextricable in CAM's struggle for autonomy. Territory is the foundational element upon which CAM's articulation of autonomy is constructed. The revindication of the never-colonized Mapuche territory-Wallmapu, lying between the Bio-Bio River to the north and the Toltén River to the south, is central to CAM's autonomist project.

It is CAM's ORTs, which via *recuperaciones de tierras* and *control territorial*, "conquer autonomy on the ground", to use Llaitul's lexicon. These nodes within the movement actively seek to recover Mapuche lands from *latifundistas* and forestry companies, who CAM regards as the main economic agents aiding the desestructuration and de-territorialization of the Wallmapu and Mapuche world. Concomitant with these actions for the revindication of occupied Mapuche physical spaces are the operations of *auto-defensa* and *resistencia*, which directly seek the protection of Mapuche communities from systematic state persecution as well as to bring to an end the depredation, fragmentation and usurpation of Mapuche territory.

Nevertheless, this chapter also illustrated that CAM's autonomist project, beyond mere territorial recovery, calls for a broader plan to revitalize the Mapuche cosmological system embedded in *Admapu ka Admongen*. In this sense, as Mapuche lands are progressively recovered from colonists and forestry companies, CAM seeks to *re-mapuchicize* these spaces via the processes of productive sowing, the collective resurrection of local knowledges, the re-implementation of Mapuche administrative units—like the Lof, Rewe and Aillarewe—, and the recovery of pre-colonial Mapuche systems of thought, modes of subsistence and religious beliefs. Overall, CAM envisions that

autonomy is only possible via the encounter of the contemporary, colonized Mapuche with its pre-colonial past. Only then, through this revindicative autonomist project, for CAM, can the Wallmapu be re-constructed.



## **Chapter V: Revindicative Autonomism**

### **Introduction**

The Council of Miskitu Elders in Nicaragua and the Arauco Malleco Coordinating Committee in Chile present an interpretation of autonomy that has so far eluded Western conceptualization. As illustrated in Chapter II of this thesis, even the most radical approaches within liberalism encounter major theoretical contradictions and convolutions in fathoming the essence of indigenous autonomist demands. Kymlicka's federacy, Lijphart's consociationalism and Bauböck's pluralist federation may well ameliorate the appalling condition of destitution that mars indigenous communities today, grant greater political power to maneuver certain cultural and legal issues at stake and even propose decentralized and often deterritorialized alternatives in which indigenous peoples can theoretically recover self-government rights and redefine its polity as a self-constitutive unit. Nevertheless, under the guise of these multicultural policies, a rather paternalist, Western-centric and universalist political project is concealed.

Contesting this Western approach to autonomy, the movements reviewed in Chapter III and Chapter IV, engage in a political strategy that departs from the conventional spectrum of inclusionist demands reviewed in Chapter I. Reimagining autonomy in non-Western and non-statist terms, these movements, contrary to the likes of CONAIE, CONIC and Council of All Lands, disavow the imposition of multicultural policies as well as internal self-determination and self-government mechanisms for they regard them as just another insidious colonialist endeavor. In addition, these movements postulate that tangible self-rule is contingent on the recovery and revindication of the totality of their territory, which in the cases of Mosquitia and Wallmapu was seized by colonial powers and incorporated into

the nation-state in the late nineteenth century (1894 and 1883 respectively). In this sense, territory is intrinsically attached to autonomy for to embrace a form of autonomy devoid of an ancestral localized space is in the eyes of these agents to thwart the rediscovery, revitalization and practicization of local buried systems of knowledge and pre-colonial ontologies. This way, framing their struggle outside of Western institutionalism, these movements probe the deceptive veneer of the seemingly democratic and egalitarian vertical approach to autonomy.

The new articulation of autonomy, epitomized by the Miskitu Council of Elders and the Mapuche CAM is, in its essence, a decolonizing strategy, an attempt by colonized indigenous subjects to actively reconquer physical localized spaces of belonging in order to reclaim monopoly over the (re)production of social spaces. This strategy, which I call in this thesis revindicative autonomism, is inherently antagonistic to even the most radical and “accommodating” liberal and reformist approaches to autonomy. In Latin America, it is also fundamentally different from the strategies embraced by movements such as FRENAPI and FOAG in that it actively rejects political inclusion as a means to achieve autonomy. Similarly, revindicative autonomism sets itself apart from other strategies, still inclusionist in their core, like those espoused by the Council of All Lands and the Putumayo Organization, which via a Western-imposed self-government and a regional/territorial form of autonomy pretend to secure self-rule for their communities. In this sense, revindicative autonomism, rather than aiming to positively affect bilateral dialogue and negotiation between state and indigenous parties, expecting a *quid pro quo*, seeks to actively subtract indigenous actors from this power-laden interaction.

To understand this emerging articulation of autonomy, it is necessary to first examine its cornerstones. Being such a broad

and multifaceted approach to autonomy, it is best to breakdown the analysis into three sections. The first section studies and aims to demarcate the ideological boundaries of revindicative autonomism via a subtractive approach. That is, it analyzes each of the ideological constructs that autonomism actively contests and opposes, such as colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, Marxism, anarchism, Christianity, and the nation state. The second section explores the centrality of territory for this form of autonomism. For its part, the third section draws parallels and divergences between revindicative autonomism, separatism and secessionism—a set of distinctions crucial to understanding this emerging form of autonomy.

### **Revindicative Autonomism: a Subtractive Definition**

Far from a utopian dream, revindicative autonomism is a practical decolonizing strategy. It aims, first and foremost, to free the indigenous subject from the shackles of colonial oppression and subserviency. It openly defies both, the continuous imposition of Western forms of knowledge and the internalization of these colonial values and worldviews. This way, indigenous movements that engage in a revindicative autonomist strategy, in a Memmian sense, aim to “cease defining [...themselves] through the categories of colonizers.”<sup>446</sup> As illustrated via the Miskitu and Mapuche cases in previous chapters, an identitarian recomposition of the indigenous subject is not a task set in the realm of theory but rather a practice of quotidian life. Via political, educational and socio-cultural reaffirmation, revindicative autonomism strives for, to borrow from Frantz Fanon, the creation of a new subject.<sup>447</sup> It is a strategy that aims to transcend cognitive dissonance, a collective refusal to abide by and attach

---

<sup>446</sup> Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992). 152.

<sup>447</sup> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (London: Penguin Books, 2001). 28.

themselves to principles and standards which they did not willingly submitted to.

Drawing from the political strategies and agendas of the Miskitu and Mapuche movements studied thoroughly in previous chapters, this largely unheeded form of autonomism can be defined as a conscious political and performative strategy of decolonization and national liberation which is inherently anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic, anti-statist, anti-systemic, *non-leftist* and non anarchist. At its core, it aims to restore the stateless condition under which indigenous societies held full monopoly of power over a particular lineal territory. Furthermore, this form of autonomism strives for a bottom-up reconfiguration of political, socio-cultural and economic frameworks in order to pave the way for collective well-being. In essence, it (re)appropriates autonomy in its most basic etymological form, denoting the imposition of law on oneself without external intervention. That is, it forsakes and rejects *ab initio* all forms and regimes of autonomy—regardless of how accommodating they are—imposed *ab extra* on the indigenous subject. Via embracing this form of autonomism, indigenous peoples and nations aspire to foster the emergence of liberatory processes.

At the core of this form of autonomism is a reconscientization strategy to revitalize and re-educate the indigenous subject in the values and principles that governed native pre-colonial societies. As in the case of the Miskitu Council of Elders, where the movement aims to recultivate the cosmological pillars of *Asla*, *Yawan Nani* and *Talia Mana*, or the case of Mapuche CAM, where it aims to attain the recovery and re-implementation of *Admapu ka Admongen*, revindicative autonomism outrightly rejects all Western ontologies and systems of thought. This includes Western individualism, linear and ascending progress

(developmental theories), scientific rationality, universalism and anthropocentric environmental ethics. The revindicative autonomist struggle refuses to submit itself to Western thought and action either in the form of cultural constructs of nature, government, social organization or spirituality.

This anti-Western feature of revindicative autonomism, however, not only seeks to rhetorically reject all Western systems and values imposed upon the indigenous subject via colonization. Rather, it has as an objective the extirpation of all Western influence from indigenous societies. A central aspect of this anti-Western and anti-colonial strategy is the removal of the colonial language from indigenous communities for a continued use of these languages, as Fanon contends, implies the acceptance of Western consciousness and values, thereby thwarting any tangible progress towards decolonization. Here, the revival of vernacular languages and literature plays a key role in this form of political struggle. In addition, as revealed by the Miskitu and Mapuche movements analyzed in this thesis, revindicative autonomism actively works towards expelling and destroying all corporate structures and actors from indigenous territory. Contesting capitalist modernity and its anthropocentric view of nature, indigenous movements seek to reverse the ethnocide they currently face. Displacement, relocation and dispossession, under this strategy, would be replaced with territorial revindication and collective ownership. In this sense, revindicative autonomism is intrinsically an anti-capitalist struggle.

The anti-colonial and anti-Western aspects of revindicative autonomism resuscitate the anti-colonial logic of Memmi, Fanon, Aimé Césaire and Reinaga in that “[...] to live, the colonized needs to do away with colonization. To become a man, he must do away with the colonized being that he has become.”<sup>448</sup> In this endeavor

---

<sup>448</sup> Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*: 151.

to recover and reaffirm its own identity, the indigenous collective subject, engaging in this form of autonomist struggle, calls for the expulsion of all Western forms of government, the rejection of imposed administrative divisions (town, municipality, village, etc.), social hierarchies (e.g., meritocracy-based) and categorizations (e.g., age, gender or class), multiculturalist policies (increased national and local representation, inclusionary institutions, educational reforms, etc.) and regimes of autonomy (decentralization, federalism, consociationalism, confederation, regional autonomy, etc.). Moreover, it denounces the imposition of a worldview that segregates private and public domains. Instead, it calls for a reconciliation of kinship with political, economic and religious life. It does so via resurrecting indigenous cosmovisions and cosmologies, (re)producing native knowledge and rebuilding pre-colonial forms of organization like the Miskitian “indigenous communitarianism” and the Mapuche *Lof, Rewe* and *Aillarewe*.

Furthermore, this form of political struggle postulates that to dismantle the colonial apparatus and seize autonomy, specifically within the Latin American context, a process of de-Christianization of indigenous communities must be ignited. Christian Churches have not only played a central historical role in the subjugation, “pacification” and indoctrination of indigenous peoples in the region but, for its most part, have remained utterly conservative and oblivious to the native nations’ plight for self-determination and autonomy. As illustrated by the cases of the Moravian and Catholic Churches in Nicaragua and Chile respectively, these Western institutions continue to engage in an insidious assimilationist and acculturationist project. Prohibiting the revitalization and dissemination of pre-Christian animistic practices, rituals and conventions—such as the traditional dance *tambakus*, the protection of *menoko* and *trayeko*, and the criminalization and mystification of all non-Western spiritual healing processes such as those conducted via the *sukya* or

Machi—the Christian Churches stymie the reawakening of indigenous spiritual fervor.

The incursion of other non-Christian foreign churches, nevertheless, is also opposed by the movements who advocate for this form of autonomy. In order to act in accordance to local standards of morality rather than foreign ones, indigenous organizations reject structures, actors, symbols and representations associated with Christianity and other non-local religions. In the process, they seek to set into motion a process of cultural re-identification as purely indigenous (e.g., as Miskitu or Mapuche) against existing forms of hybridity (e.g. Christian-Miskitu, Catholic-Mapuche). In this sense, revindicative autonomism is utterly different from other processes of indigenous decolonization in Latin America. The case of the 1990s Pan-Mayanist movement provides the most evident example of how even a comprehensive approach to cultural revitalization implicitly accepts or at worst, tolerates, the practice of non-native faiths such as Catholicism and Protestantism. In its goals to revive pre-colonial institutions and ceremonies and unify the diverse Maya culture amongst the ethnic Maya groups inhabiting Guatemala and Mexico,<sup>449</sup> Pan-Mayanism positioned itself as one of the most radical decolonizing movements in the region. Nevertheless, revindicative autonomism, in this context, is characterized by its reluctance to continue to allow indigenous spiritual beliefs and practices to be subsumed under non-Western faith systems. This anti-Christian component of the struggle, it is argued, would lead to a gradual decolonization of indigenous lore and culture.<sup>450</sup>

---

<sup>449</sup> Montejo, "The Multiplicity of Mayan Voices: Mayan Leadership and the Politics of Self-Representation," 142-43.

<sup>450</sup> The anti-Christian element of this autonomist struggle is not as strong in the Miskitu movement as it is in the Mapuche one. As illustrated earlier, religious syncretism is widespread in Mosquitia.

By resisting Western constructs, revindicative autonomist movements also reject their corollary, statism. The autonomist political struggle takes a strong stance against the Western-Westphalian state as the sole claimant of sovereignty and legitimate force throughout a given territory. In addition, revindicative autonomism denounces the imposition of a Western-rooted institution which extracts revenues from its population, organizes offices along bureaucratic rather than patrimonial lines and sharply separates the public from the private sphere. The concept of the nation-state, for revindicative autonomy, in this sense, is ideologically and culturally charged, thereby being tailor-made for Western civilization. On this account, the movements that aim for revindicative autonomism, like the Miskitu Council of Elders and Mapuche CAM, struggle not only for the liberation of their peoples from the grip of the colonial state but also, in their liberatory aspirations, reject the desire to reconstruct their nations and societies in a Western fashion. Here, the very concept of the state is seen as antithetical to indigenous forms of socio-politico and economic organization. For these movements, the establishment of a new state (e.g. Miskitu or Mapuche nation-state) conflicts with the very processes of ideological decolonization and cultural revitalization that they so steadily embrace.

Revindicative autonomist movements argue that before their territories were invaded by colonial powers, they were organized under a political system that was fundamentally at odds with the modern concept of nation-state. Here, it is crucial to point out that so far the indigenous movements in Latin America which have publicly adopted a revindicative autonomist form of struggle lost their full autonomous status only after the military invasion and forced incorporation into the colonial states in late nineteenth century. In this regard, the socio-politico and economic structures which sustained a booming civilization up until colonization are

still vivid in these indigenous communities' collective memory and political imaginary. Their desire to recover their stateless condition is not only a non-negotiable standard and a non-transitory aspiration but a catalyst in mobilizing indigenous communities. This anti-statist aspect of revindicative autonomism will be further explored and analyzed in the third subsection via drawing parallels and contrasts with separatism and secessionism.

Accompanying these anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic and anti-statist features of this form of autonomism is the refusal of these movements to subordinate their struggle to an urban-based proletarian revolution of some sort. Movements like the Council of Miskitu Elders and Mapuche CAM have throughout the years sternly denounced the insensitivity of Marxism to the political, cultural and economic realities of indigenous peoples and nations. To understand this conflict between these contrasting approaches to liberation it is necessary to briefly examine the role of the Marxist movements in Latin America. The revolutionary wave of Trotskyist Marxism that spread throughout the region in the second half of the twentieth century, for the most part, failed to gather widespread support from indigenous communities from Mexico to Bolivia, Argentina and Venezuela. In the words of Álvaro García Linera, Vice President of Bolivia, "for this form of Marxism, there were neither Indians nor community."<sup>451</sup> In this sense, the revolutionary theory of Trotskyist Marxism either represented by the leaders of the Bolivian Revolution (1952-1964), the politics of Nahuel Moreno's Movement for Socialism in Argentina or the political role of Trotskyist movements in Brazil in the 1980s and 1990s, was associated by indigenous peoples with a foreign homogenous project driven, no different to the national mestizo and European

---

<sup>451</sup> Álvaro García Linera, *La potencia plebeya: acción colectiva e identidades indígenas, obreras y populares en Bolivia* (Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2008). 378. Translation mine.

elites' nation-building politics, by Western principles and practices.

The proliferation of other forms of Marxism in the form of political parties and grassroots organizations (e.g. populist Stalinism, Chavista Bonapartism, Sandinista national reformism, etc.), nevertheless, continued to either relegate the identitarian composition of the native struggle or subordinate their demands to those of the proletarian groups. In this sense, these Marxist projects not only required the indigenous collective subject to "integrate" to the workers' revolution and acquire a class consciousness but also denied indigenous peoples the possibility of contributing, *qua* indigenous peoples, to this liberatory process. For this reason, revindicative autonomism, specifically within the Latin American context as illustrated by Hodgson's and Llaitul's utterances, regards Marxism as just another foreign, top-down and paternalizing approach to liberation. This antagonistic sentiment towards Marxism and leftist movements is shared with other indigenous movements in the region and is best illustrated in the words of an indigenous leader, who during the 2009 Continental Encounter of Agroecology Trainers LVC in Barinas, Venezuela responded to the proletarian organizations there present:

Your Western *cosmovision* of historical materialism is an interesting one, and we could learn from it. But first you must accept that it is in fact a *cosmovision*, one among many, and that you can also learn from our *cosmovisions*. Once you accept that, we can have a horizontal dialogue.<sup>452</sup>

---

<sup>452</sup> Peter Rosset and Maria Elena Martinez-Torres, "Rural Social Movements and Diálogo de Saberes: Territories, Food Sovereignty, and Agroecology," in *Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue*, ed. Program in Agrarian Studies Yale University (New Haven2013), 5. Italics in original.

From the standpoint of revindicative autonomism, Marxism's Eurocentric, stagist and unilinear line of progress denies indigenous peoples the possibility of (re)constructing their own societies according to their own ontologies and modes of subsistence. Here, the Gramscian Marxism of Peruvian philosopher, José Carlos Mariátegui, despite being more attuned to the racial diverse reality and colonial history of Latin American societies, is bounded by a paternalist approach aimed at transforming indigenous "passive" communities into revolutionary agents. Mariátegui contended that only via nurturing the revolutionary potential of the Indian could revolutionary proletarian parties, communes and soviets emerge in Latin America. This, in turn, required European notions of socialism and the proletariat to penetrate the indigenous masses in order to enable the prospect of a socialist revolution in the region. In addition, under the veneer of "universalist humanism," Latin American guerrilla leftist movements like those in Guatemala, Colombia and Nicaragua, have historically reasserted homogeneity rather than difference. A clear example of this racial blindness can be seen in Hale's conversation with Genaro, a former ladino guerrilla doctor in Guatemala who spoke of the unifacetic character of the revolutionary struggle:

Our primary contradiction was between rich and poor, and the central objective was to take power. The struggles between man and woman, and racial discrimination were considered secondary contradictions. Once the primary contradiction is addressed, and once the revolutionary forces take power, these secondary contradictions will quickly fade away, because their structural underpinnings will have been eliminated (*iban a caer por su propio peso*).

[Therefore], there was no talk, no real concern [with identity questions].<sup>453</sup>

Furthermore, revindicative autonomism shares an antagonistic sentiment against Marxism, leftist movements and pink-tide governments in Latin America with other indigenous organizations such as the Council of All Lands and AIDESEP. These movements have also rejected the prospect of a centralized economy, a unilinear line of progress and development, the exploitation of the environment for production purposes and the lack of respect for the spiritual and cultural worlds of indigenous societies. Revindicative autonomist movements, however, go one step further for they are unwilling to negotiate and establish alliances with leftist movements even if that would mean gaining political power and increased rights to either representation or self-determination, as seen by the case of CONAIE in Ecuador. Furthermore, revindicative autonomism discerns no difference between neoliberalism and Marxism for, it argues, they are both premised on the imposition of non-native rationalities and principles on the indigenous collective subject. For revindicative autonomist movements, Marxism, socialism and many post-modern neo-Marxist approaches are just another attempt at assimilation and modernization of indigenous societies by Western forces.

Moreover, revindicative autonomism does not equate to Zapatismo either. Zapatismo, in the words of the now self-retired Subcomandante Marcos, is “not fundamentalist nor millenarist indigenous thinking; and it is not indigenous resistance either.”<sup>454</sup> Zapatismo, instead, is a collective and pluralistic struggle against the class, ethnic and gender injustices produced by capitalism and,

---

<sup>453</sup> Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 229. Brackets in original.

<sup>454</sup> Yvon Le Bot, *Subcomandante Marcos, El sueño zapatista: Entrevistas con el Subcomandante Marcos, el Mayor Moisés y el comandante Tacho, del Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* (Barcelona: Plaza y Janés Editores, 1997). 338-39.

more specifically, by neoliberal policies. It pushes for the implementation of alternative forms of socio-political organization, emphasizing solidarity and cohesion amongst diverse social groups. Furthermore, the Zapatista revolution is an inclusive struggle. The popular phrase “we are all Marcos” attests to this inclusiveness. Here, the black ski mask has been used as an instrument to disguise identity, thereby inviting the participation of mestizos, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants and white Europeans in the struggle against the “mal gobierno” (bad government) in Mexico. Zapatismo, however, is neither an ethnic nor an indigenous struggle per se. In the same manner, in the words of Subcomandante Marcos, Zapatismo is and is not Marxist-Leninist, for it is the fusion of the cosmologies espoused by two different actors: urban mestizo and indigenous intellectuals in Mexico.<sup>455</sup>

Internationally, Zapatismo invites people of all races, ethnicities, classes, genders and religions to participate in the Zapatista political project to resist the menacing forces of neoliberalism as well as the oppression and impunity of the “mal gobierno.” This is particularly evident in the words of Mayor Ana María, who in a 1996 speech proclaimed:

[...] behind our ski mask is the face of all excluded women. Of all forgotten indigenous peoples. Of all persecuted homosexuals. Of all rejected youth. Of all beaten migrants [...] Of all simple and ordinary women and men that are disregarded, unrecognized, unnamed and have no tomorrow.<sup>456</sup>

---

<sup>455</sup> Walter Mignolo, "La revolución teórica del Zapatismo: sus consecuencias históricas, éticas y políticas," *Orbis Tertius* 2, no. 5 (1997): 63-65.

<sup>456</sup> Mayor Ana María, "Discurso inaugural de la mayor Ana María en el Encuentro Intercontinental 'Por la humanidad y contra el neoliberalismo,'" *Chiapas* 1996. *Translation mine.*

The most notable proof of this fluidity of identity within the Zapatista movement is the very figure of Subcomandante Marcos himself. A middle class mestizo from Mexico's capital city, "the Sup" Marcos was, alongside indigenous figures like Mayor Ana María, Comandanta Ramona and Comandante Tacho, publicly at the forefront of Zapatista leadership since the insurrection of 1994. On the whole, Zapatismo is a hybrid ideology that rejects both a puritan form of indigenous knowledge and identity as well as untempered forms of Marxist-Leninism. Instead, it aims to merge both to produce a pluralistic, non-authoritarian and egalitarian revolutionary approach to liberation *for all*.

In this sense, revindicative autonomism is at odds with the ideological premises of Zapatismo. As aforementioned, revindicative autonomism is a political and collective strategy, driven solely by indigenous actors, aimed at the restoration of indigenous radical self-government via the revindication of whole ancestral territories and lineal spaces of belonging as in the case of Mosquitia and Wallmapu. For its part, Zapatismo does not seek the reconstruction of a culturally united political system on the boundaries of the pre-colonial Mayan territory spanning from Chiapas, Tabasco, Campeche, Quintana Roo and Yucatan in Mexico to Guatemala, Belize and parts of Honduras and El Salvador. In addition, while Zapatismo is influenced by non-indigenous Western approaches such as Marxist-Leninism, revindicative autonomism outrightly condemns the Eurocentric and paternalist framework of these ideologies. In this regard, it rejects *ab initio* the prospect of establishing ideological dialogue with any Western party (regardless of their position on the political spectrum) and seldom, if at all, relies on the support of national and international civil society agents.

In addition, while both, revindicative autonomism and Zapatismo call for the implementation of alternative methods of autonomous governance—either in the form of *Lof*, *Rewe* and *Aillarewe*, “indigenous communitarianism” or “Juntas de Buen Gobierno”<sup>457</sup>—revindicative autonomism seeks to reconstruct indigenous societies in a strictly pre-colonial fashion. Here, Zapatismo overlooks the locality of its origin and the identity of those who it initially represented for it is not an indigenous or ethnonational struggle limited to the province of Chiapas or even the Mexican nation-state. In contrast, revindicative autonomism is an indigenous decolonization strategy that pushes for the restoration of local political systems and economies via the revitalization of native pre-colonial ontologies and practices in a (re)conquered and (re)occupied lineal territory. Furthermore, the hybridity of Zapatismo is in veritable conflict with the exclusive and pure indigenous ethos of revindicative autonomism. As illustrated by the Miskitu and Mapuche cases, revindicative autonomism calls for the resurrection of pre-colonial authoritative figures such as those of the *Wihta Tara* and *Weychafe*. In addition, it unreservedly excludes non-indigenous agents (e.g., mestizos, ladinos and white Europeans) from the participatory body politic of the movement. In this sense, only indigenous subjects are allowed to lead revindicative autonomist struggles.

Overall, the hybrid essence of the Zapatista struggle is regarded by the leading figures of revindicative movements as another leftist non-indigenous revolutionary struggle in Latin America. In a personal interview I conducted with Oscar Hodgson, he expressed his empathy for the Zapatistas but made it clear that “the path to indigenous liberation needs to emanate from

---

<sup>457</sup> Good Government Juntas, also known as “Caracoles”reflect the Zapatista vision of authority

indigenous cosmologies itself."<sup>458</sup> In addition, the *Wihta Tara*, during a personal interview I conducted during field research in the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua, expressed his solidarity with the Mayan peoples fighting in Chiapas but argued that the Miskitu people have had a long and conflictive history with the left.<sup>459</sup> Likewise, the *Weychafe*, Héctor Llaitul, referred to CAM as a struggle more attuned to "Aymara Indianismo than to the ideology of the Zapatistas."<sup>460</sup> In this sense, revindicative autonomism should not be misconstrued as Zapatismo for it fundamentally differs from the latter's ideological premises of hybridity.

In addition to these anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic, anti-statist, non-leftist and non-Zapatista features of revindicative autonomism, this form of struggle refuses to be subsumed under anarchist doctrine. While revindicative autonomism shares with anarchism the centrality of self-determination, autonomy and emancipation as principal objectives, the former envisions freedom not as the complete absence of restraint but rather as the supplantation of the Western-colonial force with a locally (re)constructed and (re)engineered form of control. The cases of the Council of Miskitu Elders and CAM illustrate that far from pushing for an anti-authoritarian agenda, these movements call for the re-establishment of pre-colonial forms of government that are, for the most part, hierarchical and culturally ascribed. The 2009 movement for radical autonomy in Mosquitia, while rejecting the Nicaraguan state, led to the election of the *Almuk Nani*, the *Wihta Tara* and the establishment of an indigenous army to defend the interests of the newly-created political entity. Similarly, the New Arauco War and the process of territorial (re)occupation via *Chem*

---

<sup>458</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson." *Translation mine*.

<sup>459</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams."

<sup>460</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca." *Translation mine*.

in Wallmapu has engendered a process of cultural and religious re-signification and the resurrection of the Mapuche pre-colonial authoritative political body. It follows from here that these revitalized and resurrected institutions of power are inconsistent with the prevalent goal of anarchist doctrine: the achievement of an ordered society devoid of government or authority.<sup>461</sup> Setting itself apart from anarchism, revindicative autonomism establishes new spheres of power and distinct forms of governance.

Nevertheless, in line with Peter Kropotkin's hypothesization of the possibility of establishing forms of government without the modern state, the societies that revindicative autonomist movements aim to establish also differ fundamentally from the Western state by providing their inhabitants with some sort of jurisdiction over their own affairs. As illustrated by previous chapters, pre-colonial Mosquitia and Wallmapu, contrary to the Aztec and Incan empires, were ruled in a hierarchical yet mostly decentralized manner. To a certain extent, their aim is to push for a form of power that is dispersed through parallel systems of self-administration throughout a geographically extensive territory. However, beyond this dispersion of power, revindicative autonomist movements, contrary to anarchist thinking, envision an indigenous government in power that claims full sovereignty over a lineal territory. This system, as aforementioned, is founded on the principle of authority and on the idea that the majority of its inhabitants should submit to a benevolent and wise justice, which is imposed upon them in a hierarchical manner from traditional pre-colonial governmental figures. This utterly contradicts Mikhail Bakunin's critique regarding the legitimization of authority and its capacity to rule.<sup>462</sup> In this sense, authority, for revindicative autonomism, at least theoretically, is

---

<sup>461</sup> Ruth Kinna, *Anarchism* (New York: Oneworld Publications, 2005). 5-6.

<sup>462</sup> Mikhail Bakunin, Marxism, Freedom and the State, (Bakunin Reference Archives Marxist Org, 1999), <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/mf-state/>.

commanding and controlling. It remains to be seen whether revindicative autonomist movements choose to escape this conundrum of autonomy and authority in the future, as can be seen by the case of Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) in Kurdistan which has hybridized Zagros-Taurus indigenous cultural cosmologies with Bookchinian anarchism. For now, revindicative autonomism is inherently anti-anarchist.

All in all, revindicative autonomism is a strategy for radical and practical decolonization by indigenous nations and peoples. It seeks to (re)construct native societies in a pre-colonial fashion. At the heart of this struggle for autonomy is the desire to revitalize and recultivate indigenous knowledge and practices. This aim of returning to a native *autonomously* lived experience is not a regressive strategy, as some liberal scholars would argue, but a dynamic process of re-creation and re-invention of the indigenous self. To borrow from Jane Hiddleston: "a return to some sort of 'authenticity' [...] can help the [... colonized] man to restore a sense of self and to repair the psychological damage of colonial deculturation."<sup>463</sup> Accompanying this recourse to "strategic essentialism," revindicative autonomist movements engage in a political struggle that is at its core anti-colonial, anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic and anti-statist. In the process, revindicative autonomism sets itself apart from other forms of political contestation such leftist movements, hybridized indigenous activism, the Western-lauded ideology of Zapatismo and anarchism. Most importantly, revindicative autonomism is centered on the notion of territory. As will be illustrated in the next section, tangible forms of autonomy, for revindicative autonomism, are only made possible via re-claiming and re-conquering the totality of native territories.

---

<sup>463</sup> Jane Hiddleston, *Understanding Postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 2014). 46.

## The Centrality of Territory

Although a great number of indigenous movements, such as Wallmapuwen in Chile, AIDESEP in the Peruvian Amazon and the Conselho Indígena de Roraima in Brazil, demand the demarcation, titling and legal protection of their lands, revindicative autonomism places an exceptional emphasis on territory. As demonstrated by the cases of Miskitu and Mapuche resistance in previous chapters, these movements seek to recover the totality of the pre-colonial territory which they inhabited and governed freely right up until the colonial military invasions of late nineteenth century. Mosquitia, according to the Council of Elders, has the *ipso facto* right to break free from Nicaragua for it was never colonized or settled by Spanish conquistadors and remained a free political entity even after the creation of the colonial state. Similarly, CAM argues that the territory south of the Bio-Bio River, Wallmapu, was never seized by Spanish colonial forces and continued to exist independently for over three hundred years. This common history of political, territorial and economic autonomy throughout the peak of the Spanish colonial enterprise in Latin America helps explain why these two movements are at the forefront of revindicative autonomism today.

Revindicative autonomist movements draw a sharp distinction between land and territory. On the one hand, they regard land as a collectively owned geographical space where families, communities and other agents, within indigenous administrative units, exercise rights over local socio-political and economic affairs. In this sense, while lands are regarded as the most basic form of collective ownership, on the whole, there is a lack of supra-local authority. Neither of the local authority figures claims to rule over the rest of the lands. For this reason, revindicative autonomist movements contend that the recovery, demarcation

and titling of plots of native lands, by itself, would not result in the reconstruction of pre-colonial societies. In fact, they argue that this illusory approach towards land re-distribution and legalization would actually stymie the process of pragmatic decolonization. In contrast, (re)conquering and (re)occupying the totality of the native pre-colonial geographical space (i.e., Mosquitia, Wallmapu, Tawantinsuyo, etc.) does provide a feasible road to cultural revitalization and the re-implementation of local systems of knowledge, forms of organization and economic models. However, for revindicative autonomism, it is imperative in this process that a political agent or institution claims and deploys authority over the numerous and scattered lands in order to escape atomization and unite these lands under a single political command. Only then, according to revindicative autonomist movements, will lands be reorganized and transformed into a single and lineal territory, thereby enabling the exercise of radical autonomy.

Autonomy, for revindicative autonomist movements, is contingent on territory for territory is the founding element upon which other components exist. As illustrated by Chapter III and Chapter IV, territoriality secures not only the physical spaces in themselves but also ensures the protection and preservation of the broader spiritual connections that draw from it. For example, it is only via the recovery of territory that the Miskitu can re-ignite its relationship and interaction with other beings that coexist within the same environment. The revindication of Mosquitia, in this sense, would mean the protection of *lasa nani* such as the *Liwa*, the *Duhindi* and *Waihwan*, which are the custodians and guardians of the water, forests and wind respectively. In addition, only by recovering the totality of the Miskitu homeland can core communitarian values such as *Asla* and *Pawanka* be deployed and practicized. Likewise, complete territorial revindication for CAM would safeguard the existence of the *newen* or the energies and

forces which inhabit all physical spaces of Wallmapu. For the Mapuche, these energies themselves are the source of equilibrium, fertility and tranquility. Furthermore, as seen by the case of the successful territorial recoveries by CAM, the gradual recuperation of *fundos* is already having a major impact in the processes of cultural revitalization. By re-planting native trees vital for Mapuche cosmovision and medicine such as *foye*, *temu*, *luma* and *pewen* as well as building *rucas* and other Mapuche infrastructure, the Mapuche nation is recuperating the vital spiritual spaces of the *Tren-tren Hills*, *menoko*, *mawida*, *eltun*, *trayeko*, *paliwe* and *nguillatuwe*, which allow Mapuche religious ceremonies like the *Nguillatún* and *Machitún* as well as cultural and recreational activities like the *Palín* to be formally re-established in the society.

Revindicative autonomism sets itself apart from other indigenous organizations in that it does not aim to simply reconfigure territorial boundaries under the continued power and authority of the colonial state. On the contrary, revindicative autonomism seeks to (re) occupy a particular native pre-colonial territory, have absolute power over its internal law-making processes and enjoy political independence without being subject to any superior authority. That is, by regaining access to and control of pre-colonial territories, indigenous peoples and nations that engage in a revindicative autonomist struggle seek to (re)constitute themselves as *sui generis* autonomous entities against Western political structures, such as the nation-state. In this sense, revindicative autonomism resurfaces, re-appropriates and re-interprets the notion of autonomy in its most basic etymological form: the ability to impose law on oneself and exercise self-government, within a set territory, without the intervention of any external agent.

This re-appropriation and re-definition of autonomy as contingent on territory, however, was also an institutionalized

knowledge in Western literature. It was, however, progressively whitewashed to erase any claims to territorial autonomy from the European colonies across the world. The Greek word *nomos*, as Carl Schmitt argues in *The Nomos of the Earth*, was re-interpreted by legal positivist philosophers and philologists in the nineteenth century. By following the concepts of jurists and applying a positivistic understanding of legal order, this scholarly discussion of *nomos* repressed the word's original Greek meaning and its connection with land-appropriation and ownership. This way, during this time, the way *nomos* was conceived and expressed underwent a fundamental transformation for it was deprived of its territorial connotations and, in its place, was equated to a system of norms and statutes, orders, measures and decrees—all understood in an abstract non-territorial fashion. In this context, *nomos* could no longer be distinguished from other terms such as *thesmos* [law or legislation], *psephisma* [plebiscite] or *rhema* [command]. *Nomos* came to signify a mere set of legislations designed to compel obedience. Schmitt argues, however, that contrary to this modern interpretation of the term, Aristotle had hypothesized, in his work *Politics*, that *nomos* "signified an antithesis to *psephisma*."<sup>464</sup> Schmitt then contends that "the rule of *nomos* for Aristotle is synonymous with the rule of medium-sized, well-distributed land property."<sup>465</sup> In this sense, challenging the conceptualization of *nomos* as simply "law," Schmitt asserts that in ancient Greece, *nomos* implied the distribution of land and land-appropriation itself. He forewarns:

[...] one should not translate *nomos* as law, regulation, norm, or any similar expression. *Nomos* comes from *nemein*—[a Greek] word that means both to 'divide' and 'to pasture'. Thus, *nomos* is the

---

<sup>464</sup> Carl Schmitt, *The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum*, trans. G.L. Ulmen (New York: Telo Press Ltd., 2003). 68. *Italics in original.*

<sup>465</sup> Ibid. *Italics in original.*

immediate form in which the political and social order of a people becomes spatially visible—the initial measure and division of pasture-land, i.e., the land-appropriation as well as the concrete order contained in it and following from it [...] *Nomos* is the *measure* by which the land in a particular order is divided and situated; it is also the form of political, social, and religious order determined by this process.<sup>466</sup>

*Nomos* then refers to both, the territory and the rationality of the order that organizes it.<sup>467</sup> Contrary to how *nomos* is understood today—including by the liberal multiculturalist camp represented by Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck—Schmitt contends that *nomos* does not and cannot, under any circumstance, exist prior to the appropriation of a territory. Schmitt, by resurrecting the buried Greek meaning of *nomos*, postulates that far from being fixed, *nomos* is a constitutive concept in that it aims to order reality by constructing it. *Nomos*, in this sense, should not be construed as an instrumental, legal or juridical order but as one which arises concomitantly with territory. In line with this original Greek meaning of the term is the rearticulation of *nomos* by revindicative autonomist movements. They contend that *nomos* is inextricably intertwined with territory. Revindicative autonomism, apart from putting forward a *sui generis* articulation of autonomy itself, it also, as a secondary effect, reactivates the territorial component in *nomos*. It reimagines self-law not only as the basis of a new spatial order but also as a consequence of land-appropriation itself.

---

<sup>466</sup> Ibid., 70. *Italics in original.*

<sup>467</sup> Peter Burgess, "The evolution of European Union law and Carl Schmitt's theory of the *nomos* of Europe," in *The International Political Thought of Carl Schmitt: terror, liberal war and the crisis of global order*, ed. Louiza Odysseos and Fabio Petito (New York: Routledge, 2007), 187-88.

Furthermore, the centrality of territory for this radical form of autonomism sets it apart from all other indigenous organizations in Latin America. On the one hand, it is at odds with indigenous organizations which prioritize inclusion over autonomy and political representation over territorial demands. As illustrated in Chapter II of this thesis, movements such as CONIC in Guatemala, CCNI in El Salvador and CONAIE in Ecuador either call for the integration of indigenous communities and nations into the fabric of the state or push for de-territorialized regimes of self-administration and self-government. In like manner, revindicative autonomism is also inherently different from those indigenous movements which demand a regional form of self-government within the boundaries of the colonial nation-state. Movements like Council of All Lands in Chile, FENAMAD in Peru and the Hutukara Yanomami Association in Brazil, whilst claiming that territory is pivotal to their cause, for the most part, focus on securing legal protection from state institutions to demarcate and title their lands. In addition, once these lands have been protected from privatization, mega-projects and natural reserves, these movements, at times, implement self-government mechanisms and organize their societies in administrative divisions that remarkably mirror those at work in the urban centers of the colonial state (e.g., municipalities, *comunas*, *parroquias*, *distritos*, etc.). Therefore, while most indigenous struggles make claims of collective ownership over a particular ancestral territory, revindicative autonomism goes one step further and challenges the very premises of statist autonomy.

The approach to autonomy upheld by revindicative autonomist movements is antithetical to Kymlicka's federacy, Lijphart's consociationalism and Bauböck's liberal pluralist federation. Revindicative autonomism, from the outset, rejects these approaches for it regards them as another insidious political project that constrains indigenous cosmologies and systems of

knowledge to the confines of the omnipresent hegemonic Western state. As thoroughly studied in Chapter I, while Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck use the language of autonomy, in praxis, their theories and models of multiculturalism and self-government grant nothing more than a permissive form of inclusion disguised as political and, in the case of Kymlicka and Bauböck, territorial autonomy. Their discursive utterances demonstrate the manner in which the censoring and surveilling Western hegemonic apparatus adopts non-liberal worlds into the language of liberalism. In this sense, the approaches emanating from this camp seek to appropriate autonomy, hindering the prospect of indigenous radicalization in the process. As such, liberal multiculturalism is able to metabolize and absorb what it deems indigenous illiberal nonsense into sense, to discipline indocile autonomist ideas into docile ones by “subtly changing them, through a process of incorporation [...] without making them fully reducible to a liberal core.”<sup>468</sup>

Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck manage to conform to the canons of liberal discourse, move ever closer to the communitarian camp, and heed in an unprecedented manner the calls for recognition, self-determination and autonomy by indigenous movements. Nevertheless, they achieve this without ever conventionally articulating canonical liberal themes in the Rawlsian and Dworkian sense. That said, there is no doubt that their theories have resulted in a positive reconfiguration of the nation-state, in particular for polyethnic groups and national minorities. However, their approaches vis-à-vis indigenous autonomist groups exude nothing but epistemological blindness, ignoring or dismissing alterity or epistemological violence, silencing and decontesting alternative autonomist indigenous articulations—like revindicative autonomism. As evidenced by the cases of Council of Elders and CAM, their discourses deny

---

<sup>468</sup> Bruno Anili, "Liberal incorporations: Kymlicka, Pettit and the grammar of hegemony," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 18, no. 1 (2013): 17.

indigenous peoples the right to revindicate the totality of their territory, regain and re-establish pre-colonial sovereignty, impose law on themselves and to autonomously direct the course of their affairs without the imposition of *a priori* liberal normative provisos.

Overall, revindicative autonomism exposes that liberal multiculturalism can only think in terms of inclusion. Therefore, the centrality of territory for revindicative autonomism is the strongest point of contention with these Western approaches. Revindicative autonomist movements, like the Council of Elders and Mapuche CAM, refuse to abide by Western principles and norms and reject all prospects for political dialogue and negotiation. Incompatible with state decentralization, self-administration in public policy sectors, de-territorialized self-government, regional demarcated autonomy, federacy and confederacy arrangements, autonomy, for revindicative autonomism, is founded upon regaining access and control to native territory as well as the (re) construction of a pre-colonial political entity that escapes Western institutionalism. Most importantly, as seen by the cases of Miskitu and Mapuche resistance in previous chapters, the idea of recovering Mosquitia and Wallmapu is not only set in the realm of theory but is actually practicized on a daily basis via processes of land re-appropriation and (re) occupation, such as those executed by the ORTs. Via the gradual (re)occupation of indigenous lands, revindicative autonomism envisions the re-establishment of a form of government that is locally imagined and constructed. For this reason, territory, above all other components of a revindicative autonomist struggle, such as cultural reconscientization and political reconfiguration, is a critical factor in seizing tangible and sustainable autonomy.

## **Revindicative Autonomism: between Separatism and Secessionism**

This chapter has illustrated how revindicative autonomism is an incipient and distinctive form of indigenous struggle in Latin America. It follows a *sui generis* non-Western, anti-colonial, anti-Christianic, anti-statist, anti-capitalist, non-leftist, non-Zapatista and non-anarchist path to liberation. Moreover, this work has so far also demonstrated how the demands put forward by these movements drastically differ from the inclusionist and regional autonomist claims of other indigenous agents in the region. The term autonomy, as Hurst Hannum and Richard Lillich contend, “is not a term of art or a concept that has a generally accepted definition in international law”. Paraphrasing the phrase of late jurist John Chipman Gray, they argue that “on no subject of international law has there been so much loose writing and nebulous speculation as on autonomy”.<sup>469</sup> There is no scholarly agreement either on the demands that make up an autonomism movement for, as seen by the cases studied in Chapter I, the demands put forward by autonomist organizations can range from decentralization to local self-government and from land demarcation to federalism. Therefore, in order to fully understand revindicative autonomism as a non-accommodating and non-inclusionist strategy by indigenous movements, important parallels and distinctions need to be drawn between this form of struggle and other approaches to autonomy such as communalism and *conventional* autonomism.

Furthermore, it is essential to analyze how revindicative autonomism differs from the two most prominent forms of resistance by ethnic groups and national minorities which are marginalized, oppressed and segregated: separatism and secessionism. Like revindicative autonomism, both separatist and

---

<sup>469</sup> Hurst Hannum and Richard B. Lillich, "The Concept of Autonomy in International Law," *The American Journal of International Law* 74, no. 4 (1980): 858.

secessionist projects are acts by political communities to withdraw a territory and its population from the authority of a state. This section, therefore, is concerned with identifying the distinguishing traits of revindicative autonomism vis-à-vis these forms of struggle. To do so, the section first explores and analyzes the most salient definitions for these forms of struggle in international law and political science. It then juxtaposes these definitions with the foundational features of revindicative autonomism exposed earlier in this chapter.

According to Anthony D. Smith, there are broadly six strategies employed by ethnic groups, national minorities and indigenous peoples in polyethnic states. These are isolation, accommodation, communalism, autonomism, separatism and irredentism. While isolation implies self-segregation and a conscious refusal to integrate into mainstream society, it makes no public claim to autonomy. Cases of isolationism were observed amongst Chinese communities in pre-colonial southeast Asia and Jews in medieval Europe. Ethnic groups who seek accommodation, for their part, aim for integration and, at times, even assimilation and acculturation into the dominant society. Here, the policies of multiculturalism of Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck aid to this desire for national integration. It is communalism, nevertheless, the first strategy in Smith's taxonomy that pushes for a certain degree of self-determination and self-administration. Smith states that communalist organizations aim to control communal affairs within the physical spaces where they hold majority. Clear examples of communalist demands, according to Smith, are African-American organizations which demand the state to recognize them as political actors representing their communities. Overall, these groups aim to influence state policy according to the needs of its population.<sup>470</sup> On the whole, it is clear from these definitions that revindicative autonomism deviates from these

---

<sup>470</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Revival in the Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). 15-16.

three forms of struggle. It neither seeks self-segregation within the colonial nation-state nor strives for cultural recognition and political autonomy *alieni juris*.

In regards to autonomism, Smith argues there are “various degrees of autonomy open to given ethnic communities on the scale from minimum cultural rights to maximum ‘home rule’ federalism”.<sup>471</sup> Whilst it is evident from his definition that Smith is theoretically bounded by the equivocal essence of the term “autonomy”, he does provide a detailed scope of autonomist demands. For him, autonomist demands do not aim to subvert and transcend the power of the nation-state but rather seek “to secure benefits from maintaining its links with the overall state structure.”<sup>472</sup> Similarly, Marc Weller identifies two main autonomist demands: a) enhanced local self-government and b) regionalism, federalization, or union with confirmation of territorial unity.<sup>473</sup> The strategy of autonomism that Smith and Weller so thoroughly study, nevertheless, is only *one* form of autonomism—contingent on dialogue and negotiation with the colonial state. It is premised on the desirability of political unity and territorial integration.

Furthermore, as this thesis has so far illustrated, this *conventional* scholarly understanding of autonomism is fallacious for it disregards and ostracizes radical non-statist articulations of autonomy like those upheld by the Miskitu Council of Elders, Mapuche CAM and Indianismo, amongst others in the Latin American region. In addition, the way these movements understand autonomy calls into question the top-down legal, scholarly and governmental definitions of the concept that have been historically pushed and promoted as the only road to

---

<sup>471</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>472</sup> Ibid.

<sup>473</sup> Marc Weller, "Settling Self-Determination Conflicts: Recent Developments," *The European Journal of International Law* 20, no. 1 (2009): 115.

attaining self-determination and autonomy. In other words, the Western language of autonomy, thus far, has been the only medium through which ethnic groups and indigenous peoples have made sense of, envisioned and articulated autonomist claims. Revindicative autonomism, nonetheless, breaks free from and aims to obliterate all imposed approaches to autonomy, liberation and decolonization. In doing so, it exposes how *conventional* autonomist demands, like those espoused by CONIC and CONAIE, are more inclusionist than autonomist at their core.

Now that revindicative autonomism has been differentiated from isolationist, accommodating, communalist and so-called autonomist strategies, it is now essential to analyze how it relates to separatism. Separatism is widely understood as a process of separation of a group from a larger political entity or a state. Separatist groups and organizations can advocate for either territorial, political and economic separation or, in some cases, all of the above. There is no set definition of separatism for demands can range from constitutional amendments to decentralize government authority in a variety of realms (i.e., taxation, education, religion and political organization, etc.) to demands for permissive autonomous regimes and even the withdrawal of a territory from the jurisdiction of a state. This explains why autonomism and separatism are often used interchangeably. However, at its core, separatism, is an act of resistance that aims to detach a certain polity from what is regarded an oppressive form of power. It envisions the creation of a new system that is more suited to the realities and necessities of local populations. In the words of Colin H. Williams, ethnic separatist movements are frequently:

‘Renewal movements’ seeking to recover the cultural identity of a formally independent unit [...] The incorporation of their group into a multinational state is

inherently contrary to nature and a severe impediment to the full realisation of their group development potential.<sup>474</sup>

Apart from the refusal to live under an oppressive state, Smith further argues that separatism seeks “through separation the restoration of a degraded community to its rightful status and dignity.”<sup>475</sup> For this reason, he argues, its watchwords are “identity, authenticity and diversity.”<sup>476</sup> In this sense, although the proponents of revindicative autonomism do not deploy the term “separatism” often, the struggle in conceptual terms is inherently separatist for it argues that only via an outright separation of indigenous nations from the nation-state, can a process of practical decolonization be ignited. Only via cultural, political and territorial separateness, can pre-colonial ontologies, institutions and social practices be rediscovered and revitalized. In this context, the case of Miskitu resistance against the Nicaraguan state illustrates how even permissive regimes of autonomy, within the boundaries of the nation-state, are insufficient and inadequate to satisfy the demands of revindicative autonomist movements. Autonomy is contingent on separation. The aim of revindicative autonomism, contrary to the Council of All Lands, CCNI and ANIPA, is not to struggle for a freer environment for indigenous peoples within the nation-state but to contest the very foundations of the colonial enterprise and achieve a complete separation from it. In this context, as illustrated by the case of CAM, social mobilization must be sped up, territorial re-appropriation must be progressively secured and ideological decolonization must be exercised if the goal is political, economic and territorial disassociation.

---

<sup>474</sup> Colin H. Williams, "Ethnic Separatism," *Cahiers de géographie du Québec* 24, no. 61 (1980): 50.

<sup>475</sup> Anthony D. Smith, "Towards a theory of ethnic separatism," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2, no. 1 (1979).

<sup>476</sup> Ibid., 22.

Whereas revindicative autonomism is a separatist strategy, it should not be confounded with secessionism. It is precisely in this obscure boundary between separation and secessionism that the recalcitrant indigenous collective subject paves its own way towards tangible autonomy. Moving away from the Western language of inclusion and autonomy, revindicative autonomist movements strive for the expulsion of state agents from their territory and the (re)construction of a pre-colonial society. Despite the state apparatus and its media delegates claiming that the Miskitu and Mapuche movements studied in Chapter III and Chapter IV espouse a secessionist agenda, neither movement defines itself as such. But, the main question that needs to be addressed here is how revindicative autonomism differs from secessionism, especially if the two approaches putatively strive for the withdrawal of a group from the authority of a state.

As with separation, there is a lack of consensus amongst social scientists and legal scholars in regards to a definition of secession. On the one hand, James Crawford has defined secession as “[...] the creation of a state by the use or threat of force without the consent of the former sovereign”.<sup>477</sup> For Julie Dahlitz, on the other hand, secession arises when “a significant proportion of the population of a given territory being part of a State, expresses the wish by word or by deed to become a sovereign State in itself or to join and become part of another sovereign State”.<sup>478</sup> A third definition, espoused by Aleksandar Pavkovic and Peter Radan, defines secession as the “creation of a new state by the withdrawal of a territory and its population where that territory was previously part of an existing state”.<sup>479</sup> Based on these prevalent definitions of secessionism, revindicative autonomism

---

<sup>477</sup> James Crawford, *The Creation of States in International Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). 375.

<sup>478</sup> Julie Dahlitz, "Introduction," in *Secession and International Law: Conflict Avoidance, Regional Appraisals*, ed. Julie Dahlitz (New York: United Nations, 2003), 6.

<sup>479</sup> Aleksandar Pavković and Peter Radan, *Creating New States: Theory and Practice of Secession* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007). 5.

is not secessionist for, as shown in the first section of this chapter, it rejects all Western political, social and economic systems imposed upon the indigenous subject—including the nation-state. In this sense, while revindicative autonomism aims to break free from the shackles of the colonial state, it does not envision the creation of a new nation-state (i.e., Miskitu or Mapuche nation-state) for this contradicts the very ideological foundations of this political strategy for radical decolonization. Instead, revindicative autonomist movements aim to (re)construct their societies in an indigenous fashion.

Finally, because of the colonial fragmentation of indigenous nations' territories into separate states, such as Mosquitia in Honduras and Nicaragua and Wallmapu in Argentina and Chile, there is a tendency for revindicative autonomist movements to be irredentist. While currently the Council of Miskitu Elders and CAM have focused their resources and efforts on territorial recovery in Nicaraguan Mosquitia and Chilean Wallmapu, both movements ultimately aim to (re)occupy the totality of their pre-colonial territories. Whether these movements are able to transcend state borders and expand their political project to their geographically more distant kin remains to be seen. For now, however, revindicative autonomist movements have shown that support for a radical autonomist agenda—contrary to what Van Cott, Yashar, Sieder, Postero, Gustafson and Zamosc hypothesize—is present amongst indigenous nations in the region.

## Conclusion

This chapter has studied how a largely unheeded articulation of autonomy in Latin America, epitomized by the Council of Elders in Mosquitia and CAM in Wallmapu, deviates from the contemporary scholarly understanding of autonomy. What this thesis denominates revindicative autonomism has been defined as a

conscious political strategy by indigenous nations to vindicate the totality of their pre-colonial territory and revitalize and (re)construct local political and economic forms of organization. At its core, this incipient form of struggle is anti-Western, anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic, anti-statist, non-leftist, non-Zapatista and non-anarchist. Overall, it is a practical decolonizing strategy that aims to obliterate and overwrite the colonial apparatus, which continues to oppress and marginalize indigenous communities—even within so-called multiculturalist states and their progressive regimes of autonomy that are spreading throughout Latin America.

For this form of struggle, autonomy is contingent on territory for territory is the founding element upon which other components such as government and sovereignty exist. Revindicative autonomism, as this chapter has shown, does not strive for the demarcation, titling and legalization of indigenous lands. On the contrary, it sets itself apart from other indigenous struggles for autonomy in the region in that it does not aim to simply reconfigure territorial boundaries under the power and authority of the colonial state. In other words, vertical approaches to indigenous autonomy such as decentralization, self-administration, federalism, consociationalism, confederation and regional autonomy are regarded, by revindicative autonomist movements, as colonial endeavors designed to stymie indigenous radical decolonization processes in the region. In this sense, as emphasized throughout this chapter, revindicative autonomism challenges the subordinate relationship of the indigenous subject to the nation-state and its white European and mestizo class. In doing so, it seeks to withdraw indigenous polities from the state in order to have absolute power over internal law-making processes and to enjoy political independence without being subject to any superior authority.

Lastly, by drawing parallels and contrasts between revindicative autonomism and other forms of struggle, like communalism and *conventional* autonomism, this chapter has argued that revindicative autonomism is inherently a separatist struggle. As a *sui generis* indigenous autonomist political strategy, it refuses to use the Western language of autonomy and to reinscribe itself in the dominant discourse of statism. Nevertheless, as the last section elucidated, revindicative autonomism should not be misconstrued as secessionism for it does not aim to create a new nation-state. According to revindicative autonomist movements, such as the Miskitu Council of Elders and Mapuche CAM, the creation of a nation-state would only reproduce the inequalities, which mar their communities today. In addition, as has been argued throughout this chapter, the very concept of nation-state is seen as antithetical to local ontologies and to pre-colonial forms of government, economic models and juridical structures. All in all, revindicative autonomism is a strategy of decolonization and national liberation that aims to restore the stateless condition which indigenous societies formerly possessed in their territories.



## Conclusion

In recent decades, indigenous political mobilization in Latin America has not only presented an ideological challenge to the continuation of colonial politics but has also led to major political transformations in the region. In the words of Aníbal Quijano, this mobilization represents the “clearest sign that the coloniality of power is in the most serious of its crises since its establishment 500 years ago.”<sup>480</sup> But is it really? While the constitutional reforms and policy amendments of the early 1980s and 1990s have brought along significant and certainly “tangible” changes in the reconfiguration of the nation-state, indigenous peoples and nations in the region remain, for the most part, subordinated to European and mestizo national elites. In this context, can we speak, as Quijano asserts, of a weakened colonial power? Can we speak of liberal multicultural policies as a step forward in the design of truly decolonized relationships between European-mestizo elites and the indigenous collective subject? And, most importantly, has liberal multiculturalism, its policies and practices, so far, been able to address the demands of indigenous movements in Latin America? To answer this set of questions, however, we must first tackle a central yet often either assumed or overlooked question, what does the indigenous subject want?

This thesis has illustrated that the ontologies, knowledges, demands, aspirations and political projects put forward by indigenous movements and groups in the region are undeniably heterogeneous and diverse. Contingent on colonial histories, policies of mestizaje and the influx of neoliberal regimes in the region, indigenous movements continue to struggle against colonial power. Yet, within this diversity of demands, the central and most recurrent theme has been “autonomy.” As chapter one

---

<sup>480</sup> Aníbal Quijano, “The challenge of the “indigenous movement” in Latin America,” *Socialism and Democracy* 19, no. 3 (2005): 65.

illustrated, there are some movements that embrace dialogue, negotiation and processes of national reconciliation with state parties as the most desirable ways to achieve autonomy. This thesis has called these demands “inclusionary autonomies” to denote the willingness of the movements which espouse this strategy to integrate, participate and be represented, as indigenous peoples, in local and national institutions. To borrow from Taiaiake Alfred and Corntassel, these movements embrace the “[...] notion of postcolonial justice framed within the institutional construct of the state.”<sup>481</sup> In this category we find movements as geographically and culturally diverse as the Pachakutik Movement in Ecuador, ONIC in Colombia, ORPIA in Venezuela and FRENAPI in Costa Rica, amongst many others.

There are other indigenous movements, however, for whom the path to autonomy must travel first through territorial recovery. This thesis has termed these demands “territorial autonomies,” for at the heart of their political project is the struggle for land and territory. The category “territorial autonomies” contains within itself a wide array of demands. These demands range from decentralization, land rights, land titling, territorial regional autonomy arrangements as well as territorially-based co-government initiatives, amongst others. In this category, we find movements such as the Council of All Lands in Chile, CIR in Brazil and AIDESEP in Peru, to name but a few. Territorial autonomies envision cultural revitalization and the reconstruction of indigenous societies as a process intrinsically attached to the land. A measure of self-imposed isolation is always present in territorial autonomist demands.

Neither of these two demands (political inclusion and territorial autonomy) is new. For the most part, indigenous demands in Latin America have been explained and made sense of

---

<sup>481</sup> Corntassel and Alfred, "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism," 98.

through this reductionist spectrum. As chapter two illustrated, the works of Van Cott, Yashar, Sieder, Postero, Zamosc and Richards, while significantly contributing to the study of indigenous mobilization, its internal transformations and the challenges it faces in contemporary Latin America, have nevertheless continued to use and reify this simplistic spectrum that recognizes amongst a whole region only two salient demands. Here, two brief utterances from Van Cott and Yashar epitomize how scholars have limited the horizon of available possibilities for indigenous peoples and nations. For Van Cott, indigenous peoples in Latin America "seek to redefine the terms of their citizenship and to establish mechanisms to protect their individual and collective rights."<sup>482</sup> Similarly, Yashar asserts that indigenous peoples in the region demand "[...] the right to territorial autonomy, respect for customary law, new forms of political representation and the right to bicultural education."<sup>483</sup> This illustrates how, on the one hand, alternative autonomist approaches are rendered invisible in this spectrum. On the other hand, it shows how *recognized* indigenous demands are only made sense of vis-à-vis Eurocentric concepts such as citizenship, rights, political representation, multicultural democracy, sustainable development, etc. By subscribing to this reductionist spectrum, as scholars, we continue to establish the intellectual and political horizon, defining what is "sayable, credible, legitimate or realistic, but also, by implication, what is unsayable, incredible or unrealistic."<sup>484</sup>

This critique forces us to ask: are there no indigenous movements and groups in Latin America who conceive of autonomy in non-Western terms? Can we as scholars distance ourselves from this subtle yet powerful epistemological

---

<sup>482</sup> Van-Cott, *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*: 1-2.

<sup>483</sup> Yashar, "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America," 93, 96. ———, "Indigenous Politics and Democracy: Contesting Citizenship in Latin America," 1.

<sup>484</sup> Boaventura de Sousa Santos, "Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South," *Africa Development* XXXVII, no. 1 (2012): 47.

blindness? In the words of Boaventura de Sousa Santos, “if the epistemological diversity of the world is to be accounted for, other theories must be developed and anchored in other epistemologies—the epistemologies of the South that adequately account for the realities of the global South.”<sup>485</sup> This thesis has sought to bring to the fore such subaltern, silenced and marginalized epistemologies vis-à-vis indigenous nations and repressed peoples in contemporary Latin America. To do that and to fully understand these epistemologies without casting a Eurocentric gaze, this thesis has relied on the emerging methodology of what Hale has called “activist research,” which allows closeness and dialogue with indigenous communities and its leaders, and enables the prospect of intercultural translation instead of a unilateral and disengaged interpretation of the findings. Furthermore, each phase of this research has been carried out in direct cooperation and dialogue with indigenous movements and has been shared with indigenous communities themselves. In other words, this thesis has been both “theoretically driven and [...] put to use.”<sup>486</sup>

This thesis has argued there is a third and so far overlooked indigenous articulation of autonomy in Latin America. The demands these movements and collective agents put forward are neither “inclusionary” nor simply “territorial” in character. They construct their struggles on the basis of resurrected local and spiritual knowledges, which are unrecognized and alien to Western theories and epistemologies. Moreover, their ontologies are fundamentally at odds with Western concepts such as individualism, civil society, public space and unilinear development and progress, etc. The political practices built on these ontologies this thesis called “revindicative autonomism,” to signify their aim to re-vindicate and re-claim territory and to re-establish indigenous societies in an anti-colonial and anti-Western

---

<sup>485</sup> Ibid., 43.

<sup>486</sup> Hale, “What is activist research?,” 14.

fashion. Revindicative autonomism is an epistemological approach that reimagines and reconstructs pathways for indigenous liberation outside of Western institutionalism. It is a conscious political strategy of decolonization and national liberation which is inherently anti-Western, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic, anti-statist, anti-systemic, non-leftist and non anarchist. At its core, it aims to restore the stateless condition under which indigenous societies ruled over a particular lineal territory. In addition, this form of autonomism strives for a bottom-up reconfiguration of political, socio-cultural and economic frameworks in order to pave the way for collective well-being. In essence, this transformative struggle re-appropriates autonomy in its most basic etymological sense, denoting the imposition of law on oneself without external intervention. It rejects *ab initio* all Western-centric forms and regimes of autonomy—regardless of how accommodating they are—imposed *ab extra* on the indigenous subject. By embracing this form of autonomism, indigenous peoples and nations in Latin America foster the emergence of new emancipatory processes.

In studying and bringing to the fore these overlooked non-Western conceptualizations of autonomy, this work is cognizant of the epistemological problems that inevitably arise from the adoption of a Western-situated methodological framework. In this context, this thesis is by no means alone in facing internal contradictions: being true to the non-Western character of alternative autonomies—articulated by indigenous peoples—while simultaneously communicating in a merely Western mode and speaking to a broadly Western audience. This paradox has been, ever since the 1970s, subject of thorough scrutiny in the social sciences. The studies of non-Western peoples and societies as well as the forms of knowledge they produce, via recourse to Western communicative language and analytical tools, has since

then sparked controversial debate, particularly within the disciplines of (cultural) anthropology, sociology and politics.

In his 1973 seminal work, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Clifford Geertz argued that Western and non-Western cultures are intrinsically different and warned that the use of Western and Western-derived concepts to study non-Western peoples could have pernicious consequences.<sup>487</sup> Rejecting positivism and its claims to objectivity, he posited, nevertheless, that only through “thick description” and the adoption of a hermeneutical approach could the researcher come to a closer understanding of the actors’ meanings and actions. The study of non-Western peoples then requires a careful balance between interpretation and “sensitive empathy” with the institutions and values studied. In the words of Timothy Fitzgerald, it also requires “a fastidious awareness of the concealed semantic load of western concepts that can so easily project distorted meanings onto the data.”<sup>488</sup> Being *ab initio* aware of this epistemological problematic, this thesis has aimed to avoid perpetuating Western concepts in studying indigenous articulations of autonomy. It has aimed to situate each of the bottom-up conceptualizations of autonomy within a particular historical, cultural and geographical background. It has relied on the language used by the movements themselves in voicing their dissent and setting into motion liberatory processes. As illustrated throughout the thesis, this has predominately been done by articulating their own autonomies.

Nevertheless, while taking this constructivist epistemological approach into consideration, this thesis’s analyses of what has been denominated by outsiders as “essentialism” should by no means be perceived as the perpetuation of a Western gaze on the

---

<sup>487</sup> Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973). Georges M. Schmutz, *Sociologie de la Chine et sociologie chinoise* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 1989).

<sup>488</sup> Timothy Fitzgerald, *The Ideology of Religious Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). 9.

indigenous subject. Today, the axiomatic anti-essentialist critiques espoused by social constructivists in studying anti-colonial politics are founded upon a conception of culture that is invariably fluid and hybrid. As a consequence, this position considers repression as the logical corollary of the “fixation” of a particular group or cultural category. For Seyla Benhabib, essentialism is founded upon “faulty epistemic premises.”<sup>489</sup> Similarly, for Terence Turner:

[e]ssentializing the idea of culture as the property of an ethnic group or race; it risks reifying cultures as separate entities by over emphasizing the internal homogeneity of cultures [...] it tends to fetishize them in ways that put them beyond the reach of critical analysis.<sup>490</sup>

In contrast, Coulthard contends that these anti-essentialist criticisms of indigenous mobilization “have tended to focus on the empirically problematic and normatively suspect character of recognition claims based on ‘essentialist’ articulations of collective identity.”<sup>491</sup> In line with Coulthard and against the anti-essentialist critics, this thesis has posited that “essentialist” approaches by indigenous movements and organizations are nothing more than strategic tools employed to primarily renew the dignity and recover the sense of value placed on their cultures—a sense of value which was paradoxically taken away by the very essentialist/racist colonial discourses that subjected them in the first place. In this sense, “essentialism” has been seen by this thesis as one conscious process, amongst many others, which strengthens the pathway towards decolonization, cultural

---

<sup>489</sup> Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002). 4.

<sup>490</sup> Terence Turner, “Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology That Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It?,” *Cultural Anthropology* 8, no. 4 (1993): 411-12.

<sup>491</sup> Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*.

revitalization and national re-construction—as seen by the cases presented throughout the chapters. In the words of Spivak:

I think it's absolutely on target [...] to stand against the discourse of essentialism [...] But *strategically we cannot* [...] Since the moment of essentialising, universalising, saying yes to the ontophenomenological question, is irreducible, let us at least situate it at the moment, let us become vigilant about our own practice and use it as much as we can rather than make the totally counter-productive gesture of repudiating it [...] The great custodians of the anti-universal [and anti-essentialist] are obliged therefore simply to act in the interest of a great narrative, the narrative of exploitation, while they keep themselves clean by not committing themselves to anything. In fact, they are actually run by a great narrative even as they are busy protecting their theoretical purity by repudiating essentialism.<sup>492</sup>

In this sense, this thesis has aligned itself with the emerging scholarly literature which has begun in recent years to question the ideological premises of anti-essentialist positions, particularly when they dismiss the power-politics at play in the context of anti-colonial mobilization. As pointed out by Coulthard, it should be acknowledged that *both* discourses, essentialist and constructivist ones, depending on the context, can “aid either in the maintenance or subversion of oppressive configurations of power.”<sup>493</sup>

---

<sup>492</sup> Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues* (New York: Routledge, 1990). 11-12. *Italics mine.*

<sup>493</sup> Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*.

This juxtaposition and the isolated study of the two most salient alternative autonomist conceptualizations: the Council of Miskitu Elders in Mosquitia (Nicaragua) and the Arauco-Malleco Coordinating Committee in Wallmapu (Chile) led to the theorization of revindicative autonomism. As illustrated by Chapter III and IV, contrary to other indigenous peoples in Latin America, the Miskitu and Mapuche nations were never, as a whole, conquered, colonized, settled or subjected to European powers. They retained their stateless status and autonomous political and territorial condition up until the military invasion of the Nicaraguan and Chilean nation-states in the late nineteenth century. In 1894, General Rigoberto Cabezas and his army, at the behest of President Zelaya, occupied the city of Bluefields, inaugurating a process of territorial incorporation and Mosquitian cultural integration into Nicaragua. Similarly, the 1860s “Occupation of Araucania” campaign forcefully incorporated Wallmapu into the Chilean state and confined the Mapuche nation to reservation-like territories called *reducciones*. In both cases, their land was divided and auctioned to mestizos and European settlers. The wealthy and vibrant Miskitu and Mapuche nations of the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century then became vulnerable and dependent on paternalistic government policies and handouts. This was the start of a new era characterized by zealous policies of cultural assimilation, territorial compartmentalization and the impoverishment of Miskitu and Mapuche peoples.

Hale has argued that there is a new mode of governance on the rise throughout Latin America. This mode of governance is an amalgamation of two distinct and often contrasting ideologies: “an orthodox neoliberal approach to management of the economy”

and a progressive stance on indigenous rights.<sup>494</sup> Under this new and seemingly “benevolent” and “progressive” liberal regime, in 1987 the peoples of Mosquitia were granted what has been praised as one of the most progressive and permissive regimes of autonomy in Latin America. Nevertheless, despite the attempts of this pioneering project to finally fulfill the demands of the peoples of the region, Mosquitia is today battling against the increasing incursion of state-sponsored mestizo settlers into their territory, the depredation of their natural resources at the hands of logging, mining and mega-infrastructure projects in the region, as well as a politics of corruption, nepotism and co-option at the hands of the Sandinista government. Likewise, in Wallmapu, replacing the native landscape with the quickly-growing radiata pine and eucalyptus species, the government continues to incentivize large-scale monoculture plantation projects in south-central Chile. The 1980s privatization of previously communally-owned lands paved the way for further encroachment and appropriation of the Mapuche territory and allowed the legal invasion of forestry companies and colonists to Wallmapu. These “integrative goals of the contemporary colonial agenda,” however, ignited one of the greatest waves of indigenous resistance in Mosquitia and Wallmapu, led by the Council of Elders and CAM respectively.

The epistemologies put forward by these two movements are designed to suit the particular realities of their societies. Against the imposition of Western theories and epistemologies, such as liberal multiculturalism and so-called progressive regimes of autonomy, the Council of Elders and CAM engage in a reflexive and deconstructive challenge to identify the remains of colonialism in their forms of government, cultural practices and economic activities. They put forward not only a *sui generis* epistemology but also a practical road towards decolonization. In addition, revindicative autonomist movements argue that the

---

<sup>494</sup> Hale, *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*: 75.

current regimes of government imposed on their communities are rooted in Western civilization and therefore are inadequate to account for the realities and aspirations of their peoples. In this context, the question arises, is multicultural theory a concept that needs mere revision or “adjectivising”<sup>495</sup> to become suitable to the realities and needs of indigenous societies? Or, is liberal multiculturalism doomed to failure in addressing these non-Western, non-statist, anti-capitalist, anti-Christianic, anti-statist, anti-systemic, non-leftist and non-anarchist demands? Here, as de Sousa Santos asserts, “a hermeneutics of suspicion is recommended vis-à-vis the theories produced in the global North.”<sup>496</sup>

As Chapter II illustrated, for Kymlicka, a federacy, in contrast to other non-separatist and non-federalist alternatives to the quest for self-determination, provides a laudable decentralized alternative in which indigenous peoples simultaneously recover self-government rights and redefine their polities as a self-constitutive units in a variety of realms. Beyond decentralization, for Kymlicka, it is the asymmetrical character of a federacy that undergirds a fairer interaction between the two polities. In this context, Kymlicka endorses federacy arrangements within a multinational federation as the optimal solution in granting geographically concentrated indigenous peoples special rights to self-determination and autonomy. However, this thesis has argued that applying Kymlicka’s model to the indigenous quest for self-determination in Latin America exposes the theoretical fallacies and shortcomings of this liberal framework of multiculturalism. Kymlicka’s approach to autonomy has, for the most part, challenged and transformed the dominant discourses of homogeneity both within liberal scholarship and in nascent liberal democracies of Latin America. Nevertheless, his theory, knotted to the dominant hegemony, continues to exert symbolic violence by

---

<sup>495</sup> Santos, "Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South," 45.

<sup>496</sup> Ibid.

universalizing a particular and subjective ideological definition of autonomy as *inclusion*. Imposing this re-phrased and re-packaged liberalism upon the material world, he manages to maintain the status quo while simultaneously decontest alternative indigenous definitions of autonomy, such as pragmatic decolonizing strategies like revindicative autonomism.

In other words, Kymlicka manages to incorporate non-liberal indigenous political positions and arguments by reframing them in the language and “grammar of liberalism.”<sup>497</sup> His stern commitment to defending individual autonomy from internal restrictions imposed by cultural structures and ascribed identities utterly undermines the right of indigenous peoples to recover, revitalize and establish their own historical socio-politico principles and economic structures—a process that often, at least initially, recurs to strategic essentialism. Unable or unwilling to break free from the ontological and epistemological tenets of liberalism, Kymlicka’s federacy arrangements juxtapose the diverse articulations of autonomy upheld by the Council of Elders and CAM. The fieldwork I conducted in Mosquitia revealed that the Council of Elders regards such liberal multicultural approaches as a political façade that constrains indigenous cosmologies and systems of knowledge to the confines of the hegemonic Western state. Furthermore, in a personal interview, Oscar Hodgson, Miskito leader, proclaimed that the vertical imposition of “Western individualism,” central to liberal theory, is inherently responsible for the “historical setback of indigenous progress.”<sup>498</sup> In contrast to liberal multiculturalism, the Council of Elders espouses “indigenous communitarianism” and the native concepts of *Asla*, *Yawan Nani* and *Talia Mana* as both a challenge to this enforced Western socio-political system and its core

---

<sup>497</sup> Bruno Anili, “Beyond Liberal Discourse: Meta-Ideological Hegemony and Narrative Alternatives” (University of Oregon, 2010), iv.

<sup>498</sup> “Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson.”

concepts and as a path to resurrecting their pre-colonial governing structures.

Kymlicka's inherent allegiance to liberal values and "modern liberal forms of governance" precludes this form of autonomy from flourishing even within his proposed federacy arrangements. Against Kymlicka's claim to the universality of Western principles, *Wihta Tara*, Hector Williams, in an interview during field research in Bilwi, declared that the peoples of the Atlantic Coast perceive Western political principles, namely political representation and participation in the state via political parties as not only foreign to, but conflicting with their traditional forms of government. As such, the movement calls for an indigenous governing structure divested of modern Western forms of government, systems of political representation and political parties. In this sense, the movement condemns all political parties in the autonomous region—including the ones that appeal to indigenous cosmologies, such as YATAMA and YATAMA no Sandinista. For them, the Western system of political representation and modes of governance only incentivizes the peoples of the region to change their forms of government to fit into a Western model that fragments communal leadership, undermines the power of local authorities and annihilates indigenous cosmologies.

In contrast to Kymlicka, Lijphart presents a sound defence of federal theory. He argues that when ethnic groups are geographically concentrated, federalism can be approached as a consociational method to redress an unequal distribution of powers. This flows from the argument that federal boundaries will coincide with ethnic segments, thereby enabling the design of regional autonomies within the federation. Nevertheless, throughout his work, Lijphart provides an ambiguous definition of autonomy whereby "groups run their own internal affairs, especially in the areas of education and culture." In this context,

Lijphart, moving away from the orthodox liberal core of Rawls and Dworkin, postulates that the scope of segmental autonomy will depend on the particular historical and socio-politico contexts of each national society. Thus, articulating an ambiguous yet still liberal conceptualization of autonomy, formed, kneaded and pounded under liberalism's meta-ideological hegemonic apparatus.

Though distinct to Kymlicka's federacy, Lijphart's federal arrangements presuppose shared-sovereignty amongst symmetrical parties, however, remarkably alike Kymlicka, his theory, still anchored to liberalism's ontological presumptions and basic modes of expression, becomes just another epistemological instrument for managing difference within the Fukuyaman liberal hegemonic state. In this case, it functions as an epistemological instrument, which juxtaposes and dismisses the articulations of autonomy upheld by indigenous peoples in Latin America—namely, the right as self-constituting nations to create, define and regulate the terms of their collective existence according to their indigenous ontological and epistemological views. The research I conducted in Wallmapu, Chile brings to the fore this very distinction between liberal and indigenous approaches to autonomy. In a personal interview, Llaitul revealed that CAM, unlike Lijphartian Western-imposed federal autonomous segments aims to "reappropriate the notion of autonomy and redefine it as complete independence against *winka* (non-Mapuche) agents."<sup>499</sup> For CAM, remarkably alike the Council of Elders in Nicaragua, this Western-centric and hegemonic idea of fulfilling their autonomist demands via a process of vertical redefinition of boundaries contradicts their core aspirations as a nation. In addition, for CAM, these liberal "co-optive" means to achieve autonomy further solidify their supposed "inclusion" into the political structures of the colonial state and preserve the

---

<sup>499</sup> "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca."

system of subordination to which the Mapuche are currently subjected to.

Furthermore, like Kymlicka's federacy, within Lijphart's consociational theory, power-sharing elements such as grand coalition, veto power and PR require the re-articulation of indigenous mobilization into political parties thereby aggravating the internal fragmentation of indigenous struggles and enabling the prospect of clientelistic interactions with the national elites. This approach also implies a non-existent consent on behalf of indigenous communities to adopt Western political institutions and structures. For its part, CAM, like the Council of Elders, has come to reject the predominant liberal trend, hypothesized best by Van Cott, that indigenous movements are experiencing an inevitable transition to institutionalised political parties. In contrast, CAM's leaders have persistently denounced this Western endeavor to institutionalize Mapuche resistance and shroud legitimate calls for territorial autonomy in the region. Llaitul contends that seizing autonomy means the recovery, revitalization and re-establishment of the *Reche* and the cosmological project embedded in *Admapu Ka Admongen*. This, in turn, entails the resurrection of Mapuche pre-colonial authority figures like the *Weichafe* (warrior), *Lonko* (head/chief), and *Werken* (messenger), amongst others. This form of autonomy, as Chapter IV has illustrated, also rejects and challenges Western-imposed administrative divisions such as municipalities and districts. Instead, this movement aims to reconstruct the Mapuche nation via the re-implementation of the administrative socio-politico spaces like the *Lofs*, *Rewes* and *Aillarewes*. In short, Lijphart's approach, like Kymlicka's, successfully addresses some of the core political and cultural demands of minority ethnic groups. However, regarding indigenous movements like the Council of Elders and CAM is no more than a paternalist liberal Western endeavour to tenuously palliate the inequalities in the

distribution of wealth and power as well as incorporate, appropriate and folklorize a culture, which is often the source of resistance.

Just the same, Bauböck, as part of this liberal camp for addressing the *thymotic* urges of national minorities and indigenous peoples, advances a radical pluralist approach to the dilemma of federation and secession. Bauböck, more attuned to Lijphart and unlike Kymlicka, conceives that the solution to the quest for self-determination by indigenous peoples lies in the redefinition of federal arrangements, rather than their abandonment. Liberal democracies, for him, “should accommodate rather than attempt to overcome” their *thymotic* urges for autonomy. In its broadest sense, his normative theory advocates for a large-scale decentralization of the liberal state to allow for geographically concentrated indigenous groups to re-organize their communities into federal autonomous subunits. In contrast to these two liberal approaches for co-opting indigenous autonomist claims, Bauböck’s theory proposes the redrawing of internal boundaries and the devolution of political power from central authorities to symmetrical territorial units. He argues that it is only via the implementation of territorial autonomy (TA) that indigenous peoples can secure a regional majority within federal segments. This, in turn, will confer on them greater political ability to influence and legislate over cultural, legal and economic issues within their territory. For Bauböck, this pluralistic federation will eventually dampen the burgeoning calls for secession within liberal multicultural societies. Nonetheless, the success of this “permissive” federation, stamped by and confined to liberal ideological apparatuses, lies in the re-foundation of a federal citizenship, where both regional and national identities converge. This shared citizenship requires indigenous representatives to equally voice the concerns and interests of indigenous and non-indigenous inhabitants in their territory.

In this sense, liberalism, as a meta-ideological hegemony, enforcing its core ontological and epistemological presumptions over certain synchronic nodes, ensures that all conceptualizations of autonomy, orthodox and otherwise, ultimately flow back to the diachronic structure. Bauböck's radical theory, as one such synchronic node, unable to break free from liberalism, is converted into a coercive instrument, imposing hegemonic values and principles. As such, it implicitly coerces indigenous peoples into adhering to a monolithic notion of liberal citizenship and thereby, imposing a Western form of intra-government based on the centrality of the individual subject, public sphere, political parties, majoritarian vote, and a separation of powers into rigid branches of government. Like Kymlicka and Lijphart, Bauböck fails to observe that these so-called "culturally void" and "universal" elements of liberal democracy are not necessarily shared by indigenous groups, who at times call for the reconstruction of their societies via the revitalization of non-Western traditional forms of government and the resurrection of pre-colonial forms of authority—as the rise of revindicative autonomist movements attests.

In this sense, Kymlicka's federacy, Lijphart's consociationalism and Bauböck's liberal pluralist federation may well ameliorate the appalling living conditions that mar indigenous communities, grant greater political power to manoeuvre certain cultural and legal issues at stake and also propose decentralized alternatives in which indigenous peoples can theoretically recover self-government rights and redefine their polity as a self-constitutive unit. These approaches, overcoming Rawls and Dworkin's orthodox liberalism and incorporating Taylor and Sandel's communitarian principles, *prima facie* can be misconstrued as a case of liberal reflexivity adopting and adapting to alternative illiberal cosmovisions and thereby, non-Western articulations of

autonomy. However, their theoretical postulations and its unwillingness to surpass liberal structures of signification like liberty, human rationality and individualism as well as the ontological presumption of the dialectic between the liberal universal state and the omnipresent *thymos*, expose liberalism operating as a meta-ideological hegemony.

Their discursive utterances demonstrate the manner in which this censoring and surveilling hegemonic apparatus adopts non-liberal worlds into the language of liberalism. Kymlicka, Lijphart and Bauböck manage to conform to the canons of liberal discourse, move ever closer to the communitarian camp, and heed in an unprecedented manner the calls for recognition by indigenous autonomist movements. Nevertheless, they achieve this without ever conventionally articulating canonical liberal themes in the Rawlsian and Dworkian sense. That said, there is no doubt that their theories have resulted in a positive and to some extent, progressive reconfiguration of the nation-state, in particular for polyethnic groups and national minorities. However, their approaches vis-à-vis indigenous groups exude nothing but epistemological blindness, ignoring or dismissing alterity or epistemological violence, silencing and decontesting alternative autonomist indigenous articulations. As evidenced by the cases of Council of Elders and CAM in Latin America throughout this thesis, their discourses deny indigenous peoples the right to regain pre-colonial sovereignty, impose law on themselves and to autonomously direct the course of their affairs without the imposition of *a priori* Western and liberal normative provisos.

In this sense, the works of these unconventional liberal thinkers are there to accommodate and co-opt dissent via mithridatism. The liberal co-optation of the voices of dissent and non-liberal themes, as Anili astutely illustrates, is achieved

through consuming small doses of non-liberal poison like the radical and antithetical approaches to autonomy voiced by indigenous autonomist movements like the Council of Elders and CAM. Liberalism, in Anili's words, "may gradually grow immune from its most devastating effects" however, its epistemological and ontological presumptions impede it from ever uttering such radical non-liberal indigenous claims. As such, as this thesis has demonstrated, any future study of indigenous mobilization and their autonomist demands requires us, as scholars, to "keep a distance vis-à-vis Western Eurocentric theoretical traditions" if we are ever to understand and make sense of their political projects and unique epistemologies at grassroots level. The future task then for the "activist researcher," to borrow the term from Hale, is to adopt a two-fold strategic approach: on the one hand, to continue to expose the traces, tinctures and influences of Eurocentrism. That is to denaturalize the now unquestionable and unchallengeable presumptions of, to borrow from Corntassel, the white privileged values of the self-appointed guardians of liberal multiculturalism. On the other, to further analyze, study and bring to the fore the silenced demands, cosmovisions and knowledges of such revindicative autonomist movements. That is, the future task at hand is to expose and counter liberal mithridatism as well as bring the utterances and epistemologies of these revolutionary indigenous groups into mainstream narrative and public discourses.



## **Appendix I: List of Indigenous Movements**

Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia  
Organización Nación P'urhepecha  
Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco  
Partido Autonomista Mapuche Wallmapuwen  
Confederación Sindical Única de Trabajadores Campesinos de Bolivia  
Yapti Tasba Masraka Nanih Aslatakanka  
Frente Juvenil Xochicuautla  
Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca  
Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana  
Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia  
Consejo de Todas las Tierras  
Asociación Nacional Indígena Plural por la Autonomía  
Consejo de Organizaciones Mayas de Guatemala  
Organization Van Inheemsen in Suriname  
Organización de las Naciones y Pueblos Indígenas en Argentina  
Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas  
Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño  
Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik-Nuevo País  
Movimiento de Unificación y Lucha Triqui  
Pueblos Unidos Multiétnicos de Amazonas  
Organización Regional de los Pueblos Indígenas de Amazonas  
Consejo Nacional Indigena Maya Ch'ortí de Honduras  
Consejo Indígena de Centro América  
Movimiento de los Indígenas del Ecuador  
Centro de Culturas Indígenas del Perú  
Confederacion Nacional de Organizaciones Campesinas, Indigenas y Negras  
Confederación de los Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia  
Conselho Indígena de Roraima

Confederación Indígena Neuquina  
Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional  
Organización Zonal Indígena del Putumayo  
Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes  
Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Katari  
Movimiento Indio Tupac Katari  
Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina  
Asamblea Popular de los Pueblos de Oaxaca  
Autoridades Indígenas de Colombia  
Associacao Comunidade Waimiri Atroari  
Consejo do Povo Indigena Ingarko  
Movimiento 10 de Abril  
Movimiento de la Juventud Kuna  
Fédération Lokono  
Federación de Asociaciones de Comunidades Guaraníes de la Región Oriental  
Movimiento Indígena y Campesino Paraguay Libre  
Coordinadora de Pueblos Étnicos de Santa Cruz  
Consejo de la Nación Charrúa de Uruguay  
Federación de Campesinos de Cochabamba  
Pueblos Unidos de la Huasteca  
Congresos de Comunidades Nativas Amueshas y Campas del Valle  
Palcazu-Pichis  
Movimiento Indio Pedro Vilca Apaza  
Unión Indígena Cubea del Cuduyarí  
Asamblea de Jefes Indigenas Brasil  
Federación Indígena de Puerto Ayacucho  
Consejo Nacional Indio de Venezuela



## **Appendix II: Ethical Clearance**

This thesis has obtained ethical clearance from the Human Research Ethics Committee at Griffith University. The research conducted in this thesis has followed the protocol of the Australian National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

Ethical Clearance approved September 2012

GU Ref No: PPP/02/12/HREC



## Bibliography

- Aburto, Leonel Delgado. "El Caribe Nicaragüense en textos de la literatura nacional moderna: de la civilización protectorista a la mulatidad global." *América Latina Hoy* 58 (2011): 63-80.
- Aguilar, Liliam Hernández, and María Esther Rodríguez Fernández. "Dirección Nacional Reglamento a la Ley 3859 (Decreto Ejecutivo No. 26935-G)." 1-18: Dirección Nacional de Desarrollo Comunal DINADECO, 2009.
- Alarcón, Tomás. "The Ayllu: The Basic Social Unit of the Aymara People." *St. Thomas Law Review* 14, no. 449 (2001-2002): 449-58.
- Albó, Xavier. "El Retorno del Indio." *Revista Andina* 9, no. 2 (1991): 299-345.
- Alianza Magonista Zapatista. "Declaration of the People of Oaxaca."  
[http://espora.org/amz/article.php3?id\\_article=108](http://espora.org/amz/article.php3?id_article=108).  
———. "¡Viva Tierra y Libertad!"  
[http://espora.org/amz/article.php3?id\\_article=53](http://espora.org/amz/article.php3?id_article=53).
- Alianza Social Independiente. "Estatutos del Partido Versión con Modificaciones ". Bogotá: Alianza Social Independiente, 2013.
- Alvarado, Jorge Echazu. "El concepto de nación y los académicos antropólogos " In, (2009).  
<http://www.katari.org/concepto-de-nacion/>.
- Anili, Bruno. "Beyond Liberal Discourse: Meta-Ideological Hegemony and Narrative Alternatives." University of Oregon, 2010.
- . "Liberal incorporations: Kymlicka, Pettit and the grammar of hegemony." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 18, no. 1 (2013): 11-33.
- Antil, Juan Catrillanca. 13 of July 2009.
- APPO, and CODEP. "Resumen Final del Foro Nacional Construyendo la Democracia y la Gobernabilidad."  
<http://codepappo.wordpress.com/2006/08/17/resumen-final-del-foro-nacional-construyendo-la-democracia-y-la-gobernabilidad/>.
- Aprobación de la Revisión, Reajuste y Clarificación Estatutaria por la Junta Directiva.*
- Arana, Diego Barros. *Historia General de Chile I*. Linkgua Digital, 2012.
- Aranda, Darío. *Argentina: el debate a fondo. Audios*. Sevicios en Comunicación Intercultural Servindi, 2011.
- Asamblea Constituyente, and Honorable Congreso Nacional. "Constitución Política del Estado." La Paz, 2009.

Asamblea Legislativa de la República de Costa Rica. "Ley Indígena No. 6172." edited by Asamblea Legislativa de la República de Costa Rica and Ministerio Público Poder Judicial. San José, 1977.

Asamblea Nacional Constituyente. "Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic." Caracas, 1999.

Asamblea Nacional de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela. "Características del Estado del Amazonas."

[http://www.asambleanacional.gov.ve/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=24780&Itemid=188&lang=e](http://www.asambleanacional.gov.ve/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=24780&Itemid=188&lang=e)  
S.

Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua. "Reglamento a la Ley No. 28 "Estatuto de Autonomía de las Regiones de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua"." In *Decreto A.N. No. 3584*, edited by Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua.

La Gaceta Diario Oficial, 2003.

Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua, and Presidencia de la República. "Ley No. 445: Ley del Régimen de Propiedad Comunal de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua y de los Ríos Bocay, Coco, Indio y Maíz." edited by Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua, 1-21. Managua: La Gaceta Diario Oficial, 2003.

Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua, and Presidencia de la República. "Ley de Régimen Jurídico de el Gran Canal Interoceánico de Nicaragua y de Creación de la Autoridad de el Gran Canal de Nicaragua." edited by Presidencia de la República and Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua. Managua: Asamblea Nacional, 2012.

Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua. "Aprueban reforma de proyecto hidroeléctrico en Tumarín." In, *Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua* (2012). Published electronically 13 of November.

<http://www.asamblea.gob.ni/86672/aprueban-reforma-de-proyecto-hidroelectrico-tumarin/>.

Asociación Indígena Argentina. "Comunicado sobre Formosa."  
<http://asociacionaira.blogspot.com/>.

Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana. "Centro de Información y Planeación Territorial Aidesep (CIPTA)." Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, 2012.

———. "¿Cómo estamos organizados?"

<http://www.aidesep.org.pe/index.php?id=2>.

Assemblée Nationale. "Constitution de la République Française." Paris: Assemblée Nationale, 1958.

Assies, Willem, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema. "Diversity as a Challenge: A Note on the Dilemmas of Diversity." In *The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America*, edited by Willem

- Assies, Gemma van der Haar and André Hoekema. 295-313.  
 Amsterdam: Thela Thesis, 2000.
- Assies, Willem, Gemma van der Haar, and André J Hoekema. *The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis, 2000.
- Astvaldsson, Astvaldur. "The Dynamics of Aymara Duality: Change and Continuity in Sociopolitical Structures in the Bolivian Andes." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 32, no. 1 (February 2000): 145-74.
- Azkintuwe. "Alianza Territorial, la organización que lidera movilización mapuche." *Azkintuwe*, 16 of June 2012 2009.
- . "Alianza Territorial, la organización que lidera movilización Mapuche." In, (2009). Published electronically 8 of August.  
<http://www.azkintuwe.org/agosto151.htm>.
- Baklanoff, Eric N. "Argentina, Chile, and Mexico: Contrasts in Economic Policy and Performance ". *Journal of Inter-American Studies* 3, no. 4 (October 1961): 497-508.
- Bakunin, Mikhail. *Marxism, Freedom and the State*. Bakunin Reference Archives Marxist Org, 1999.  
<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/mf-state/>.
- Baracco, Luciano. "From British colonialism to revolutionary developmentalism: The 're-birth' of autonomy in Nicaragua's Caribbean Coast." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 8, no. 4 (2012): 374-92.
- . "Introduction." In *National Integration and Contested Autonomy: The Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua*, edited by Luciano Baracco. 3-10. New York: Algora Publishing, 2011.
- Bárcenas, Fernando. "¿Derecho a la independencia de las naciones de la Moskitia?" *El Nuevo Diario*, 30 of November 2009.
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Inc., 2012.
- Barry, Brian. "The consociational model and its dangers." *European Journal of Political Research* 3 (1975): 393-412.
- Bauböck, Rainer. "Beyond Culturalism and Statism: Liberal Responses to Diversity." *Eurosphere Working Paper Series*, 2008.
- . "Multinational Federalism:Territorial or Cultural Autonomy?" In *Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations*, edited by Ronald Stade. Sweden: International Migration and Ethnic Relations, 2001.
- . "Recombinant Citizenship." *Reihe Politikwissenschaft Political Science Series*, 1999.
- . "The Rights of Others and the Boundaries of Democracy." *European Journal of Political Theory* 6, no. 4 (September 2007 2007): 398-405.
- . "Why Stay Together? a Pluralist Approach to Secession and Federation." In *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, edited

- by Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. New York: Oxford Scholarship Online, 2000.
- Baumeister, Andrea T. "Two Liberalisms and the 'politics of difference'." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 3, no. 3 (October 1998): 307-24.
- Beltrán, Bolívar. "Circunscripciones territoriales indígenas." *Instituto Científico de Culturas Indígenas*, no. 35 (february 2002).
- Bengoa, José. *El Tratado de Quilín*. Santiago: Editorial Catalonia, 2003.
- . *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche*. Santiago: Editorial LOM, 2000.
- , ed. *La Memoria Olvidada. Historia de los Pueblos Indígenas de Chile*. Santiago: Publicaciones del Bicentenario 2004.
- Benhabib, Seyla. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Bertodano, Joseph-Antonio de-Abreu y. "Colección de los Tratados de Paz, Alianza, Neutralidad, Garantía, Protección, Tregua, Mediación, Accesión, Reglamento de Límites, Comercio, Navegación, &c. Hechos por los Pueblos, Reyes y Príncipes de España con los Pueblos, Reyes, Príncipes, Repúblicas y demás Potencias de Europa y Otras partes del Mundo." edited by Diego Peralta, Antonio Marin and Juan de Zúñiga. Madrid, 1740.
- Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. "Tratados y Acuerdos Históricos en la Cuestión Mapuche." Santiago: Congreso Nacional de Chile, 2013.
- Boletín Autonomía. "Censo 2011: Población Indígena de Costa Rica Aumenta 39%." In, no. 60 (2011). Published electronically 24 of May 2012.  
<http://hablacostarica.com/articles/11639-censo-2011-poblacion-indigena-de-costa-rica-aumenta-39>.
- Bolin, Inge. *Rituals of Respect: the secret survival in the high Peruvian Andes*. Austin: Texas University Press, 1998.
- "Bolivia's Evo Morales scraps Amazon road project." In, (2011). Published electronically 21 of October.  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-15409447>.
- Bonnefoy, Pascale. "Claiming Ancestral Lands." In, (2009).  
<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/chile/090817/indigenous-mapuche-land-battle?page=0,1>.
- Bot, Yvon Le. *Subcomandante Marcos, El sueño zapatista: Entrevistas con el Subcomandante Marcos, el Mayor Moisés y el comandante Tacho, del Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional*. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés Editores, 1997.
- Bowen, James D. "Multicultural Market Democracy: Elites and Indigenous Movements in Contemporary Ecuador." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 43, no. 3 (2011): 451-83.

- Boyarin, Jonathan, ed. *Remapping Memory: The Politics of TimesSpace*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Brading, David A. "Manuel Gamio and Official Indigenismo." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 7, no. 1 (1988): 75-89.
- Brett, Roderick Leslie. *Social Movements, Indigenous Politics and Democratisation in Guatemala, 1985-1996*. Boston: Brill Academic 2008.
- Bruckmann, Monica. "Alternative Visions of the Indigenous People's Movement in Latin America: Reflections on Civilisation and Modernity." *Social Change* 40, no. 4 (2010): 601-08.
- Brysk, Alison. *From Tribal Village to Global Village, Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Brysk, Alison, and Carol Wise. "Liberalization and Ethnic Conflict in Latin America." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 32, no. 2 (summer 1997): 76-104.
- Burgess, Peter. "The evolution of European Union law and Carl Schmitt's theory of the nomos of Europe." Chap. 11 In *The International Political Thought of Carl Schmitt: terror, liberal war and the crisis of global order*, edited by Louiza Odysseos and Fabio Petito. 185-202. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Bushey, Jorge Matamoros. "Consejo de Ancianos: historia oculta detrás de una tradición en la Mosquitia." *Latin American Journal Online* 59 (2009): 8-18.
- Butler, Judy. "YATAMA: Rebellion with a cause?". *Revista Envío*, no. 232 (November 2000).
- Calbucura, Jorge, Carlos Contreras Painemal, and Reynaldo Mariqueo. "Líderes Mapuche y su Rol en el Desarrollo de los Sucesos Históricos." Enlace Mapuche Internacional, <http://www.mapuche-nation.org/espanol/html/documentos/doc-93.htm>.
- Calle, Daniel. "En el actual gobierno los Kataristas estamos excluidos." In *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización*. La Paz, 2010.
- Campbell, Howard. "Tradition and the New Social Movements: The Politics of Isthmus Zapotec Culture." *Latin American Perspectives* 20, no. 3 (Summer 1993): 83-97.
- Campbell, Joel Narváez. "El Reino de la Moskitia." *El Nuevo Diario*, 20 of May 2009.
- Canal N. *Conferencia de Prensa: Presidente de AIDESEP Alberto Pizango*. La Victoria: Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, 2012.
- Cárcamo, Wladimir Soto. *Aucán Huilcamán habla de su propuesta de régimen autonómico para el territorio Mapuche*. Escenario Chile, 2009.
- Carrillanca, Héctor Llaitul. "Habla Hector Llaitul Prisionero político de la CAM: "La Lucha Mapuche debe ser Anticapitalista"." In, political declaration, (2013). Published

electronically 24 August 2013.  
<http://www.werken.cl/?p=9695>.

- Castillo, Beatriz Huertas. *Indigenous Peoples in Isolation in the Peruvian Amazon: Their Struggle for Survival and Freedom.* Somerset: Transaction Publishers, 2004.
- Cecilia Valenzuela Mira Quién Habla. *Cecilia Valenzuela entrevista a Lidia Rengifo Lázaro Secretaria General AIDESEP.* Lima: Willax TV, 2012.
- . *Cecilia Valenzuela entrevista a Miguel Piovesan: las personas están antes que los árboles y los animales.* Lima: Willax TV, 2012.
- Centro de Documentación Nuke Mapu. "Benetton y los Mapuche." In., <http://www.mapuche.info/lumaco/Benetton.html>.
- Centro de Estudios e Investigación que Promueve los Valores y Principios de una Sociedad Libre. "Denuncia de Irregularidades en Compra de Tierras." Libertad y Desarrollo, 2014.
- Centro de Información y Planificación Territorial AIDESEP, and International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. "Bases Regionales de AIDESEP." Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, 2005.
- . "Reservas territoriales a favor de pueblos indígenas en aislamiento voluntario." Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, 2005.
- Chamorro, Pedro Joaquín Cuadra. *La reincorporación de la Mosquitia, estudio de interpretación histórica.* Managua1944.
- Chávez, Constantino Lima, Hilda Reinaga, Pablo Mamani Ramirez, Marcos Marin Mamani, Rogelio Mayta, Carlos Mamani, Abraham Delgado, et al. 20 of September 2011.
- Chávez, Guillermo. "Aparece vocero de "Comando Trizano" y amenaza con "hacer volar" a dirigentes y lonkos indígenas." *El Austral*, 30 of July 2009.
- Chávez, Thomas E. *Spain and the independence of the United States: an intrinsic gift.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002.
- Chihuailaf, Elicura. *Recado confidencial a los chilenos.* Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 1999.
- Chihuailaf, Elicura, Richard Vera, José Aylwin, and Andrea Coñuecar, eds. *El despertar del pueblo mapuche: nuevos conflictos, viejas demandas.* Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2004.
- Chile Hoy TV. *Resistencia Mapuche en Arauco Chile.* Centro de Documentación Mapuche, 2010.
- Choque, María Eugenia, and Carlos Mamani. "Reconstitución del ayllu y derechos de los pueblos indígenas: el movimiento indio en los Andes de Bolivia." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 6, no. 1 (2001): 202-24.
- Cinema Films. *Chenalhó: el corazón de los altos*, vol. 2. Cinema Films, 2003. documentary.

- Cleary, Matthew R. "Democracy and Indigenous Rebellion in Latin America." *Comparative Political Studies* 33, no. 9 (November 2000): 1123-53.
- CNN Chile. *Aucan Huilcaman entrevista en CNN*. Santiago de Chile, 2009. Interview.
- "A colony in dispute: past and future of British Honduras." *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 48, no. 190 (1958): 151-59.
- Comandancia General del EZLN. "Declaración de la Selva Lacandona." México: Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional, 1993.
- Comisión de Legislación y Puntos Constitucionales. "Dictamen No. 135 Favorable." edited by Asamblea Legislativa República de El Salvador. Portal de Acceso a la Información Pública: Asamblea Legislativa República de El Salvador, 2012.
- Comisión de Trabajo Autónomo Mapuche. "Informe de la Comisión Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato." Santiago: Grupo de Trabajo Legislación e Institucionalidad, 2003.
- Comité Clandestino Revolucionario Indígena-Comandancia General del Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional. "Cuarta Declaración de la Selva Lacandona."  
<http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/>.
- . "Segunda Declaración de la Selva Lacandona." Montañas del Sureste Mexicano, 1994.
- Comunidad Wente Winkul Mapu. "Carta Pública." País Mapuche, 2013.
- CONADI, Comité de Difusión del Sistema Integral de Información y Atención al Ciudadano(a) SIAC de la Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena. "Ley Indígena No. 19.253 Establece Normas Sobre Protección, Fomento y Desarrollo de los Indígenas, y Crea la Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena." edited by CONADI, 14-89: CONADI, 2011.
- Confederación Campesina del Perú. "Breve Historia de la CCP."  
[http://www.movimientos.org/cloc/ccp/show\\_text.php3?key=2140](http://www.movimientos.org/cloc/ccp/show_text.php3?key=2140).
- Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonía Ecuatoriana. "Territorios."  
<http://www.ecuanex.net.ec/confeniae/>.
- Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador. "Declaración Política."  
[http://www.conaie.org/images/stories/pdfs/proyecto\\_poltico\\_de\\_la\\_conaie.pdf](http://www.conaie.org/images/stories/pdfs/proyecto_poltico_de_la_conaie.pdf).
- . "Sobre Nosotros, ¿qué es la CONAIE?"  
<http://www.conaie.org/sobre-nosotros/que-es-la-conaie>.
- Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia. "Acuerdos firmados CIDOB-Gobierno." [http://www.cidob-bo.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=436&Itemid=100](http://www.cidob-bo.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=436&Itemid=100).
- Conference of Indian Nations And Organizations of South America. "Working Commission Reports." Tiwanaku: South American Indian Information Center, 1983.

- Conget, Cristián Frene, Mariela Núñez Ávila, and Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo. "Hacia un nuevo Modelo Forestal en Chile." *Revista Bosque Nativo*, 2010, 25-35.
- Congreso Constituyente Democrático. "Constitución Política del Perú." edited by Oficialía Mayor del Congreso, 1-60. Lima: Congreso de la República del Perú, 1993.
- Conklin, Beth A. "Body Paint, Feathers, and VCRs: Aesthetics and Authenticity in Amazonian Activism." *American Ethnologist* 24, no. 4 (November 1997): 711-37.
- Consejo Cívico de Organizaciones Populares e Indígenas de Honduras. "Declaración de las Caminatas." 23. COPINH, 2010.
- . "Declaración de Purutukwa."  
<http://copinh.org/leer.php/9734021>.
- Consejo Coordinador Indígena de la Asamblea Nacional de Delegados. "Comunicado # 3: Vigilia Indígena frente a Casa Presidencial Por la Aprobación de la Ley de Desarrollo Autónomo de los Pueblos Indígenas." Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas,, 2009.
- Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño. *Audio de la Conferencia de Prensa que ofreció el CCNIS, con respecto a los 80 años del '32 y 20 años de la firma de los acuerdos de paz.* Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño, 2012. Audio.
- . "Comunicado CCNIS Aprobada Reforma Constitucional sobre la Existencia de Pueblos Indígenas en El Salvador." Cushcatan: Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño, 2012.
- . *Comunicado de los Pueblos Indígenas de El Salvador.* 2011.
- . "Pueblos Indígenas y los ODM Post-2015." San Salvador: Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño, 2013.
- Consejo de Ancianos de la Costa Atlántica. "Carta a la OEA." Bilwi: Pueblo Indio, 1998.
- Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia. "Carta al Sr. Daniel Ortega S. Presidente de la República de Nicaragua y a la Sra. Rosario Murillo Coordinadora del Poder Ciudadano y Primera Dama de Nicaragua." 2012.
- . "Consejo de Ancianos Proclama de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de la Nación Comunitaria." <http://www.puebloindio.org/moskitia/proclama.htm>.
- . "Perceptos y Normas de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia: discutido y aprobado en la décima Asamblea General de Naciones Indígenas y de Comunidades Multiétnicas y en la Segunda Convención de la Moskitia." 1-32. Bilwi: Organización Pueblo Indio, 2001.
- . "Proclama de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas de la Nación Comunitaria." Bilwi: Pueblo Indio, 1997.

- Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Moskitia. "Consejo de Ancianos de La Nación Moskitia." Pueblo Indio, <http://www.puebloindio.org/moskitia/consejo.htm>.
- Consejo de Organizaciones Mayas de Guatemala. *Construyendo un futuro para nuestro pasado: derechos del pueblo maya y el proceso de paz*. Guatemala: Cholsamaj, 1995.
- . *Derechos específicos del pueblo maya*. Austin: University of Texas, 1991.
- Consejo de Todas las Tierras. "Comunicado del Consejo de Todas las Tierras en el Marco del 12 de Octubre: Llamado al ejercicio de libre determinación." Mapuexpress Informativo Mapuche, <http://www.mapuexpress.net/?act=publications&id=859>.
- Consejo Directivo del Ejecutor del Contrato de Administración de la Reserva Comunal Purus. "Declaración de Gastabala: No pasara el Proyecto de Ley No. 14369!". Gastabala Río Purus: Servicios en Comunicación Intercultural Servindi, 2007.
- Consejo Indígena de Centro América, Consejo Indígena Mesoamericano, and Red de Mujeres Indígenas de Biodiversidad. "Declaración de Cushcátan: La Visión Indígena Mesoamericana sobre la Cumbre de Río+20." Cushcátan: Consejo Coordinador Nacional Indígena Salvadoreño, 2012.
- Consejo Nacional Indio de Venezuela. "Consejo Nacional Indio de Venezuela." <http://www.conive.org/>.
- Conselho Indígena de Roraima. "O CIR." <http://cir.org.br/index.php/template/template-articles>.
- "Constitución Política de la República de Guatemala." Ciudad de Guatemala: Corte de Constitucionalidad República de Guatemala, 1985.
- Contraloría General de la República de Chile, Contraloría Regional de la Araucanía, and Unidad de Auditoría e Inspección. "Informe Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena." Temuco: Contraloría General de la República de Chile,, 2011.
- Convención Moskitia. "Convención de la Moskitia." Palacio de las Sesiones de la Convención Mosquita: Consejo de Anciano de la Nación Comunitaria Moskitia, 1894.
- Conzemius, Eduard. *Ethnographical Survey of the Miskito and the Sumu Indians of Honduras and Nicaragua*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin, 1932.
- Coordenação das Organizações Indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira. "COIAB demands the direct participation of indigenous peoples in Phase Two of the PPG7." <http://www.amazonia.org.br/english/noticias/print.cfm?id=67650>.
- Coordinadora Arauco Malleco. "Comunicado Coordinadora Mapuche Arauco Malleco." Wallmapu, 2012.
- Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco. "Análisis de la Lucha de la C.A.M. Movimiento

- Mapuche y Proyecciones. Documento resultado de la conversación que sostuvo la revista Weftun con dirigentes de la C.A.M.": Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuches en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco.
- . "Antecedentes Generales." In, *Weftun: Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto* no. 1 (2001). Published electronically November. <http://www.nodo50.org/weftun/publicacion/kom1.htm>.
- . "Cinco Mitos acerca de la CAM." Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco.
- . "Comunicado." <http://www.nodo50.org/weftun/>.
- . "El pensamiento emancipatorio de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto." WEFTUN Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, 2013.
- . "El pueblo mapuche y su larga lucha." Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco.
- . "Parte 2 La Práctica Política del Proyecto de Liberación Nacional Mapuche. Estrategia y Táctica de la CAM." WEFTUN Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, 2013.
- Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica. "1ra. Cumbre Regional Amazónica Saberes Ancestrales, Pueblos y Vida Plena en Armonía con los Bosques." COICA, 2011.
- . "APA." <http://www.coica.org.ec/sp/miembros/apa.html>.
- . "Declaraciones." [http://www.coica.org.ec/sp/ma\\_declaraciones/index.html](http://www.coica.org.ec/sp/ma_declaraciones/index.html).
- Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica, Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, Confederación Nacional de Comunidades del perú Afectadas por la Minería, Organización Regional de Pueblos Indígenas del Oriente, Coordinadora Regional de Pueblos Indígenas de San Lorenzo, Organización Regional de Pueblos Indígenas de la Amazonía Norte, Organización Regional de AIDESEP Ucayali, *et al.*
- "Declaración de Iquitos: No hay Redd+sin Territorios, Derechos y Autonomía de los Pueblos Indígenas." Iquito: Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, 2011.
- Coordinadora Nacional de Organizaciones Campesinas.
- "Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina CONIC." <http://www.cnoc.org.gt/conic.html>.
- Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina. "Objetivos." [http://www.mayaconic.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=13&Itemid=20](http://www.mayaconic.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=13&Itemid=20).
- . "Propuesta de Ley General de Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas de Guatemala." edited by Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina, 1-39, 2009.

- Corntassel, Jeff. "Who is Indigenous? 'Peoplehood' and ethnonationalist approaches to rearticulating indigenous identity." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 9, no. 1 (2003): 75-100.
- Corntassel, Jeff J. "An Activist Posing as an Academic?". *American Indian Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (2003): 160-71.
- Corntassel, Jeff J., and Taiaiake Alfred. "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism." *Government and Opposition* 40, no. 4 (2005): 597-614.
- Corntassel, Jeff J., Corey Snelgrove, and Rita Kaur Dhamoon. "Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3, no. 2 (2014): 1-32.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. Amazon Kindle.
- Courtney de Kalb. "Nicaragua: Studies on the Mosquito Shore in 1892." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 25 (1893): 236-88.
- Crawford, James. *The Creation of States in International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Cunningham, Myrna. "Changing Nicaragua is Changing Ourselves." *URACCAN Update*, 18 of March 1998 1998.
- Cunningham-Kain, Myrna. "Changing Nicaragua is Changing Ourselves." *URACCAN Update*, no. special enlarged edition (18 of March 1998 1998).
- Dabashi, Hamid. *Brown Skin White Masks*. London: Pluto Press, 2011.
- Dahlitz, Julie. "Introduction." In *Secession and International Law: Conflict Avoidance, Regional Appraisals*, edited by Julie Dahlitz. 1-10. New York: United Nations, 2003.
- de-las-Casas, Bartolomé. *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*. London: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Diaz, Bernal. *The Conquest of New Spain*. London: Penguin Books, 1963.
- "Dirigentes indígenas miskitos piden independencia de Nicaragua." In, *La Nación Mundo* (2009). Published electronically 14 of October.  
[http://www.nacion.com/mundo/Dirigentes-indigenas-miskitos-independencia-Nicaragua\\_0\\_1079892022.html](http://www.nacion.com/mundo/Dirigentes-indigenas-miskitos-independencia-Nicaragua_0_1079892022.html).
- Dourojeanni, Axel, and Andrei Jouravlev. "El Código de Aguas de Chile: entre la ideología y la realidad." edited by CEPAL Recursos naturales e infraestructura. Santiago de Chile: Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe CEPAL, 1999.
- DPA. *CONACAMI President Denounces State Political Persecution* Lima: Mines and Communities, 2005.  
<http://www.minesandcommunities.org/article.php?a=5760>.

- Dworkin, Ronald. "In Defense of Equality." *Social Philosophy & Policy* I (1983): 24-40.
- . "Liberalism." In *Public and Private Morality*, edited by Stuart Hampshire. 113-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- . *Taking Rights Seriously*. London: Duckworth, 1977.
- . "What is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 4 (fall 1981): 283-345.
- . "What is Equality? Part I: Equality of Welfare." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (summer 1981): 185-246.
- Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional. "Declaración de la Selva Lacandona." <http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/>.
- El Economista. "Surge grupo indígena miskito separatista en Caribe de Nicaragua." In, (2009).  
<http://ecodiario.eleconomista.es/internacional/noticias/181335/04/09/Surge-grupo-indigena-miskito-separatista-en-Caribe-de-Nicaragua.html>
- Elazar, Daniel Judah. *Constitutionalizing Globalization: the Postmodern Revival of Confederal Arrangements*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998.
- . *Exploring Federalism*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1987.
- Elizondo, Guillermo. "Carta de la Organización BRIBRIPA KANEBLÓ a los Diputados." In, letter addressed to Congress, (2010).  
<http://costaricahoy.info/opinion/foro/carta-de-la-organizacion-indigena-bribripa-kaneblo-a-los-diputados/58512/>.
- Equipo Envío. "The Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua." *Envío Digital*, September 1981.
- Escárcega, Sylvia. "Authenticating Strategic Essentialisms: The Politics of Indigenousness at the United Nations." *Cultural Dynamics* 22, no. 1 (2010): 3-28.
- Exquemelin, Alexandre O. *The Buccaneers of America, translated by Alexis Brown*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969. 1678.
- Fafoutis, Dean. "Clayton-Bulwer Treaty." In *Britain and the Americas: culture, politics, and history*, edited by Will Kaufman and Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson. 229-30. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO Inc, 2005.
- Falk, Richard. "The Right of Self-Determination under International Law: The Coherence of Doctrine versus the Incoherence of Experience." In *Self-Determination and Self-Administration: A Sourcebook*, edited by Wolfgang Danspeckgruber and Sir Arthur Watts. 47-63. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Federación de Comunidades Nativas de la Provincia de Purus. "VII Congreso Ordinario de FECONAPU." 1-14. Comunidad

- Nativa Nueva Esperanza: Agencia de Prensa Ambiental, 2012.
- Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes. "Programas Territorio." Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes,  
<http://www.fenamad.org.pe/programas/territorio/>.
- . "Quiénes Somos: Historia." Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes,  
<http://www.fenamad.org.pe/quienes-somos/historia/>.
- Fédération des Organisations Autochtones de Guyane (FOAG). "Declaration on Collective Rights." In *Commission for Human Rights Intersession of the Working Group on the United Nations' Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Awala-Yalimapo: Fédération des Organisations Autochtones de Guyane (FOAG), 2002.
- Fenelon, James V., and Thomas D. Hall. "Revitalization and Indigenous Resistance to Globalization and Neoliberalism ". *American Behavioral Scientist* 51, no. 12 (August 2008 2008): 1867-901.
- Fernández, Miguel Calderón, and Gerardo Rojas Solano. "Costa Rica y la Autonomía de los Pueblos Indígenas." 1-5: Universidad de Aquino Bolivia.
- Field, Les W. "To Die in This Way: Nicaraguan Indians and the Myth of Mestizaje." *Rural Sociology* 65, no. 2 (2000): 348-51.
- . "Who are the Indians? Reconceptualizing Indigenous Identity, Resistance, and the Role of Social Science in Latin America." *Latin American Research Review* 29, no. 3 (1994): 237-48.
- Fischer, Edward. "Beyond Victimization: Maya Movements in Post-War Guatemala." In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc. Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.
- Fitzgerald, Timothy. *The Ideology of Religious Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Floyd, Troy S. *The Anglo-Spanish Struggle for Mosquitia*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1967.
- Foro Escandinavo por los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas. "Uso estratégico de la pregunta 26 del CENSO 2012." In, (2012).  
<http://www.mapuche.info/?kat=4&sida=3085>.
- Frente de Defensa Ambiental de Cajamarca, Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, Confederación Nacional de Comunidades del Perú Afectadas por la Minería, and Confederación Nacional Agraria. "Declaración de la Asamblea Nacional de los Pueblos del Perú y el Tahuantinsuyo." Cajamarca: Confederación Nacional de Comunidades Afectadas por la Minería, 2012.
- . "Declaración de Lima de la II Asamblea Nacional de los Pueblos del Perú y el Tahuantinsuyo." Lima: Minga Informativa de Movimientos Sociales, 2012.

- Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas. "Proyecto de Ley de Desarrollo Autónomo no. 14.352." Servicio Paz y Justicia en Costa Rica,  
[http://frenapi.serpajcostarica.org/blog/?page\\_id=115](http://frenapi.serpajcostarica.org/blog/?page_id=115).
- Fundación para la Autonomía y el Desarrollo de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua. "Regiones Autónomas de Nicaragua."  
<http://www.fadcanic.org.ni/?q=es/node/18>.
- Gabbert, Wolfgang. "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?". In *National Integration and Contested Autonomy: the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua*, edited by Luciano Baracco. 11-38. New York: Algora Publishing, 2011.
- . "The Kingdom of Mosquitia and the Mosquito Reservation: Precursors of Indian Autonomy?". In *National Integration and Contested Autonomy*, edited by Luciano Baracco. 24-57. New York: Algora Publishing, 2011.
- Gaitan-Barrera, Alejandra. "Coordinadora Arauco Malleco: recovering pre-colonial autonomy in Wallmapu." In, *Intercontinental Cry* opinion, (2014). Published electronically 1st of October.  
<https://intercontinentalcry.org/recovering-pre-colonial-autonomy-wallmapu-25677/>.
- Gaitán-Barrera, Alejandra, and Govand Azeez. "Epistemological Blindness or Violence: Liberal Multiculturalism and the Indigenous Quest for Autonomy." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 36, no. 2 (2015): 184-201.
- Galeana, Patricia. *El tratado McLane-Ocampo: la comunicación interoceánica y el libre comercio*. México Distrito Federal: Editorial Porrúa, 2006.
- Garay, Luis Jorge. *Colombia: estructura industrial e internacionalización 1967-1996*. Biblioteca Virtual del Banco de la República, 2004.
- García, María Elena, and José Antonio Lucero. "Un País Sin Indígenas? Rethinking Indigenous Politics in Peru." In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.
- García-Aguilar, José Luis. "The Autonomy and Democracy of Indigenous Peoples in Canada and Mexico." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 565, no. september (1999): 79-90.
- García-Babini, Salvador, and Juan Carlos Ocampo-Zamora. "The Caribbean Coast: Independence or Desperation?" In, no. 340 (2009). Published electronically November 2009.  
<http://www.envio.org.ni/articulo/4097>.
- García-Linera, Álvaro. "El desencuentro de dos razones revolucionarias Indianismo y Marxismo." *Revista Barataria*, no. 2 (Marzo-Abril 2005 2005).
- Garth, José. "Tranques en Bilwi por tierras." In, (2012). Published electronically 20 of July 2012.

- <http://www.laprensa.com.ni/2012/07/20/departamentales/109265-tranques-bilwi-tierras>.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Godrej, Farah. "Towards a Cosmopolitan Political Thought: The Hermeneutics of Interpreting the Other." *Polity* 41, no. 2 (April 2009): 135-65.
- González, Miguel. "Autonomías territoriales indígenas y regímenes autonómicos (desde el Estado) en América Latina." In *La Autonomía a Debate: Autogobierno indígena y Estado plurinacional en América Latina*, edited by Miguel González, Araceli Burguete Cal y Mayor and Pablo Ortiz-T. 35-62. Quito: FLACSO.
- González, Nila Leal. "Derechos territoriales indígenas en Venezuela y la geopolítica institucional." *Cuestiones Políticas* 22, no. 37 (December 2006 2006): 198-217.
- Gotkowitz, Laura. *A Revolution for Our Rights*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Gow, David D, and Joanne Rappaport. "The Indigenous Public Voice: The Multiple Idioms of Modernity in Native Cauca." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Grandin, Greg. *The Empire of necessity: Slavery, Freedom, and Deception in the New World*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2014.
- Guha, Ranajit. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." In *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asia History and Society*, edited by Ranajit Guha. 1-8. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Gustafson, Bret. "Amid Gas, Where Is the Revolution?". *NACLA Report on the Americas* 46, no. 1 (2013): 61-66.
- . "Manipulating Cartographies: Plurinationalism, Autonomy and Indigenous Resurgence in Bolivia." *Anthropological Quarterly* 82, no. 4 (2009): 985-1016.
- . "Paradoxes of liberal indigenism: Indigenous movements, state processes and intercultural reform in Bolivia." In *The Politics of Ethnicity: Indigenous Peoples in Latin American States*, edited by David Maybury-Lewis. 267-306. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Gužauskytė, Evelina. *Christopher Columbus's naming in the diarios of the four voyages (1492-1504)*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.
- Habermas, Jürgen. "Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State." In *Multiculturalism*, edited by Amy Gutmann. 107-48. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- . "Three Normative Models of Democracy." *Constellations* 1, no. 1 (1994): 2-10.
- Hale, Charles R. "Activist Research v. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of Politically Engaged

- Anthropology." *Cultural Anthropology* 21, no. 1 (2006): 96-120.
- . "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34, no. 3 (2002): 485-524.
- , ed. *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- . "Introduction." In *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, edited by Charles R. Hale. 1-28. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- . *Más Que Un Indio: Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 2006.
- . "Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America." *Polar* 28, no. 1 (2005): 10-28.
- . "The Nicaraguan Mosquitia in Historical Documents, 1844-1927: The Dynamics of Ethnic and Regional History by Eleonore Von Oertzen; Lioba Rossbach; Volker Wunderich." *American Ethnologist* 20, no. 3 (1993): 663-64.
- . *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan state, 1894-1987*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- . "Resistencia para que? Territory, autonomy and neoliberal entanglements in the 'empty spaces' of Central America." *Economy and Society* 40, no. 2 (2011): 184-210.
- . "Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the "Indio Permitido"." *North American Congress on Latin America Report* 38, no. 2 (2004): 16-21.
- . ""Wan Tasbaya Dukiara": Contested Notions of Land Rights in Miskitu History." In *Remapping Memory: The Politics of TimeSpace*, edited by Jonathan Boyarin. 67-98. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- . "What is activist research?". *Social Science Research Council* 2, no. 1-2 (2001): 12-15.
- Hale, Charles R., Edmund T. Gordon, and Galio C. Gurdian. "Rights, Resources and the Social Memory of Struggle: Reflections on a Study of Indigenous and Black Community Land Rights on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast." *Human Organization* 62, no. 2 (2003): 369-81.
- Hannum, Hurst. *Autonomy, Sovereignty, and Self-Determination: the Accommodation of Conflicting Rights*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Hannum, Hurst, and Richard B. Lillich. "The Concept of Autonomy in International Law." *The American Journal of International Law* 74, no. 4 (1980): 858-89.
- Hanson, Anne-Marie. "Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate edited by Mabel Morana, Enrique

- Dussel and Carlos A. Jauregui Twenty Theses on Politics by Enrique Dussel." *Antipode* 43, no. 5 (1 of November 2011).
- Harris, Olivia. *Economía Étnica*. La Paz: Editorial Hisbol, 1987.
- Helms, Mary W. "Of Kings and Contexts: Ethnohistorical Interpretations of Miskito Political Structure and Function." *American Ethnologist* 13, no. 3 (1986): 506-23.
- Herlihy, Laura Hobson. "The Mermaid and the Lobster Diver: Gender and Ethnic Identities among the Río Plátano Miskito Peoples." University of Kansas, 2002.
- Hernández, Isabel. *Autonomía o Ciudadanía Incompleta: El Pueblo Mapuche en Chile y Argentina*. Santiago: Pehuén Editores, 2003.
- Hiddleston, Jane. *Understanding Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Historiadores. "Cuarta declaración de historiadores respecto de la cuestión nacional mapuche." In *Rebelión en Wallmapue: Resistencia del Pueblo-Nación Mapuche*, edited by Le Monde Diplomatique. 17-19. Santiago: Editorial Aún Creemos en los Sueños, 2013.
- Hooker, Ray. "Autonomy: What it is and isn't." *URACCAN Update*, 18 of March 1998 1998.
- Horowitz, Donald L. "The alternative vote and interethnic moderation: A reply to Fraenkel and Grofman." *Public Coice* 121 (2004): 507-16.
- Hristov, Jasmin. "Indigenous Struggles for Land and Culture in Cauca, Colombia." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 32, no. 1 (2005): 88-117.
- Huarachi, Simón Yampara, Maribel Chipana Pacoricona, Aurelio Alvarado Alvarado, Teófilo Laymi Ticona, and Irma Onofre Cuevas. political statement, 13 of July 2011.
- Huilcamán, Aucán. 28 of June 2012.
- . *Discurso del Representante Mapuche en las Naciones Unidas*. Foro Permanente de los Pueblos Indígenas, 2012.
- Human Rights Watch. "Undue process: terrorism trials, military courts, and the Mapuche in southern Chile." In *Human Rights Watch*, 2004.
- Huntington, Patricia. "Challenging the colonial contract: The Zapatistas' insurgent imagination." *Rethinking Marxism* 12, no. 3 (2000): 58-80.
- Instituto de Investigaciones de la Amazonía Peruana. "Ámbito de Acción." Instituto de Investigaciones de la Amazonía Peruana, <http://www.iiap.org.pe/IIAPinfo.aspx>.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas. "Bolivia: características socio demográficas de la población indígena." La Paz: Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas, 2003.
- International Labour Organisation. "Activities by region: Latin America." International Labour Organisation, [http://www.ilo.org/indigenous/Activitiesbyregion/LatinA\\_merica/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/indigenous/Activitiesbyregion/LatinA_merica/lang--en/index.htm).
- . "C19 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples." <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/ratifcs.pl?C169>.

- . "C107 Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention, 1957." Geneva: ILO, 1957.
- . "C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989." ILO, <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/convde.pl?C169>.
- Irving, Washington. *The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. Vol. II, New York: G.P. Putnam and Son, 1868.
- IX Asamblea General de Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Étnicas. "Por la Tierra, la Naturaleza, la Vida y el Futuro." Organización Pueblo Indio, 1998.
- Jackson, Jean E. "Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. 81-122. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- . "Neoliberal Multiculturalism and Indigenous Movements." *Latin American Research Review* 44, no. 3 (2009): 200-11.
- Jimenez-Altamirano, Isabel. *Indigenous Encounters with Neoliberalism: Place, Women and the Environment in Canada and Mexico*. Vancouver: UCB Press, 2013.
- Joseph, Don Domingo, ed. *Compendio de la Historia Geográfica, Natural y Civil del Reyno de Chile Escrito en Italiano por el Abate Don Juan Ignacio Molina*. Madrid, 1788.
- Kingsbury, Benedict. "Self-Determination and "Indigenous Peoples"." *American Society of International Law* 86, no. 1-4 (April 1992): 383-97.
- Kinna, Ruth. *Anarchism*. New York: Oneworld Publications, 2005.
- Koppen, Barbara van, Mark Giordano, and John Butterworth, eds. *Community-based water law and water resource management reform in developing countries*. Cambridge: CAB International, 2007.
- Krotz, Esteban. "Reseña de "Política para la Reinvindicación de los Mayas de Hoy: Fundamento de los Derechos Específicos del Pueblo Maya" de Demetrio Cojticuxil." *Revista Nueva Antropología* XVI, no. 054 (1998): 135-38.
- Kymlicka, Will. "American Multiculturalism and the 'Nations Within'." Chap. 12 In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, edited by Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton and Will Sanders. 216-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . "Being Canadian." *Government and Opposition* 38, no. 3 (July 2003): 357-85.
- . *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- . *Multicultural Citizenship* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- . *Politics in the Vernacular*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- , ed. *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

- . "Toleration and Its Limits ". In *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, edited by Will Kymlicka. 152-72. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- La Asociación Nacional Indígena Salvadoreña. "Background Information." [http://members.tripod.com/~anis\\_usa/page4.html](http://members.tripod.com/~anis_usa/page4.html).
- La Brújula Semanal. *Entrevista con el Wihta Tara sobre la independencia de La Moskitia*. 2009.
- La Chispa, and Héctor Llaitul. "Héctor Llaitul: "Nuestra Lucha es necesariamente anti-capitalista, si no es imposible la reivindicación de lo propio"." WEFTUN Voz Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, <http://weftun.org/ENTREVISTAS/lachispa2012.html>.
- La Jornada, and Canal Seis de Julio. *Crónica de una Rebelión*. Ciudad de México, 2003. documentary.
- Lara, Horacio. *Crónica de la Araucanía* Santiago: Imprenta de El Progreso, 1889.
- Lara, Rafael. "Siguen reclamando en nombre de la Moskitia." *El Nuevo Diario*, 2011.
- . "Siguen reclamando en nombre de la Moskitia." *El Nuevo Diario Nicaragua*, 22 of September 2011 2011.
- Lefinao, Julio Paillalef. *Los Mapuche y el Proceso que los Convirtió en Indios: Psicología de la Discriminación*. Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, 2003.
- Léger, Marie. "Regional Autonomy on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast." In *Aboriginal peoples: toward self-government* edited by Marie Léger. 40-63. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1994.
- Leis, Raúl. "What are the comarcas for?" In, 11, no. 19 (2005). [http://www.thepanamanews.com/pn/v\\_11/issue\\_19/opinion\\_02.html](http://www.thepanamanews.com/pn/v_11/issue_19/opinion_02.html).
- Leiva, Arturo. *El primer avance a la Araucanía: Angol 1862*. Temuco: Ediciones Universidad de la Frontera Temuco, 1984.
- Lenman, Bruce P. *Britain's Colonial Wars 1688-1783*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Lijphart, Arend. "Consociation and Federation: Conceptual and Empirical Links." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 12, no. 3 (September 1979): 499-515.
- . "Constitutional Design for Divided Societies." *Journal of Democracy* 15, no. 2 (April 2004): 96-109.
- . *Democracy in Plural Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.
- . "The Wave of Power-Sharing Democracy." Chap. 2 In *The Architecture of Democracy*, edited by Andrew Reynolds. 37-54. London: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lima-Chávez, Constantino. "Vigencia y perspectiva indianista." In *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización. Katarismo e Indianismo en el proceso político del MAS en Bolivia*. La Paz, 2010.

- Linera, Álvaro García. *La potencia plebeya: acción colectiva e identidades indígenas, obreras y populares en Bolivia*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2008.
- Linnekin, Jocelyn. "Cultural Invention and the Dilemma of Authenticity." *American Anthropologist* 93, no. 2 (1991): 446-49.
- Llaitul-Carrillanca, Héctor. "Ante las Medidas Estatales la Lucha por el Territorio y la Autonomía." Concepción: Presos Políticos Mapuche CAM Wican, 2014.
- . "El Pensamiento Emancipatorio de la Coordinadora Arauco Malleco: una estrategia de Liberación Nacional." edited by Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, 1-70. Concepción, 2013.
- Llaitul-Carrillanca, Héctor, and Jorge Arrate, eds. *Weichan: Conversaciones con un weyche en la prisión política*. Santiago: Ceibo Ediciones, 2012.
- Llanquileo-Pilquimán, Ramón. "La Disputa del Fundo El Canelo." El Manzano Concepción: Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco Malleco, 2014.
- López, Fermín. "Consejo de Ancianos declara independencia de Costa Caribe." *El Nuevo Diario*, 2009.
- . "En lo que devino Asamblea de Pueblos Indígenas: Consejo de Ancianos declara independencia de Costa Caribe." In, *El Nuevo Diario* (2009). Published electronically 19 of April 2009.  
<http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/nacionales/45639-consejo-ancianos-declara-independencia-costa-carib/>.
- . "Estalla violencia en Puerto Cabezas." In, *El Nuevo Diario* (2009). Published electronically 19 of October 2009.  
<http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/nacionales/59739-estalla-violencia-puerto-cabezas/>.
- López, Horacio. "El Caso de Mosquitia: Del Protectorado al intento de secesión." In, (2009). Published electronically 20 of August.  
<http://www.centrocultural.coop/blogs/nuestramERICANOS/2009/08/20/el-caso-de-mosquitia-del-protectorado-al-intento-de-secesion/>.
- López, Horacio A. "El Caso de Mosquitia: Del Protectorado al intento de secesión." In, (2009). Published electronically 20 of August.  
<http://www.centrocultural.coop/blogs/nuestramERICANOS/2009/08/20/el-caso-de-mosquitia-del-protectorado-al-intento-de-secesion/>.
- Los Pueblos de Abya Yala. "Declaración del Encuentro Continental de los Pueblos de Abya Yala por el Agua y la Pachamama." Confederación de Nacionalidad Indígenas del Ecuador,  
<http://www.coniae.org/component/content/article/3-notis3/444-declaracion-del-encuentro-continental-de-los-pueblos-de-abya-yala-por-el-agua-y-la-pachamama->.
- Lovera, Don Pedro Mariño de. *Colección de Historiadores de Chile y Documentos Relativos a la Historia Nacional Tomo VI*.

- Crónica del Reino de Chile, escrita por el Capital Don Pedro Mariño de Lovera.* Santiago: Imprenta del Ferrocarril 1865.
- Lucero, José Antonio. "Locating the 'Indian Problem': Community, Nationality and Contradiction in Ecuadorian Indigenous Politics." *Latin American Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2003): 23-48.
- . "The Paradoxes of Indigenous Politics." *Americas Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (2011): 44-47.
- . "Representing "Real Indians": The Challenges of Indigenous Authenticity and Strategic Constructivism in Ecuador and Bolivia." *Latin American Research Review* 41, no. 2 (2006): 31-56.
- Macionis, John, and Ken Plummer. *Sociology: A Global Introduction*. Second Edition ed. London: Pearson Education Limited, 2002.
- Macusaya, Carlos. "El reconocimiento de lo plurinacional dentro de los límites de la dominación colonial." Movimiento Indianista Katarista, <http://movimientoindianistakatarista.blogspot.com.au/2011/07/el-reconocimiento-de-lo-plurinacional.html>.
- Makaran-Kubis, Gaya. "El nacionalismo étnico en los Andes: el caso de los aymaras bolivianos." *Revista de Estudios Latinoamericanos Latinoamérica*, no. 49 (2009): 35-78.
- Mann, Michael. *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Mapuexpress. "Tratado de Tapihue: El reconocimiento de la independencia de la Nación Mapuche." In, (2010). Published electronically 28 of December. <http://paismapuche.org/?p=2742>.
- Marcel, Valerie. "The Constructivist Debate; Bringin Hermeneutics (Properly) In." 1-20. Paris: Institut d'études politiques de Paris, 2001.
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. "V Declaración de la Selva Lacandona." <http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/>.
- Martínez-Sánchez, Francisco. "El Primer Partido Político Indígena en México." *Derecho y Cultura* enero-abril, no. 13 (2004): 103-16.
- Mattiace, Shannan L. "Representation and Rights: Recent Scholarship on Social Movements in Latin America." *Latin American Research Review* 40, no. 1 (2005): 237-50.
- Mauceri, Philip. "Internationalization as an Explanation? The Development of Ethnic Conflict in Latin America." In *Ethnic Conflict and International Politics: Explaining Diffusion and Escalation*, edited by Steven E Lobell and Philip Mauceri. 95-110. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Mayor Ana María. "Discurso inaugural de la mayor Ana María en el Encuentro Intercontinental 'Por la humanidad y contra el neoliberalismo'." *Chiapas*, 1996, 102-03.
- McWhinney, Edward. "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples." United

- Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law,  
[http://untreaty.un.org/cod/avl/pdf/ha/dicc/dicc\\_e.pdf](http://untreaty.un.org/cod/avl/pdf/ha/dicc/dicc_e.pdf).
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.
- "Mensaje del General J. Santos Zelaya al Congreso." Managua, 1904.
- Mesa Nacional Indígena de Costa Rica, Fundación Para La Paz Y La Democracia, and Fundación para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos en Centroamérica. *Video documental sobre el Proyecto de Ley de Desarrollo Autónomo de los Pueblos Indígenas y la necesidad de que sea aprobado en la Asamblea Legislativa de Costa Rica*. San José: Consejo Indígena de Centro América, 2007. Documentary.
- Mignolo, Walter. "La revolución teórica del Zapatismo: sus consecuencias históricas, éticas y políticas." *Orbis Tertius* 2, no. 5 (1997): 63-81.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Considerations on Representative Government*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1869.
- Miller, Russell A. "Collective Discursive Democracy as Indigenous Right to Self-Determination." *American Indian Law Review* 31, no. 2 (2007): 341-73.
- Ministerio de Agricultura de Chile. "Decreto Ley 2568 Modifica Ley no. 17 729 sobre Protección de Indígenas y Radica Funciones del Instituto de Desarrollo Indígena en el Instituto de Desarrollo Agropecuario." edited by Ministerio de Agricultura: Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile, 1979.
- Minorities at Risk Project. "Assessment for Indigenous Peoples in Chile." 1-4: The United Nations Refugee Agency, 2003.
- . "Chronology Indigenous Peoples in Chile." 1-5: The UN Refugee Agency, 2004.
- Minority Rights Group International. "World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples - Honduras: Lenca, Miskitu, Tawahka, Pech, Maya, Chortis and Xicaque."  
<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,MRGI,,HND,,49749d15c,0.html>.
- . "World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples - Suriname : Overview."  
<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/publisher,MRGL,SUR,4954ce5523,0.html>.
- . "World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples- French Guiana "  
<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,,GUF,,4954ce0d23,0.html>.
- Mitnick, Gilda Waldman. "Chile: indígenas y mestizos negados." *Política y Cultura*, no. 21 (2004): 97-110.
- Molina, Avelino Cox. "El mundo de los Isigni (espíritus) y las fuerzas negativas frente a los tres agentes principales de la salud en las comunidades miskitas."  
<http://www.manfut.org/RAAN/sukia.html>.

- Montejo, Victor. "The Multiplicity of Mayan Voices: Mayan Leadership and the Politics of Self-Representation." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. 123-48. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Montesquieu, Charles de. "The Spirit of Laws." 439. London: William Benton Publisher, 1956.
- Morris, Glenn. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place - Left-Wing Revolution, Right-Wing Reaction and the Destruction of Indigenous Peoples." *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, no. 11.3 (1987).
- Movimiento Autonomista Pluriétnico de la Costa Caribe de Nicaragua. "Carta Abierta al Presidente Daniel Ortega (La autonomía regional costeña)." In, (2011).  
<http://elcorreonicaraguense.blogspot.com/2011/03/carta-abierta-al-presidente-daniel.html>.
- Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik-Nuevo País. "Plan de Gobierno Democrático del Estado Plurinacional: Iniciar lo Irreversible." Quito: Coordinador Nacional del MUPP-NP, 2006.
- Movimiento Indianista Katarista. "Somos Millones 1781;2009." Movimiento Indianista Katarista,  
<http://movimientoindianistakatarista.blogspot.com.au/search/label/Pronunciamientos>.
- Munoz, Luis Campos. "Chile's Mapuche: Not yet 'pacified'." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 37, no. 1 (July/August 2003).
- Navarrete, Federico. "El Mestizaje y las Culturas Nacionales." Programa Universitario México Nacion Multicultural-UNAM,  
<http://www.nacionmulticultural.unam.mx/Portal/Izquierdo/BANCO/Mxmulticultural/Elmestizajeylasculturas-elmestizaje.html>.
- Neri, Jaime Corisepa. "Bienvenidos." Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes,  
<http://fenamad.org.pe/saludos.php>.
- Ngati Apa. "About Us."  
[http://www.ngatiapa.iwi.nz/About/about\\_us.htm](http://www.ngatiapa.iwi.nz/About/about_us.htm).
- "Nicaragua Indigenous Protests Include Kidnapping." In, *Newsroom Panama* (2012). Published electronically 1st of March 2012.  
<http://www.newsroompanama.com/index.php/news/latin-america/nicaragua-indigenous-protests-include-kidnapping>
- Nichols, Elizabeth Gackstetter, and Kimberly J Morse. *Venezuela*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2010.
- Norman, Wayne. "Citizenship in Culturally Diverse Societies: Issues, Contexts, Concepts." In *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, edited by Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. 1-42. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Noticias Net. "En asamblea comunitaria, el MULT acuerda separarse del PUP." In, *Noticias Net* (2012).

<http://www.noticiasnet.mx/portal/blogs/epidiaz/20141216/asamblea-comunitaria-mult-acuerda-separarse-del-pup>.

Oertzen, Eleonore von. "Protestantism and Ethnic Identity: Moravian Missionaries on the Nicaraguan Coast in the 19th Century." *Cuadernos de Antropología*, no. 15 (2005): 45-52.

Oertzen, Eleonore von, Lioba Rossbach, and Volker Wunderich, eds. *The Nicaraguan Mosquitia in historical documents, 1844-1927: the dynamics of ethnic and regional history*. Berlin: D Reimer, 1990.

Offen, Karl H. "The Territorial Turn: Making Black Territories in Pacific Colombia." *Journal of Latin American Geography* 2, no. 1 (2003): 43-73.

Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism United States Department of State. "Country Reports on Terrorism 2011-Chile." United States Department of State, 2012.

Oficina de la Agencia de las Naciones Unidas para los Refugiados en Colombia. "Colombia, desplazamiento indígena y política pública: paradoja del reconocimiento." 2-20. San José, 2006.

Olien, Michael D. "The Miskito Kings and the Line of Succession." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 39, no. 2 (1983): 198-241.

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación la Ciencia y la Cultura. "Registro de América Latina y el Caribe de Memoria del Mundo de la UNESCO reconoce documentos sobre historia del pueblo mapuche." Santiago: UNESCO Office in Santiago, 2013.

Organización Fraternal Negra Hondureña, Consejo de Organizaciones Populares e Indígenas en Honduras, Alianza Verde, and Representantes del Pueblos Pech. "Declaración de la Asamblea de Pueblos Indígenas y Negros de Honduras."

[http://servindi.org/pdf/declaracion\\_pueblo\\_honduras.pdf](http://servindi.org/pdf/declaracion_pueblo_honduras.pdf).

Organización Internacional del Trabajo. "El Trabajo Decente en la Industria Forestal en Chile." Santiago: Organización Internacional del Trabajo, 2012.

Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia. "Sobre Nosotros: Misión, Visión, Estructura."

[http://www.onic.org.co/sobrenos\\_n.shtml](http://www.onic.org.co/sobrenos_n.shtml).

Organización Zonal Indígena del Putumayo. "Nuestro Pensamiento: de los Conceptos y Principios Rectores." Organización Zonal Indígena del Putumayo,  
[http://ozip.org.co/sitio/?page\\_id=67](http://ozip.org.co/sitio/?page_id=67).

Órganos de Resistencia Territorial ORT-CAM. "20 Octubre 2009 Comunicado Público Coordinadora Mapuche Arauco Malleco." In, (2009).

<http://www.askapena.org/?q=es/node/597>.

—. "Declaración de autonomía y guerra al Estado chileno." La Jornada México,

<http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2009/11/16/oha151-declaracionmapuche.html>.

Oscar Hodgson-Arguello. "La soberanía de la moskitia un desafío a la doctrina occidental." *El Nuevo Diario Nicaragua*, 8 of June 2010.

Pagden, Anthony, ed. *Hernan Cortes: Letters from Mexico*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco. "Aclarando verdades y mentiras sobre la CAM, entrevista realizada por Weftun a Jose Llanquilef, dirigente de nuestra organización." Página Oficial de la Coordinadora de Comunidades en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, <http://www.nodo50.org/weftun/>.

———. "Conversaciones en Torno a las Movilizaciones del Pueblo Mapuche." Weftun: Voz de la Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto, <http://www.nodo50.org/weftun/>.

———. "Inchin Taiñ Dugu." In *Weftun Página Oficial CAM*, edited by Coordinadora de Comunidades Mapuche en Conflicto Arauco-Malleco, 2003.

Painel-Seguel, Vicente. "Consideraciones acerca del Nguillatun." In, no. december (2009).

Pairicán, Fernando. "El Pensamiento Mapuche sí expresa la diversidad." In, *CARCAJ Flechas de Sentido* (2012). Published electronically 31 of July.

<http://www.carcaj.cl/2012/07/el-pensamiento-mapuche-si-expresa-la-diversidad/>.

———. "Sembrando ideología: el Aukiñ Wallmapu Ngulam en la transición de Aylwin (1990-1994)." *SudHistoria* enero-junio, no. 4 (2012): 12-42.

———. "Ser Machi encarcelado en Chile." *The Clinic*, 30 of May 2013.

Pairicán, Fernando, and Rolando Álvarez. "La Nueva Guerra de Arauco: la Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco y los nuevos movimientos de resistencia mapuche en el Chile de la Concertación." *Revista Izquierdas Chile*, 10 of August 2011, 66-84.

Pais Mapuche. "Wente Winkul Mapu: "Al Estado le preocupe que levantemos nuestra bandera de dignidad y le digamos que éste es territorio mapuche"." In, (2012).

<http://paismapuche.org/?p=4138>.

Pallares, Amalia. *From peasant struggles to Indian resistance: the Ecuadorian Andes in the late twentieth century*. University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

Parekh, Bhikhu C. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.

Partido Autonomista Mapuche Wallmapuwen. "Preguntas Frecuentes." Partido Autonomista Mapuche Wallmapuwen, <http://www.wallmapuwen.net/preguntas-frecuentes-2/>.

- Pavković, Aleksandar, and Peter Radan. *Creating New States: Theory and Practice of Secession*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Peña, Guillermo de la. "Social Citizenship, Ethnic Minority Demands, Human Rights and Neoliberal Paradoxes: A Case Study in Western Mexico." In *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy*, edited by Rachel Sieder. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Periódico La Tercera. *Aucan Huilcaman entrega carta en La Moneda*. Santiago de Chile, 2010. Interview.
- Perry, J.H. *The Spanish Seaborne Empire*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's political leader, Héctor Llaitul-Carrillanca." Concepción, 2013.
- "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with CAM's weichafe Ramón Llanquileo Pilquimán." El Manzano Concepción, 2013.
- "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán Barrera with Mapuche Political Prisoners' Representative Guacolda Chicahual." Santiago, 2013.
- "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader and legal advisor to the Council of Elders Oscar Hodgson." 2013.
- "Personal interview by Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera with Miskitu leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams." Bilwi, 2013.
- "Personal interview by the author with Miskito leader, the Wihta Tara, Héctor Williams." Bilwi, 2012.
- Petas, James, and Henry Veltmeyer. *What's left in Latin America?: regime change in new times*. Abingdon: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2009.
- Phillips, Anne. *Democracy and Difference*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- Pineda, Baron L. "Creole Neighborhood or Miskito Community?: A Case Study of Identity Politics in a Mosquito Coast Land Dispute." *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 6, no. 1 (2001): 120-55.
- Pineda, Baron L. *Shipwrecked Identities: Navigating Race on Nicaragua's Mosquito Coast*. second ed. New Brunswick Rutgers University Press, 2006. 1967.
- Planas, Roque. "Chile's Mapuches Call for Regional Autonomy." In, (2009). <https://nacla.org/node/6115>.
- Pletcher, David M. *Diplomacy of Trade and Investment: American Economic Expansion in the Hemisphere 1865-1900*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1998.
- Portugal-Mollinedo, Pedro. "Condiciones para una verdadera descolonización." In *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización. Katarismo e Indianismo en el proceso político del MAS en Bolivia*. La Paz, 2010.

- . "Descolonización y Revolución India en la obra de Fausto Reinaga." *Periódico Pukara*, 7 of November 2007 2007.
- Posern-Zielinski, Aleksander. "Book Review: El Palin. Juego Tradicional de la cultura mapuhe." *Studies in Physical Culture and Tourism* 19, no. 1 (2012): 50-53.
- Postero, Nancy Grey. "Articulations and Fragmentations: Indigenous Politics in Bolivia." In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.
- . *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Postero, Nancy Grey, and Leon Zamosc. "Indigenous Movements and the Indian Question in Latin America." In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc. 1-31. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.
- . *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.
- Prado, José Nuñez del. *Economías Indígenas: Estados del arte desde Bolivia y la economía política*. La Paz: Nuevo Periodismo Editores
- Ciencias del Desarrollo de la Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, 2009.
- Prensa Lafkenche. "Quiénes Somos." Identidad Lafkenche, [http://www.identidadlafkenche.cl/laf/?page\\_id=2](http://www.identidadlafkenche.cl/laf/?page_id=2).
- Presidência da República. "Decreto de 15 de Abril de 2005. Homologa a demarcação administrativa da Terra Indígena Raposa Serra do Sol, localizada nos Municípios de Normandia, Pacaraima e Uiramutã, no Estado de Roraima.", edited by Presidência da República Casa Civil Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Brasilia, 2005.
- Presidencia de la República. "Acuerdos de San Andrés." 1996.
- . "Reglamento de la Ley de Comunidades Nativas y de Desarrollo Agrario de las Regiones de Selva y Ceja de Selva Decreto de Ley No. 22175." edited by Presidencia de la República. Lima, 1978.
- Presidencia de la República, and Asamblea Nacional de la Republica de Nicaragua. "Ley 28: Estatuto de la Autonomía de las Regiones de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua." edited by Asamblea Nacional de la República de Nicaragua. Managua: La Gaceta Diario Oficial de la Federación, 1987.
- Presidencia de la República, and Ministro de Educación Pública. "Decreto 22072 Crea el Subsistema de Educación Indígena." edited by Presidencia de la República and Ministro de Educación Pública. San José: Inter-American Development Bank, 1993.
- Quemenado, Pablo Marimán. *Parlamento y Territorio Mapuche*. Concepción: Ediciones Escaparate, 2002.

- Quijano, Aníbal. "The challenge of the "indigenous movement" in Latin America." *Socialism and Democracy* 19, no. 3 (2005): 55-78.
- Quispe, María Teresa. *Venezuela: Gobiernos Locales y Pueblos Indígenas*. Puerto Ayacucho: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2005.
- R., Bernardo O'Higgins. 13 of March 1819.
- Radio Fides. *Resumen del Conflicto TIPNIS*. La Paz: Bolivia Exterior Bolivia y el Mundo, 2011.
- Radio Insurgente. *Audios del Tercer Encuentro de los Pueblos Zapatistas con los Pueblos del Mundo "La Comandanta Ramona y las Zapatistas"*. Caracol de la Garrucha: Radio Producciones Insurgente, 2008.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita. "Cutting through State and Class: Sources and Strategies of Self-Representation in Latin America." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Ramos, Clemente. "Los ciclos del Movimiento Indianista Katarista." In *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización*. La Paz, 2010.
- Rangel, Marc. *Memories of Mosquitia*. Xlibris Corporation, 2009.
- Rawls, John. "Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory: The Dewey Lectures 1980." *Journal of Philosophy* 77 (1980): 515-72.
- . "Social Unity and Primary Goods." In *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, edited by Amartya Sen and Bernard Williams. 159-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . *A Theory of Justice*. Boston: President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1971.
- Reinaga, Fausto. *El Indio y el Cholaje Boliviano: proceso a Fernando Diez de Medina*. Ediciones PIAKK, 1964.
- . *Tesis India*. La Paz 1971.
- Reino Unido de la Gran Bretaña e Irlanda, and República de Nicaragua. "Tratado de Managua." edited by Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores. Londres: La Gaceta, 1860.
- República de Nicaragua, and Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña. "Tratado Harrison-Altamirano." edited by Asamblea Nacional Legislativa, 4. Londres: La Gaceta Oficial, 1906.
- Rice, Roberta. *The new politics of protest: indigenous mobilization in Latin America's neoliberal era*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2012.
- Richards, Patricia. *Pobladoras Indígenas and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004.
- . *Race and the Chilean miracle: neoliberalism, democracy and indigenous rights*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013.
- Rocabado, Franco Gamboa. "Bolivia y una preocupación constante: El indianismo, sus orígenes y limitaciones en el siglo XXI." *Araucaria Revista Iberoamericana de Filosofía, Política y Humanidades*, no. 22 (2009): 125-51.

- . "El indianismo en Bolivia: orígenes y límites en el siglo XXI." New Haven: Yale University, 2009.
- Rockefeller, Steven. "Comment." In *Multiculturalism*, edited by Amy Gutman. 87-98. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Rogers, Nicholas. "Caribbean Coast Borderland: Empire, Ethnicity, and the Exotic on the Mosquito Coast." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 26, no. 3 (2002): 117-38.
- Roper, J. Montgomery, Patrick Wilson, and Tom Perreault. "Introduction to Special Issue on Indigenous Transformational Movements in Contemporary Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2003): 5-22.
- Rosen, Lawrence. "The Right to Be Different: Indigenous Peoples and the Quest for a Unified Theory." *The Yale Law Journal* 107, no. 1 (October 1997): 227-59.
- Rosset, Peter, and Maria Elena Martinez-Torres. "Rural Social Movements and Diálogo de Saberes: Territories, Food Sovereignty, and Agroecology." In *Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue*, edited by Program in Agrarian Studies Yale University, 1-26. New Haven, 2013.
- Saavedra, Alejandro. *Los Mapuche en la sociedad chilena actual*. Santiago: Lom Ediciones, 2002.
- Saavedra, José Luis. "El devenir del proceso katarista e indianista." In *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización. Katarismo e indianismo en el proceso político del MAS en Bolivia*, 169-80. La Paz: Fondo Editorial Pukara, 2010.
- Safa, Helen I. "Challenging Mestizaje: A Gender Perspective on Indigenous and Afrodescendant Movements in Latin America." *Critique of Anthropology* 25, no. 3 (July 20 2005): 307-30.
- Sánchez-Curiuento, Juan. "El Az Mapu o Sistema Jurídico Mapuche." *Revista CREA*, no. 2 (2001): 28-39.
- Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. "Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South." *Africa Development* XXXVII, no. 1 (2012): 43-67.
- Sartre, Jean Paul. "Introduction." In *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, edited by Albert Memmi. xxi-xxix. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.
- Schmitt, Carl. *The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum*. Translated by G.L. Ulmen. New York: Telo Press Ltd., 2003.
- Schmutz, Georges M. *Sociologie de la Chine et sociologie chinoise*. Paris: Librairie Droz, 1989.
- Segunda Convención de la Moskitia. "Resolución: Segunda Convención de la Moskitia." Polideportivo de la Ciudad de Bilwi: Consejo de Ancianos de la Nación Comunitaria La Moskitia, 2001.
- Semanal, La Brújula.

- Servicio de Paz y Justicia, and Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas. 20 of February 2012.
- Servicio Nacional de Meteorología e Hidrología SENAMHI.  
 "Situación Hidrológica Nacional Semana del 20 al 26 de Abril de 2009." *Boletín Hidrológico Semanal*, 27 of April 2009, 3-9.
- Servicio Paz y Justicia Costa Rica, and Frente Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas. 29 of May 2012.
- Servicios de Comunicación Intercultural Servindi. "Venezuela: exigen política pública para demarcar tierras indígenas." In, (2011). <http://servindi.org/actualidad/52610>.
- Sevicios en Comunicación Intercultural Servindi. "Venezuela: Pueblos indígenas debatirán líneas estratégicas del PSUV." In, (2011). <http://servindi.org/actualidad/40795>.
- Sieder, Rachel. "Challenging Citizenship, Neo-liberalism and Democracy: Indigenous Movements and the State in Latin America." *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest* 4, no. 3 (2007): 301-07.
- . "Introduction." In *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy*, edited by Rachel Sieder. 1-23. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- . "Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan State, 1894-1987 by Charles R. Hale." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14, no. 3 (1995): 379-80.
- . "Rethinking Democratisation and Citizenship: Legal Pluralism and Institutional Reform in Guatemala." *Citizenship Studies* 3, no. 1 (1999): 103-18.
- Sieder, Rachel, and Elizabeth Dore. "Book Notes." *The Journal of Development Studies* 30, no. 2 (1994): 529-30.
- Silva, Sebastián. "Aucán Huilcamán: "La autodeterminación de los pueblos indígenas es un derecho humano"." In, (2010). Published electronically 20 of September.  
<http://www.mapuexpress.net/?act=publications&id=4087>
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Revival in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- . "Towards a theory of ethnic separatism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2, no. 1 (1979): 21-37.
- Solorzano, Edgard. "Interview with Dr. Oscar Hodgson Arguello." *URACCAN Update*, 18 of March 1998.
- Soulier, Hortense. "Yamor Festival in Otavalo."  
<http://www.articledashboard.com/Article/Yamor-Festival-in-Otavalo/2283482>.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Staten, Clifford L. *The History of Nicaragua*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2010.
- Ströbele-Gregor, Juliana. "Culture and Political Practice of the Aymara and Quechua in Bolivia: Autonomous Forms of

- Modernity in the Andes." *Latin American Perspectives* 23, no. 72 (1996): 72-90.
- Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos. "Chiapas, la treceava estela. Segunda parte: una muerte." In, (2003). Published electronically 25 of July 2003.  
[http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/2003/2003\\_07\\_b.htm](http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/2003/2003_07_b.htm)
- . "Chiapas: la treceava estela. Primera parte: UN CARACOL." In, (2003).  
[http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/2003/2003\\_07\\_a.htm](http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/2003/2003_07_a.htm)
- . "Chiapas: la treceava estela. Tercera parte: un nombre." In, (2003).  
[http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/2003/2003\\_07\\_c.htm](http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/2003/2003_07_c.htm)
- Sujo, Prof. Hugo. "La reincorporación de la Mosquitia." *WANI*, 1986, 17-22.
- Survival International. "Amazon Indians demand Italian priest's expulsion over 'Death Road'." In, (2012). Published electronically 5 of July.  
<http://www.survivalinternational.org/news/8463>.
- . "Amazon Indians demand Italian priest's expulsion over 'Death Road'." In, no. 5 of July (2012).  
<http://www.survivalinternational.org/news/8463>.
- Tarica, Estelle. *The Inner Life of Mestizo Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Taylor, Charles. *Irreducibly Social Goods*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- . "The Politics of Recognition." In *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, edited by Amy Gutmann. 25-70. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- "Temen violencia en Bilwi." In, *La Prensa* (2009). Published electronically 18 of October 2009.  
<http://www.laprensa.com.ni/2009/10/18/departamentales/1373744-temen-violencia-en-bilwi>.
- Temucuicui, Comunidad Autónoma. "Urgente: Carabineros atacan a Temucuicui."  
<http://comunidadtemucuicui.blogspot.com/2011/08/urgen-te-carabineros-atacan-temucuicui.html>.
- The Clinic. "Comando Hernán Trizano: "Dirigentes mapuche volarán por los aires"." In, (2009). Published electronically 6 of August 2009. [Final Thesis WITH PAGES copy.docx](#).
- The Documentation Department of the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. "Chile 1979: The Mapuche Tragedy." 1-60. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1979.
- The Nicaragua Dispatch. "Congress approves reforms for Tumarin." *The Nicaragua Dispatch*, 13 of November 2012 2012.

- Toll, Roser. "Chile invokes terror law for 'criminal' wildfire." In, no. 6 of January 2012 (2012). Published electronically 6 of January 2012.
- Tótoro, Dauno. *Üxüf Xipay: El Despojo*. Ceibo Producciones, 2003.
- "Tratados celebrados y firmados entre el Coronel graduado de los ejércitos de la República Comandante de alta frontera, y Delegado de la Ciudad de Los Angeles Pedro Barnachea, autorizado por el señor Brigadier de los ejércitos de Chile Gobernador Intendente de la Provincia de Concepción para tratar con los naturales de ultra Biobío y don Francisco Mariluán Gobernador de 14 Reducciones, contenidos en los artículos siguientes." edited by Congreso Nacional de Chile: Biblioteca Nacional del Congreso, 1825.
- Tricot, Tito. *Autonomía: El Movimiento Mapuche de Resistencia*. Santiago: Ceibo Ediciones, 2013.
- Troyan, Brett. "Ethnic Citizenship in Colombia." *Latin American Research Review* 43, no. 3 (2008): 166-91.
- Turner, Terence. "Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology That Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It?". *Cultural Anthropology* 8, no. 4 (1993): 411-29.
- . "Representation, Polyphony, and the Construction of Power in a Kayapó Video." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Turpo, Aureliano. "Socialismo o Comunitarismo del Siglo XXI." In *Historia, Coyuntura y Descolonización. Katarismo e Indianismo en el proceso político del MAS en Bolivia*. La Paz, 2010.
- "Una ceremonia ancestral unirá a 350 parejas provenientes de diferentes regiones con la participación de sacerdotes originarios aymaras." *Cambio*, 5 of May 2011.
- UNICEF Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe. "Study shows great inequalities among Peruvian children."
- UNICEF Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe, [http://www.unicef.org/lac/media\\_18656.htm](http://www.unicef.org/lac/media_18656.htm).
- Unión Base CONFENIAE. "Bio-Piratas Roban y Patentan Nuestras Medicinas Más Sagradas."
- <http://www.ecuanex.net.ec/confeniae/>.
- United Nations. "Charter of the United Nations." 1945.
- . "The United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights." Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,
- <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>.
- United Nations General Assembly. "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples." Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,
- <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/independence.htm>.
- . "United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." 1-15: United Nations, 2007.

- United States Embassy in Managua. "Miskito Independence: Death & Mayhem in Bilwi Protests." Managua: WikiLeaks, 2009.
- . "What's really behind the Mosquito Coast Independence Movement?". Managua: WikiLeaks, 2009.
- Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization. "Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization Yearbook 1997." edited by Ryan Atticus, 116-18. Cambridge: Kluwer Law International, 1997.
- Untoja-Choque, Fernando. *Retorno al Ayllu: Una Mirada Aymara a la Globalización*. Fondo Editorial de los Diputados, 2001.
- Valdés, Gerardo Larraín. *Dios, Sol y Oro: Diego de Almagro y el Descubrimiento de Chile*. Santiago: Editorial Andrés Bello, 1987.
- Valdivia, Pedro de. "Carta al Emperador Carlos V. 15 de Octubre de 1550." Concepción del Nuevo Extremo, 1550.
- Van-Cott, Donna Lee. "Broadening Democracy: Latin America's Indigenous Peoples' Movements." *Current History*, 2004, 80-85.
- . "Building inclusive democracies: Indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in Latin America." *Democratization* 12, no. 5 (2005): 820-37.
- . *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000.
- . *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . "Indigenous Movements Lose Momentum." *Current History*, 2009, 83-89.
- Vasconcelos, José. *La Raza Cósmica: misión de la raza iberoamericana*. Distrito Federal: Editorial Porrúa, 2007.
- Venegas, María Angélica. "Caso Lumaco: Aumenta Cifra de Mapuches Detenidos." *El Mercurio*, 13 of December 1997.
- Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpschoofden in Suriname. "Wie is Vids?" Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpschoofden in Suriname, [http://www.vids.sr/?page\\_id=54](http://www.vids.sr/?page_id=54).
- Vergara, Pablo. "Llaitul, el mapuche más temido por las forestales." In, (2012). Published electronically 10 of January. <http://www.theclinic.cl/2012/01/10/llaitul-el-mapuche-mas-temido-por-las-forestales/>.
- Villagra, Nicole. "Werkén de Consejo de Todas las Tierras: clase política es incapaz de resolver conflicto mapuche." *BioBio Chile*, 21 of August 2011.
- Wallmapuwen. "Declaración de Principios El Partido al que Aspiramos." Wallmapuwen [http://www.wallmapuwen.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Declaraci%C3%B3n-de-Principios\\_Wallmapuwen.pdf](http://www.wallmapuwen.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Declaraci%C3%B3n-de-Principios_Wallmapuwen.pdf).
- Walzer, Michael. *Thick and Thin*. Notre-Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

- Warren, Kay B. "Voting against Indigenous Rights in Guatemala: Lessons from the 1999 Referendum." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Warren, Kay B, and Jean E Jackson. "Studying Indigenous Activism in Latin America." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B Warren and Jean E Jackson. 1-46. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Weber, David J. *The Spanish frontier in North America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Weller, Marc. "Settling Self-Determination Conflicts: Recent Developments." *The European Journal of International Law* 20, no. 1 (2009): 111-65.
- Williams, Colin H. "Ethnic Separatism." *Cahiers de géographie du Québec* 24, no. 61 (1980): 47-68.
- World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth. "Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth." Cochabamba: Derechos de la Madre Tierra, 2010.
- Wunderich, Volker. "La unificación nacional que dejó una nación dividida: el gobierno del Presidente Zelaya y la 'reincorporación' de la Mosquitia a Nicaragua en 1894." *Revista de Historia*, no. 34 (1996): 10-43.
- Yashar, Deborah J. *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . "Contesting Citizenship: Indigenous Movements and Democracy in Latin America." *Comparative Politics* 31, no. 1 (1998): 23-42.
- . "Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America." *World Politics* 52, no. 1 (1999): 76-104.
- . "Indigenous Politics and Democracy: Contesting Citizenship in Latin America." The Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies, 1997.
- . "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America." In *Constructing Democratic Governance: Latin America and the Caribbean in the 1990s--Themes and Issues*, edited by Jorge I Domínguez and Abraham F Lowenthal. 87-105. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Young, Crawford. *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1976.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- . "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship." *Ethics* 99, no. 2 (1989): 250-74.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Two concepts of self-determination." Chap. 8 In *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Minority Rights*, edited by

- Stephen May, Judith Squires and Tariq Modood. 176-95.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Zamosc, Leon. "The Ecuadorian Indian Movement: From Politics of Influence to Politics of Power." In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.
- Zibechi, Raúl. "Bolivia- Constantino Lima: The Other Politics Born of Everyday Experience." In, (2009). Published electronically 6 of October 2009.  
<http://upsidedownworld.org/main/bolivia-archives-31/2145-bolivia-constantino-lima-the-other-politics-born-of-everyday-experience>.





