> To be Indian . . . we have to speak in our language and
> in Spanish, we have to weave and write, we have to walk
> with our llamas and fly in planes, we have to retain our
> traditions and be modern at the same time.
>
> — Mario, rural schoolteacher in highland Cuzco

Toward the end of my fieldwork in the Peruvian highlands in 1998, my younger brother, Fito, flew to Cuzco for a visit. He had never been to the Andes before, and I was eager to show him all its rugged beauty and, of course, to take him to the communities where I had been conducting research for over a year. He and I had never talked about the specifics of my work. Fito simply knew that I was working with indigenous communities and researching rural education.

Our first outing was a trip to the well-known Sacred Valley of the Incas on a local bus. We walked to the bus stop, bought our tickets, and waited for the bus to fill up and depart. While we waited, a man wearing a poncho and a *ch'ullu* (woven hat) typical of a community located in the highlands above the Sacred Valley rode up to the bus on a bicycle. A young boy, sitting on the handlebars, wore a Ninja Turtles T-shirt, a Chicago Bulls jacket, and Levis jeans, though he was also wearing *ujutas*, the traditional black rubber sandals worn by most indigenous and peasant farmers in the region. My brother was startled when he saw the man and the boy, and watched carefully as the man picked up his bike and handed it to the driver's assistant, who stood on the roof of the bus arranging the passengers' belongings. Fito was even more surprised, it seemed, by the fact that the two men were speaking to each other in Quechua. He observed their interaction for a while, then shifted his gaze to the boy, who had made his way to a woman selling bread, and watched the exchange between them, also in Quechua. At that point he turned to me and said, " I thought only Indians spoke Quechua." I asked him

means to be (and to not be) Indian, particularly the troubling distinction — all too commonly made — between modernity (defined as progress and enlightenment) and tradition (read as backwardness and ignorance), have been critical in shaping recent discussions over indigenous rights and mobilization. But more theoretically, this book is about indigenous citizenship and the struggle over representation and voice. In particular, I examine the varying (and competing) representations of indigenous identity, education, and citizenship in local, national, and transnational spaces. These spaces are by no means neatly defined, but rather are themselves zones of engagement in which indigenous community members, state officials, and development practitioners (among others) construct and disrupt, negotiate and contest the means and ends of multicultural policies.

A tremendous diversity of actors have participated in these conversations. The Peruvian state, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international development agencies, social scientists, the media, Latin American indigenous leaders and intellectuals, rural indigenous communities in Peru, and indigenous rights advocates (among others) have all deployed their own multiple visions of indigenous representations. This book explores the intersections of recent debates about indigenous rights and empowerment through an analysis of the connections (and gaps) between local, national, and transnational spaces of contention. It does so by looking at the tensions between and within highland Quechua indigenous communities, the state, and indigenous rights activists in Peru and the multiple cultural and political consequences of these tensions.

Specifically, I examine the contradictions of and local challenges to the implementation of development policies, such as intercultural education, that form part of a larger national and international multicultural project. Much is at stake in these debates as they speak to the changing position of indigenous people in the nation-state and in transnational development agendas. As states and NGOs devote increasing attention to what the World Bank calls "ethno-development," it is important to pay close attention to the multiscale and complex construction of indigenous identities and the unequal power relations that complicate even the most well-intentioned efforts at advocacy. For example, as indigenous parents in highland Peru resist state and NGO intercultural education initiatives, they create new local spaces for collective action that have resulted (at least in Cuzco) in one of the very goals of indige-

simply a case of rural communities and their advocates against the neoliberal state, but rather a more complicated story of changing agendas and alliances in which Quechua parents can mobilize against pro-indigenous NGOs, and NGO goals can converge with those of both the state and the international development community. These twists and turns are not unique to Peru but are part of a broad pattern of local and global interactions characterized by contradictory projects of resistance and integration (see, for example, Alvarez, Dagnino, and Escobar, eds., 1998; K. Warren 1998a; and Edelman 1999).

As I try to show throughout the rest of this book, multisited ethnographic analysis is critical for understanding broader (local and global) representations of indigenous organizing, rights activism, and development policies. In the chapters that follow, I explore how debates over education and interculturality (*interculturalidad*) in highland Peru have sparked a "new" round of indigenous activism. The concept of interculturalidad in Peru is similar to the concept of multiculturalism in the United States, though indigenous leaders, state officials, and NGO practitioners stress that the term implies not only the recognition of difference but also "the development of respectful relationships between and among different cultural groups in the country." As one Otavalo friend put it, "multiculturalism is to know that you have neighbors who are different from you, but interculturalidad is when you and your neighbors hold hands to keep each other up [*se agarran de la mano para mantenerse levantados*]." Interculturalidad, like multiculturalism, is a contested term. However, we can try to understand the distinction between them in the following terms: multiculturalism is the recognition of a reality (Peru is a country of a diverse cultural and linguistic makeup); interculturalidad is the *practice* of a multiculturalism in which citizens reach across cultural and linguistic differences to imagine a democratic community. In that vein, bilingual intercultural education is the mechanism par excellence used to foster intercultural unity out of multicultural difference.

In the remainder of this chapter, I look at the particular place that Peru has occupied in discussions about indigenous movements in Latin America, and briefly explore how indigenous citizenship has become a part of new development agendas. Finally, I introduce the people, places, and methods important to this study, and provide a summary of the three sections that make up the rest of this book.

Patrinos 1994) and presented as "archaic obstacles" to the development of "modern" nations (Vargas Llosa 1990). Increasingly, however, tensions between the exclusionary political structure of Latin American governments and the various challenges coming from both local communities in the region and international advocates of indigenous rights have defied this simplistic notion of Indianness (Varese 1996; Díaz Polanco 1997; Stavenhagen 1992, 2002). Indeed, indigenous leaders have been relatively successful in their demands for national and international recognition of indigenous cultural and political rights, and have undeniably challenged ideas about democracy, citizenship, and development.

In fact, the stunning (re)emergence of indigenous peoples as important political actors in Latin America since the 1980s has by now been widely documented (Albó 1991; Stavenhagen 1992, 2002; Van Cott, ed., 1994; Brysk 2000a; Yashar 1998).[1] As many observers have also noted, international institutions have both enabled and reinforced this development through such reforms as Convention 169 of the International Labor Organization, on collective indigenous rights, and the U.N.-declared decade of indigenous people (1995–2004). Also of increasing scholarly interest are the state reforms that have often merged liberal and multicultural projects, what the political scientist Donna Lee Van Cott has called an "emerging regional model of constitutional multiculturalism" (2000: 17; see also Assies et al., eds., 2000, and Sieder, ed., 2002). While some optimistically classify these reforms as ones that inform a "radically new politico-legal order and conception of citizenship" (Sieder, ed., 2002: 5), others point out that the political spaces that have been opened by "neoliberal multiculturalism" are dangerous in that they limit the radical potential of social movements as they "pro-actively shape the terrain on which future negotiations of cultural rights take place" (Hale 2002: 488; see also Gustafson 2002). As scholars have noted about globalizing discourses in general, these converging international and state agendas are double-edged, useful to both movements of resistance and projects of governance (Brysk 2000b, Edelman 1999). Thus we should critically examine new multicultural agendas and discourses that promote the rights of indigenous peoples from both above and below.

The case of contemporary Peru sheds important light on these contradictory processes of incorporation and exclusion when we examine both state multiculturalism and indigenous rights activism. The Peruvian case also con-

(TRC) held at Princeton University in February 2003, several legal and human rights experts commented on the strange turn of events that had taken Peru from the authoritarian rule of Alberto Fujimori to the constitution of the TRC. Most of the speakers were from the United States, though they all had important work and research experience in the country. Each remarked on the "peculiarity" of Peru. One speaker argued, perhaps a bit facetiously, that in Peru, you never know what might happen. "It's a strange country." The one Peruvian member of the roundtable, the well-respected senior anthropologist Luis Millones, then felt compelled to comment: "It is interesting to hear people say that Peru is a strange country. I do not think it is a strange country. I think this [the United States] is a strange country." The panelists and audience laughed in appreciation. Yet through the laughter the question of the peculiarity of Peru still lingered. Indeed, it is a theme that runs through much of the scholarship on Latin America, especially on indigenous politics in the Americas, since the 1990s.

In the context of the region-wide wave of indigenous social movements, dubbed the "return of the Indian" by Xavier Albó (1991), Peru has been the biggest surprise to scholarly observers. In the heart of the Inca empire, a country with a significant indigenous population (estimated to represent around 40 percent of the total), the "indigenous movement" seems to be slumbering, especially in comparison with its neighbors. The anthropologist Paul Gelles writes that "the way that activists have organized along ethnic-based lines in [Ecuador and Bolivia] is virtually inconceivable in Peru" (2002: 246). Similarly, indigenous movements in Peru have been described as "marginal" (Albó 1991), "largely nonexistent" (Yashar 1998), and "a profound failure" (Mayer cited in Yashar 1998). Luis Millones himself has noted how strange this has seemed to some observers:

A year ago, the World Bank decided to make funds available to indigenous populations in Latin America. These were very important funds that would be distributed between Mexico and Tierra del Fuego. To do so, the Bank went in search of the representative indigenous institutions in all of the Latin American countries. And it found itself with the surprising discovery that between Ecuador and Bolivia, there was a country [Peru] without indígenas. (Millones 2000: 79)

Not only is social-movement activity seemingly missing, but according to leading scholars, so are governmental efforts to implement a new kind of multiculturalism. David Maybury-Lewis asserts that while in Ecuador and

it is true that Peru is different from its neighbors, this focus on Peruvian "absence" has obscured the richness of indigenous activism in Peru. As I have discussed elsewhere, indigenous politics in both lowland and highland settings has been vibrant even if it has not always taken the shape of nationwide mobilizations, as in other countries (García and Lucero 2004). If, instead of searching for the sources of Peruvian exceptionalism, we examine closely the interactions between indigenous highlanders, NGO activists, and the state, we confront a different set of questions. Why do people choose or reject Indianness? Who is speaking for indigenous people? Why are local communities mobilizing against NGO and state initiatives ostensibly meant to help indigenous highlanders? How have multicultural education and the politics of culture and language become a terrain of dispute in Latin America? What should indigenous movements look like? In order to move beyond the limits of Peruvian exceptionalism, in this book I try to emphasize the complexity of the cultural processes that provide the elements for constructions of highland indigenous citizenship and intercultural development.[2]

As the anthropologists Kay Warren and Jean Jackson note, "Self–other oppositions, drawn both by activists in their oratory and by anthropologists in their ethnography, turn out to be anything but fixed. Rather, interaction occurs in social fields where alliances shift, definitions are reworked, entities are renamed, and authority is rethought" (2002: 28). In short, we move from taking absence as a point of departure to exploring actually existing multiple and vibrant articulations of indigenous politics. The concept of articulation, especially as formulated by Stuart Hall (1996 [1986]) and used by James Clifford (2001) and Tanya Li (2000), is particularly helpful for understanding how we can move beyond thinking of indigeneity in the all-or-nothing terms of authenticity and invention, cultural survival and extinction.

A theory of articulation is both a way of understanding how ideological elements come, under certain conditions, to cohere together within a discourse, and a way of asking how they do or do not become articulated, at specific conjunctures, to certain political subjects . . . It asks how an ideology discovers its subject rather than how the subject thinks the necessary and inevitable thoughts which belong to it. (Hall 1996 [1986]: 141–142)

The articulations of indigenous politics in Peru reveal important dynamics that cannot be encompassed by views of Peru as simply a case of absence.

mientos (uprisings) in Ecuador and road blockades in Bolivia. Rather than simply argue for a recoding of Peru as a case of success rather than failure, in these pages I examine the ways in which scholars, activists, and NGOs have participated in the construction of models and expectations that have made such assessments possible in the first place. To that end, the following section explores several scholarly visions of failure or absence and presents a slightly different view of Peruvian indigenous cultural politics, one that challenges representations of an "inadequately" indigenous Peru.

Constructing and Explaining Indigenous Absence

In view of the lamentations over the lack of indigenous political activity in Peru, it is helpful to review three of the most common explanations offered for this absence of ethnic mobilization. Respectively, these approaches emphasize questions of class, politics, and culture. First, some scholars argue that class identities and discourses have historically crowded out ethnic identities and movements. According to this view, the legacies of the populist and corporatist government policies of General Juan Velasco Alvarado (1968–75) continue to classify indigenous populations by class-based labels and social programs. As discussed in Chapter 2, Velasco famously prohibited even the use of the term *Indian*, promoting instead identification as campesinos or peasants. De-Indianization as a strategy of populist reform and of leftist mobilization, then, made ethnic Indian identification unlikely (Gelles 2002).

This argument, however, is unpersuasive, as it simplifies the relationship between class and ethnicity; they are hardly mutually exclusive. Indeed, throughout the 1960s and 1970s, "indigenous utilization of class rhetoric was a political option that did not represent the loss of indigenous culture, but was rather a strategy toward its empowerment" (de la Cadena 2001: 21). Moreover, this view neglects the fact that other Andean states saw comparable efforts to "re-baptize Indians as peasants," as Albó (1994) has put it, yet still boast a resurgence of more explicitly indigenous political identities. This explanation is, at best, insufficient.

A second explanation, drawing on social-movement scholarship, looks to the lack of political opportunity and capability in building supracommunal organizations, due largely to the disastrous effects of civil war (Albó 1991, Yashar 1998). As has been widely discussed (e.g., Poole and Rénique 1992,

for grass-roots organizing. On one side, leftist militants eliminated rival sources of political power; on the other, government forces interpreted any sort of gathering as potentially subversive. This explanation, however, suffers from the fact that organizing did indeed occur during times of terror, and not only despite the violence but at times because of it. Largely in response to political conflict, indigenous communities organized to defend themselves from attack in both highland and lowland contexts. The most notable examples are the Asháninka army in the Central Jungle region and the *rondas campesinas* (peasant patrols) in the Andes (Vásquez, interview, June 2002; Starn 1992, 1999; Sieder 2002). It is also significant that some of the oldest and most active indigenous organizations in Peru are found in zones that continue to be afflicted by political violence.[4]

Moreover, explaining indigenous mobilization through a structural view of political opportunity and capacity, while valuable, tends to assume a rather static notion of indigenous identity politics, one that seems simply to be awaiting the right conditions to emerge through the cracks of uneven states (but see Yashar 1998). A political/structural approach does say much about the conditions for visible protest, but it says very little about the " hidden transcripts" (Scott 1990) and the cultural dynamics of identity formation that are an important part of collective action.

Given the difficulties of class and political accounts, it makes considerable sense to consider more cultural explanations of the nature of Peruvian identities. Among the most influential has been the one advanced by the Peruvian anthropologist Marisol de la Cadena (2000). Closely analyzing the cultural force and particularity of *indigenismo* and *mestizaje* in Cuzco, de la Cadena tries to answer the question of Peruvian exceptionalism. She rejects earlier contentions that Peruvian Indian identity has been erased by national projects of mestizaje. She emphasizes instead the significance of historical conditions that have led Peruvian Andeans (specifically those in Cuzco, or *cuzqueños*) to appropriate and redefine the term *mestizo* as a way " to develop de-Indianization as a decolonizing indigenous strategy" (2000: 325). Examining the discourse and practices of urban cuzqueño intellectual elites, university students, mestiza market women, and others, she argues that they have all expanded their mestizo identity to include indigenous practices. In doing so, these individuals (whom she labels " grass-roots indigenous intellectuals") have redefined dominant notions of mestizo and indigenous identity. Defying perceptions of indigenous identity as " exclusively rural, essen-

mean erasing indigenous cultural identity. In other words, indigenous practices do not disappear when indigenous people learn Spanish and move to the city. Thus one strategy of empowerment employed by indigenous intellectuals in Cuzco is to perform their identity as *indigenous* mestizos. Given this reworking of the terms of Peruvian ethnic and racial discourses, de la Cadena contends that the lack of *recognized* ethnic mobilization in the country is due to the fact that indigenous mestizo activism is not usually considered ethnic activism.

Her contribution is important because it helpfully problematizes the distinction made between the categories of Indian and mestizo, and highlights the complexity of identity formation. Indigenous mestizo activism is an important concept, as it contributes to a more nuanced understanding of Peruvian cultural politics. However, while her contribution is a helpful alternative to the scholarship that emphasizes Peruvian failure, it misses important parts of the story. Specifically, it neglects other forms of activism that cannot be described as indigenous *mestizo* activism. Unlike the urban intellectuals that de la Cadena emphasizes, rural (often monolingual) indigenous parents are also negotiating identity in politically important ways. Additionally, indigenous students and intellectuals in transnational institutes are promoting alternative (local and global) visions of Indianness that challenge dominant categories and structures of representation but reject the label of mestizo.

Accordingly, the research presented in this book continues the critical line of cultural research represented by de la Cadena and others, by suggesting additional ways to move beyond the questions of absence and failure in Peru. Interactions between indigenous parents, activists, and the state suggest the need for a complex view of both social movement and success. Additionally, the transnational nature of contemporary indigenous politics requires viewing Peru as embedded in cultural and political processes that occur at multiple scales. When we readjust our gaze away from national cases and nationwide movements (such as the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador, or CONAIE), the constellation of Peruvian indigenous politics suddenly appears striking.

Highland communities are the sites of a great deal of conflict, resistance, and organization. The protagonists of much of this activity are Quechua parents who reject programs that, according to NGO activists, are meant to educate their children and in time empower and incorporate their communities

cern their real interests. Given such a diagnosis, the remedy is training, education, and other strategies to raise the consciousness of Quechua community members. However, often these strategies are implemented in ways that seek not to educate but to dictate the new terms of policies that come " from the ministry." Compliance with new reforms is obtained not through new consciousness but often with old-fashioned coercion. Intercultural activists, in and outside government, seem to deliver the same message: The state has given you these programs; participate or lose access to these resources that have generously been offered to your people.

For students of social movements, things seem curiously upside down. The peculiarity of these kinds of interactions is perhaps most clearly illustrated in an encounter described in Chapter 4, in which a state official described her intercultural work and the work of the NGOs (who were often the " executing agents" of state policy) in the communities as nothing less than a social movement on behalf of indigenous people and inspired by indigenous movements throughout the region. If social movements are directed by state policies, one can reasonably ask what the term means and what we should call the resistance to the " movement" from the people on whose behalf it is being constructed.

This contestation over the very idea of " social movement" is significant because it puts into relief the importance of the models of contention analysts use to understand social struggles over meaning and resources. Thinking about both the complex interactions in the Peruvian countryside and the vast literature on social movements,[5] one could ask: What counts as a social movement? One could find plenty of support for a wide range of answers. NGO supporters of indigenous organizing follow many scholars in seeing social movements as the visible protests coordinated by professional activists (Tarrow 1994, Tilly 1993-94). In this view, the training of indigenous youth is a crucial step in the formation of an indigenous social movement. Others, perhaps including the government workers who see intercultural education as a social movement, would adopt the more flexible conception of social movements as " wars of interpretation" that take many forms as they unsettle the dominant meanings and codes of society. In an effort to bring together a fractious field of scholars, Charles Tilly (1993–94) has characterized social movements as " clusters of political performances" involving authorities and challengers. I don't seek to discuss these typological debates here, but taking Tilly's evocative idea, local communities are clearly the sites

may not care to see this resistance in these terms, I cannot think what makes community organizing against intercultural education any less of a movement than indigenous mobilizing against other forms of state intervention. Indeed, as I discuss further in Chapter 1, Quechua communities have organized themselves against a series of external agents, including the deadly forces of both Sendero Luminoso and state military units and the ostensibly more benign forces of international development. The actions and struggles of Quechua parents and intercultural activists are emblematic of the contemporary struggles over the very meaning of citizenship in the Andes.

Intercultural Development: Citizenship and Livelihoods

Throughout Latin America, indigenous peoples are undoubtedly facing new challenges as they are increasingly integrated into national and global contexts (Yashar 1998; Brysk 2000a; Van Cott 2000). One of those challenges is the dilemma faced by indigenous movements when leaders demand the right to participate fully in national society while simultaneously pressing for special and sometimes separate status in that society. Intercultural activists in Peru face this challenge not as indigenous leaders but often as "outsiders," activists not from indigenous communities but working in their name toward what some call a "multicultural citizenship" (Montoya 1998). However, there are some difficulties with the very category of "intercultural activists," as the term can include nongovernmental advocates of bilingual intercultural education, state bureaucrats involved with its implementation, and intellectuals who work both within and outside the state. The trouble in unpacking this label and untangling the actors involved suggests a need not for more specific terms but rather, as shall soon become more apparent, for a more flexible theory of articulation, in the double sense given to the term by Hall, as both a political "cobbling together" and the process of voicing a collective identity.

Activists' efforts to construct indigenous citizenship represent, in their view, a move from the undemocratic subjectivities of prior eras — that is, as members of a separate (and not equal) "Republic of Indians" during colonial times — and as nationalized (and ostensibly de-Indianized) peasants linked to states by populist leaders and policies. Becoming an indigenous cit-

Moreover, it reveals an awareness of the changing historical positioning of "us" (Quechuas) and "them" (state and international agents).

The central arena for the construction of this new kind of citizenship, in the view of activists, is the schoolhouse, the place long recognized as a kind of "citizenship factory" (Luykx 1999). Struggles over citizenship and indigenous politics, of course, go beyond the schoolhouse, as mobilizations around mining, coca, and human rights have demonstrated (Caballo and Boyd 2002, García and Lucero 2004, Youngers and Peacock 2002, SERVINDI 2002b, Rojas 2003). However, intercultural education occupies a special place in the contemporary history of indigenous mobilization. During authoritarian times (1990–2000), bilingual education was one of the few causes that activists could advance without necessarily inviting government repression. In the current moment of democratic transition, bilingual intercultural education remains a central concern of advocates for a truly inclusive, intercultural Peru.

The implementation of intercultural education is important not only for the impact it has had on questions of citizenship, identity, and indigenous self-determination, but also because it forms part of a larger effort aimed at effecting real, palpable material improvement in the lives of Peruvian highland populations. Typically, local and international NGOs are charged with implementing and overseeing these programs at local levels. In recent years, NGOs have played an increasingly prominent role as intermediaries between the state and marginalized groups in Latin America, partly in response to the reduction of social welfare programs administered by the state (Bebbington and Thiele 1993, Fisher 1997, Bebbington 2000). Mounting concern over indigenous rights on the part of international donor agencies has also shifted the balance toward an emphasis on funding NGOs with a focus on indigenous language preservation, cultural revival, indigenous health, and indigenous education. Thus intercultural education programs are an extension of the enterprise of grass-roots development and human rights advocacy that have been the subject of serious scholarly and policy debates (Hornberger, ed., 1997; Healy 2001; Kleymeyer 1994).

The literature on development is vast and it is not necessary to summarize it here. However, for the purposes of this book, it is useful to highlight two distinct analytic approaches to understanding how new development policies, such as educational reforms, work. On one side, such initiatives as bilingual intercultural education are hailed as important examples of the kind

modern scholarly critique has emerged against the discursive power that the development industry has, in Arturo Escobar's (1995) phrase, to make and unmake the Third World (see also Ferguson 1994). Critics such as Escobar argue that development is a dangerous fiction that reinforces unequal power relations by expanding the domain of "states, dominant institutions, and mainstream ways" (Escobar 1991: 667). Marc DuBois levels the charge directly at such local grass-roots efforts as bilingual intercultural education: "small development organizations that operate on a grass-roots level . . . appear to be potentially the most dangerous if a Foucauldian sense of power is used to examine development anew" (1991: 91).

So are the educational changes taking place in Cuzco a part of the new inclusive and culturally sensitive ethno-development or a part of the fictions of progress that constitute new disciplinary strategies targeted at subaltern populations? The position I develop more fully in Chapter 4 is attentive to the questions raised by these perspectives but skeptical of both views. Close ethnographic study of the new opportunities and dangers of changing development agendas and community responses reveals a dynamic field of contestation where possibilities are not defined by the goals of international organizations or the pessimism of Foucauldian views of power. Though it is remarkable that international organizations such as the International Labor Organization, the United Nations, and the World Bank have shifted their energies away from integrationist policies toward multicultural ones, one should still ask how the new multicultural agendas are being forged in Geneva, New York, and Washington, by whom, and on behalf of whom (Fox and Brown 1998). A close look at the cultural understandings of intercultural activists, state officials, international funders, and indigenous peoples is needed to evaluate how inclusive the new policies of intercultural development truly are. Moreover, scholarship on the compatibility of multicultural policies and neoliberal agendas (Wade 1997, Hale 2002, Gustafson 2002) further complicates this story and compels us to look closely at the intersections of global agendas and local practices.

Local ethnographic research can provide valuable insights into the workings of the global discourses and practices of development. Indeed, taking a ground-level view of globalization is perhaps the most powerful and feasible way to capture the imbrications of the local and the global. Local ethnography is also a useful corrective to postmodernist indictments against development writ large that often operate at such a high level of abstraction that

conditions of certain exploitation and (often) cruel physical violation.

In order to understand the limits and possibilities of intercultural education as an ethno-development strategy, I have sought to study closely both the formulation and implementation of NGO efforts and the responses of the indigenous community members who are the most affected by those efforts. Throughout this book I suggest that a crucial factor accounting for indigenous rejection (in Cuzco) of NGO educational and cultural reforms is the marked contrast between the ideology behind such programs and their practical implementation. To understand this gulf between NGO goals and community realities, it is necessary to explore the multiple contradictions of development practices. In particular, the tensions between NGO discourses about social equality and the reproduction of ethnic hierarchies, and between their nongovernmental status and simultaneous reliance on governmental authority (especially that of the Ministry of Education and other state agencies), raises questions about their contributions toward grass-roots mobilization and empowerment. While NGOs have often provided alternative spaces for discussion of reform and democracy, we should not assume that there is a clear line separating the budgets, personnel, and agendas of governmental and nongovernmental spheres (Jelin 1998).

In highlighting some of these contradictions, I do not intend to join the chorus of antidevelopment theorists but rather to follow the lead of skeptical yet committed ethnographers of development and culture who are concerned with tracing the unequal material and cultural impacts of specific development policies on rural people (e.g., Starn 1994, Gupta 1995, Gill 1997, Edelman 1999, and Bebbington 2000). I do not seek to defend a separation between the discursive and material stakes of development, for such dichotomies are of little help. Rather, I hope to contribute to the critical but engaged study of the local effects of development policies. Such a grounded view can offer a concrete sense of the social costs of contradictory discursive practices and the human costs of abandoning all hope in development.

In the Field: Places, Methods, and Terminology

In recent years the importance of multisited (and multiscaled) research has become increasingly clear (Marcus 1995). Moving between rural and urban spaces and across local, national, and international scales not only

for this book was multisited in that I worked in Peruvian rural highland communities, highland towns, highland cities, coastal cities, and among Peruvians in a neighboring Andean country. However, as the field of anthropological research is remapped to include long-distance nationalisms (Glick Schiller et al. 2001), flexible (and diasporic) citizenships (Ong 1999b), and the anthropologist herself (Stephen 2002: 21), we must keep in mind that even multisited analyses inform only part of the story. Additionally, as global technology makes contact and communication easier, and as indigenous and other grass-roots organizations gain access to computers and the Internet, cyberspace has also become an important field research site. While uneven resources still determine access to these tools, the Internet has clearly become a critical site of struggle (Delgado 2002). E-mail and its subscription lists, online newsletters, and Web sites are now legitimate sources of production, negotiation, and reproduction of knowledge.[6] These sites have also facilitated the development of both new and already established collaborative networks of (for example) local organizations and intellectuals, international funders, and social scientists.

Moreover, as those traditionally labeled informants or subjects of research increasingly challenge these and other (unequal) power-laden terms and construct their own representations and interpretations of cultural and political histories, often products of anthropological (mis)understandings (K. Warren 1992, Fabian 2001), they have helped to transform the field of anthropology. In my view, the now common move among (engaged) anthropologists toward " an entirely new set of priorities" (Stephen 2002: 11), including a rethinking of neutrality and observation as political acts (Wright 1988: 365– 367, Diskin 1991: 171) and an intimate collaboration from the outset with the community with which one wishes to work, is critical for a more responsible practice of anthropology (García 2000), as well as for the democratization of ethnography and the ethnographic method (Paley 2001: 20).

I should also say a word about my role as a Peruvian-American ethnographer working in the Peruvian Andes. I spent two summers in the city of Cuzco (1996 and 1997) taking courses in language and linguistics at the Colegio de Estudios Andinos and conducting preliminary research before moving to Cuzco for long-term field research in the fall of 1997. By the time I arrived in the city the third time, I had already had many conversations with intercultural activists about the kind of research I was interested in conducting. In fact, my research topic — the connections between bilingual inter-