

ESTABLISHING BOUNDARIES:  
INDIGENOUS NATIONALIZATION  
IN LATIN AMERICA

*Margarita O'Donnell-Morales*

Historically, the *indio* have held a subservient and precarious position within the nation-states of Latin America. Their legal rights ambiguous and few, indigenous peoples are often excluded from the democratic process or denied access to state resources such as education and health care. Indigenous peoples remain on the periphery of the Latin American state, most often subordinate within their respective government systems. Indeed Indigenous people are the most marginalized group in Latin America, a region of the world infamous for social inequality and poverty; as Alison Brysk explains, they are the “poorest, sickest, most abused, and most defenseless” (1996: 40). During Latin America’s celebration of the Columbian quintcentenary, indigenous groups mobilized around the “Five Hundred Years of Resistance” campaign—a movement that sought to highlight the injustices suffered by the native inhabitants of the Americas. As the campaign’s name suggests, indigenous communities on the continent continue to struggle against various forms of political, economic, and cultural domination by the nation-states in which they exist.

In the past thirty years, the need to coexist with national governments has prompted indigenous groups to actively seek institutional representation and cultural security within the parameters of the nation-state. These groups have made enormous progress in Latin America, securing an increasing number of political and economic rights that ensure their continued physical and cultural survival. Moreover, public awareness of the value of indigenous culture and the symbolic importance of such cultural identities have flourished. These successes have resulted from transformations in indigenous cultures, which, like all cultures, constantly evolve. The most successful groups have adapted their political tactics to a rapidly globalizing world completely different from the one their forefathers knew five hundred years earlier. Securing economic and territorial rights for indigenous peoples in Latin America is necessary for achieving successful pluralistic democracies in the region.

This paper examines the relationship between indigenous groups and the nation-state, focusing on the interplay between cultural identity, resource control, land rights, and political tactics. By examining two specific ques-

---

O'Donnell-Morales is a fourth-year undergraduate at Columbia University in the political science department and a research intern at the International Center for Transitional Justice.

tions, this paper reveals both the general dilemmas facing indigenous peoples and how they counteract such predicaments. The first question addresses how cultural identity has become ingrained in notions of territorial and economic autonomy. To answer, this paper explores the overlapping subtleties of resource mobilization and cultural identity politics as descriptions of indigenous motivations. The second question analyzes the methods and discourses indigenous groups use to achieve political ends within the nation-state. I discuss cultural identity and resource rights as they relate to structures of integration and the struggle for self-government by considering two distinct groups — the Kuna and the Kayapó. Marked by transnational technology, global markets and transnational activism, the current era of globalization has significantly shaped the way indigenous groups seek political power. I argue that strategies of political activism through international linkages are eventually unsustainable because indigenous communities are not actively engaged with the state in the creation of an institutionalized, or political space.

A comparison of the Kuna of Panama and the Kayapó of Brazil, reveals different ways native peoples engage their respective nation-states. (Some literature spells the name of the Kuna as “Cuna,” while the community itself uses “Tule” or “Tulemala” in its own language; Howe xiii.) Although these two groups differ culturally, important lessons arise from their successful struggles for territorial and economic autonomy. The Kuna of Panama are often described as a model for indigenous activism in Latin America. This group has politically engaged the Panamanian government in various ways since the turn of the twentieth century; as a result, it gained territorial autonomy in the 1920s. The Kuna have created a very distinct political space for themselves within the Panamanian government, and have strong institutional frameworks for political and economic activism. On the other hand, the Kayapó of Brazil, have fought only recently against the Brazilian state for control of resources in lands traditionally considered theirs. The Kayapó alliance with international organizations and media reinforce the effect of globalization on international relations.

#### *A Few Caveats*

Although parallels between the Kuna and Kayapó are central to this presentation, this paper does not purport to be an in-depth ethnographic study of the two groups. A body of anthropological literature detailing their cultural and political identities exists for both groups. The Kuna and Kayapó have struggled for autonomy in two different time periods that are decades apart. Nevertheless, despite such cultural and political differences, their experiences reveal great insight regarding the methods indigenous peoples engage their respective nation-states. Due to the history of marginalization of indige-

nous peoples in Latin America, it is crucial to find successful models of political activism that come from indigenous communities themselves, and to analyze those successes on both practical and theoretical levels. This essay does not promote the superimposition of new political structures onto indigenous communities, but offers analysis of the models and mechanisms that have equally acknowledged cultural distinctness and encouraged political representation within the government. More specifically, the practical ideas and suggestions that the Kayapó could gain from the Kuna must still reflect the uniqueness of the Kayapó situation.

A brief discussion regarding the terminology used within this essay is crucial. In English, the term “indigenous peoples” is the most prevalent and accepted terminology used to describe the original inhabitants of the Americas before colonization. However, Brysk points out that indigenous activists have recently reclaimed “Indian” as a self-appellation (54). In Spanish, the word “indio” has strong derogatory connotations and should be avoided. The politically correct term is “indígena.” In this essay, I will use the terms indigenous peoples, and avoid “Indian,” a historically and socially loaded term.

#### *Identity, Cultural Politics, and Land*

Cultural identity is the fundamental principle organizing indigenous movements across Latin America, and is crucial to forms and rhetoric of political activism. In his essay “Cultural Politics of Identity in Latin America,” Charles Hale notes the historical shift in Latin America that marked the transition from conceptions of indigenous populations as class-based actors, usually members of the peasant-class, to an emerging awareness of their role as cultural and ethnic actors (579). He defines “identity politics,” which he uses interchangeably with “cultural politics,” as the “collective sensibilities and actions that come from a particular location within society, in direct defiance of universal categories that tend to subsume, erase, or suppress this particularity” (568). Location refers to a group’s position within society and is shaped by “distinctive social memory, consciousness, and practice,” or more distinctively, the activities that create culture (Hale 568). With specific reference to indigenous groups, Hale is concerned with the use of cultural identity as a means of justifying distinct territorial, political, and economic goals.

As Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar further explain in *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures*, the cultural identity refers not only to the struggle over meanings and symbols, but also to the attempt to change structures of inequality and to “redefine the meanings and the limits of the political system” (5). Potential to change the status quo is central to indige-

nous uses of symbols and traditions in legitimizing demands for political and economic rights. Furthermore, as Jordan and Weedon claim, “for marginalized and oppressed groups, the construction of new and resistant identities is key to a wider political struggle to transform society” (5). Cultural distinctiveness is therefore, a tool and a vehicle for justifying autonomy within the nation-state because cultural survival is linked to territorial rights and, in turn, to economic rights.

Cultural identity is strongly grounded in older myths, traditions, and values and has become increasingly salient in a globalized world. As Hale explains, it is not that indigenous groups such as the Kayapó have only recently discovered or even created their culture, but rather that they have been “rearticulated” and leaders have found “new means to collectively express and pursue interests, demands, and values that have long-standing importance to them” (571). Thus, cultural politics are highly symbolic and depend on intergroup perceptions, and on how these perceptions in turn affect their interactions. The images and discourse indigenous groups use to portray themselves reflect their immediate goals.

The most important of such goals is securing land, or exercising the right to territories that are traditionally indigenous. Globally, indigenous peoples retain legal ownership over only six percent of the land’s surface, and even this land is illegally encroached upon by miners, loggers, farmers, tourists, and hunters (IUCN 61). In effect, the battle over land and its varied natural resources, is central to the indigenous struggle. Stan Stevens explains how:

To a considerable degree, the state of the land and their continued rights to inhabit and live from it are intrinsic not only to many indigenous peoples’ subsistence welfare but also to their cultural survival... Their ways of life and continued existence as peoples are threatened by the loss of autonomy over their lands and their livelihood and by the destruction of the environmental basis of their distinctive cultures and identities (3). In other words, for indigenous groups, territorial integrity and cultural survival are inextricably linked. Land is not only a principle means of economic survival, but also an intimate symbol of culture.

As indigenous communities struggle for the civil and political recognition that precedes territorial and resource rights, they use a discourse of cultural tradition and identity. Thus, territorial rights are inherently linked to resource mobilization. As the Kayapó case, discussed later, shows the relationship between identity politics and territorial rights is crucial for the international “marketing” of indigenous goals. For example, the symbolic value of land is central to appeals to the international and national public; Stevens asserts that indigenous populations are “finding the establishment of protected areas is a means to gain international support for their settlement and

land use rights” (3). Moreover, without means of economic subsistence, indigenous populations are dependent upon social welfare programs and international aid donations. Cultural autonomy is impossible without some type of resource control. As will be further discussed, the territorial autonomy of the Kuna and their control over natural resources have been primary factors in ensuring their continued existence as a culture. The Kuna and Kayapó differ in their approaches to political engagement of the state, yet, the methods of these two communities are complementary.

### *At Home or Away?*

As native communities increasingly clash with nation-states, crucial questions regarding the economic, political, and cultural future of the original peoples of Latin America come to the fore. Recently, domestic struggles have been mediated on the international level, through non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international forums, and the media. Some political scientists, such as Alison Brysk, argue that the internationalization of indigenous resistance reveals a “wavering” of the state, in that it has lost its monopoly on resources, power, and information (2000: 13). According to this theory, globalization and the concomitant internationalization of certain issues have undermined national sovereignty by creating new mechanisms for issue-linkages and application of pressure that affect domestic politics. Therefore, international institutions have weakened the power traditionally held by nation-states. [These sentences contradict the point she is trying to make.

This essay postulates that nation-states are the primary players involved in the issue of indigenous rights. They possess monopolies on the use of force, legislation, and distribution of goods within their boundaries; further, domestic actors must coexist with the national government (Urban and Sherzer 8). Therefore, by working within state institutions to secure their future, indigenous groups create national spaces for themselves. Transnational linkages between NGOs and local groups, such as those the Kayapó use in an effort to gain territory, are certainly beneficial for short-term recognition and advances. However, success in sustaining a viable cultural and economic identity is revealed in the continuity of the Kuna community in Panama. By using local levels of government to ensure representation at the national level, the Kuna set an example of successful indigenous activism for the rest of Latin America.

In the last two decades, indigenous groups have acted internationally to achieve local goals. They use a variety of methods to legitimize their struggle for autonomy within the nation state. One such method is application of legal and institutional pressure. For example, the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights has heard at least three cases on indigenous

rights in Latin America (Davis 10-13). The international community has slowly moved toward the creation of international mechanisms intended to protect the cultural, political, and economic lives of the indigenous peoples of the world. Despite existing conventions, resolutions, and treaties on other groups such as refugees and children, the United Nations has not been proactive in protecting indigenous rights. However, in 2000, the UN created the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues with a “mandate to discuss indigenous issues relating to economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights;” the forum is also responsible for providing advice and recommendation in raising awareness of indigenous issues and for promoting the coordination of solutions (ECOSOC Resolution 2000/22).

Crucial to understanding how cultural politics work as tools for political activism is the international context of indigenous rights. New forms of globalization fostered by transnational institutional links, integrated markets, and high-technology communications have revolutionized the mechanisms of political activism. In effect, globalization has promoted the utility of cultural politics by creating new mediums of expression. Indigenous groups ‘market’ their cultural identity, symbols, images, and history to international NGOs working for environmental or indigenous causes. Donna Lee Van Cott echoes Brysk’s and Hale’s observations that indigenous leaders have used resources that “have been available for a long time” to “sustain collective action in pursuit of a radical transformation of the state” (par. 2). Cultural identity of indigenous becomes highly politicized, as it becomes a tool for securing territorial and economic rights within the nation-state. Identity politics remains the primary mechanism of political engagement and mobilization for the Kayapó.

#### *The Kayapó: International Marketing and Networking*

The current Kayapó struggle for cultural and economic autonomy occurs in an increasingly globalized world where sovereign matters are often subject to much international scrutiny. As Urban and Sherzer explain, “by bringing international pressure to bear – the appeal being to a global public opinion, to which ... the state will be responsive – the goal is to secure Indian rights, up to and including the kind of relative autonomy achieved by the Kuna” (9).

The Kayapó have used their cultural identity and international reputation as leverage in order to gain concessions from the Brazilian state. Their discourse has been framed by appealing to the notion of self-determination, emphasizing that land rights and access to natural resources ensure cultural survival, ethno-development, and economic survival. This claim has been

‘marketed’ to international activist groups, who have appropriated such images and ideas in their “search for models of sustainable uses of rain forest [which have] created an ecological rationale for defending indigenous land rights” (Conklin and Graham 697).

In *The Shifting Middle Ground: Amazonian Indians and Eco-Politics*, Conklin and Graham discuss how Amazonian Indians, especially the Kayapó, have become integrated into international consumer culture and activist networks. In order to draw international attention to their cause, they bypass the traditional power structure of state institutions and frame their arguments in a modern discourse of consumerism, environmental conservatism, and the protection of indigenous cultures and land rights. This strategy has been successful; since the early 1990s, the Kayapó, numbering approximately 4000, have possessed legal rights to a territory the size of Scotland (Conklin and Graham 700). Their ability to secure rights to this land can be attributed to their close partnerships with international activist groups and with ecologically conscious companies such as the Body Shop. (The Body Shop uses photographs of the Kayapó to market their Brazilian nut products, and compensates individuals for their images.) Moreover, between 1988 and 1992, the Kayapó leader Payakan garnered more international attention to the Kayapó cause by visiting seven European countries, speaking at the World Bank and on the Phil Donahue show, meeting with Presidents François Mitterrand of France and Jimmy Carter, and appearing on the front cover of the Atlanta magazine *Parade* (Conklin and Graham 695). In essence, these forms of publicity were effective in promoting territorial rights for his people.

Eco-indigenous activism is imbued with symbolic and cultural politics; in fact, it is through such politics that the Kayapó have achieved their goals. Payakan has modeled himself as a representative of traditional knowledge and of environmentally respectful cultures. The caption of the cover photograph of *Parade* reads: “I am Payakan, a chief of the Kayapó Indians of Brazil. What is known as the Amazon rainforest is the land upon which my people live. Help me save lives – yours and ours;” the article is entitled “A Man Who Would Save the World” (Conklin and Graham 696). In the caption, Payakan promotes himself and his people not only as stewards of the forests working for the good of general humanity, but also as a subordinate needing outside protection and assistance. Indigenous peoples provide symbolic capital for organizations, which in turn provide them with venues to assert their claim of territorial autonomy. Bonnie McCay and Louise Fortmann describe the new language and symbols of indigenous activism as “attempts to articulate, defend and reclaim their roles as proprietors and stewards of common resources” (1). This explicit attempt to create a new type of discourse combining indigenous cultural survival and territorial integrity

into an international cause has been the main force behind successful indigenous mobilization. By reaching out to international activists, using the media, and acquiring corporate sponsorships, the Kayapó have boycotted the Brazilian government and its mechanisms for representation.

The transnational linkages in which the Kayapó are involved are typified by Keck and Sikkink's famous "boomerang effect," outlined in their seminal work, *Activists Beyond Borders*. The boomerang effect is defined as the process whereby NGOs and activists in one nation use their relationships with foreign, and many times marginalized groups to apply pressure on the latter's government for reform. In the case of the Kayapó leaders such as Payakan enlisted the help of foreign activists to publicize their situation in Brazil, and to put forth arguments for cultural, economic, and territorial survival. As these NGOs and other activist groups campaigned for awareness of the plight of the Kayapó, the international community became cognizant of violations against the native group. The resulting pressure from various governments within the international community pushed the Brazilian government to cede territorial rights to the Kayapó. This occurrence demonstrates a method the international community has used to influence domestic politics and perpetuate a set of global norms. The boomerang effect acknowledges the strength of international networks that NGOs and activists create and use in catalyzing change while undermining traditional claims to national sovereignty. However, Keck and Sikkink's theories have limited practical application, as they are impeded by the reality of state-centrism.

Brazil's responsiveness to international pressure seems to display a weakening of state sovereignty over internal matters. However, the appeal to international networks for indigenous rights is only effective to a certain extent, as indigenous groups are enclosed within national boundaries and are subject to national laws. States possess monopolies on the legitimate use of force, which severely limits the influence of other actors (Urban and Sherzer 8). (Too repetitive). The extent that the international community can influence sovereign issues, specifically regarding indigenous peoples, is limited but has been increasing, particularly through the proliferation of shared values, norms, and laws. Therefore, the success of indigenous groups gaining territorial rights depends on the ability of indigenous groups to interact with the nation-state.

In Brazil, the internationalization of indigenous struggle has "orchestrated a nationalist backlash against the worldwide outcry" (Maybury-Lewis 225). David Maybury-Lewis, the director of the NGO Cultural Survival, notes that in 1988 the newspaper *Estado de São Paulo* published articles accusing international groups helping the Kayapó of "using the Indian issue as a pretext for preventing Brazil from exploiting its own mineral wealth," thereby, perpetuating dependence on foreign companies (225). Both the

Brazilian government and media resented foreign intrusion into their domestic affairs. As a result, the Kayapó have been depicted as "childlike," "antinationalist," "unpatriotic," and actively working to undermine the security and cohesiveness of the Brazilian state (Conklin and Graham 705). Schwartzman, ValZria, and Pankarau have labeled this backlash sentiment the "Copacabana syndrome"—a phrase that implies that if the indigenous peoples are ceded territory, their demands for land will never be satisfied even if they obtain the famous Copacabana beach in Rio de Janeiro (39). Therefore, although the internationalization of the Kayapó struggle has legitimized its members' rights and identities within the state, it has simultaneously undermined their positions as participants in a cohesive national community. By boycotting Brazilian government venues for political and territorial claims, the Kayapó have antagonized the government, the media, and much of the citizenry.

Despite these tensions, the Kayapó have secured an enormous indigenous reserve of land? and full economic rights over their territory. for example, they currently negotiate the terms of mining and logging access to their lands. Though the Kayapó have thus far succeeded in carving out their own sphere within the state, their situation will remain precarious until they institutionalize these reforms through some means of political representation within the Brazilian government. As long as indigenous groups remain subservient to nation-states, pleading to international activist organizations is not an effective way to secure rights within their country. International organizations have limited influence over national laws, and, as the Brazilian response to the Kayapó appeal to the international community shows, international NGO involvement may further marginalize indigenous groups. Alcida Ramos lambastes the involvement of non-governmental organizations, suggesting: "Constricted by the abusive application of state warship, the Indians were put in the uncomfortable position of virtual creatures of NGOs —[a] sort of private warship" (4). The only viable long-term solution for indigenous societies is to work independently with the state by becoming integrated into its political, institutional, and electoral apparatuses, thus ensuring equitable representation. Successful indigenous activism may use transnational organizations to resist state pressure in order to gain territorial rights, but they must also integrate themselves into state mechanisms of governance to secure their national rights.

#### *The Kuna: Seeking Security Within the State*

One of the most successful examples of indigenous resistance to state intrusion is the Kuna of Panama. These people have been challenged by many territorial, economic, and cultural intrusions, but have successfully resisted state pressure while integrating themselves into state mechanisms in

order to safeguard their cultural and political existence (Maybury-Lewis 87). They have gained large areas of territory, asserted control over natural resources, and maintained a culturally and linguistically distinct identity within Panama. This indigenous community currently numbers around 40,000 in the San Blas Kuna district, occupying 240 kilometers of the Atlantic coastline, including over fifty inhabited islands (Moore 28). In the first half of the century, the Panamanian government was sympathetic towards claims concerning the economic livelihoods of the Kuna, giving them exclusive farming and fishing rights while refusing their demands for complete control over land and water. According to respected Kuna anthropologist James Howe the “conflict on this point was inevitable” because “both sides saw control of the land as essential to their integrity, as a nation or as a people ...” (1991: 30). The Kuna viewed what they considered to be their territory as an integral part to their cultural distinctiveness. Howe claims the Kuna have always been intensely “proud and aloof, sometimes to the point of xenophobia,” and condescending towards non-Kuna, who they call *wagas* (22). In a further expression of strong cultural identity bordering on ethnocentrism, the Kuna call themselves *olotule*, or “golden people” (Howe 1991: 22). The Kuna have a long history of resisting the Panamanian state, beginning with a refusal to recognize Panamanian statehood for over ten years and aligning themselves with the United States (Howe 1991: 22). In fact, it was political pressure from the US government that encouraged the Panamanian government to grant the Kuna territorial independence in 1925. However, it was not until 1938 that the Panamanian government officially recognized the legal rights of the Kuna and established the San Blas Kuna reserve (Howe 1986: 19).

Indigenous groups must institutionalize themselves within the state apparatus to secure a sustainable lifestyle. The Kuna have done so by creating their own Congresses and NGOs, and engaging in electoral politics. Each Kuna community is governed by a “gathering,” also known as in Spanish as *congreso* and in Kuna as *konkreso* (Moore 28). Local gatherings are attended by the entire community and are governed by chiefs, below whom are interpreters and constables (Moore 30). Moreover, according to the “tribal charter,” there are at least three General Congresses a year, to which each local community sends a delegation. These General Congresses discuss issues raised by the delegations, handle disputes, and hear representatives from the Panamanian government (Howe page number?). The Kuna have maintained extensive autonomy over their economic and cultural lives. For example, they do not pay taxes to the Panamanian government (Howe 1986: 213). The Kuna Congress has an International Relations Commission which deliberates on matters of Panamanian-Kuna relationships, such a commission reveals the strength of the Kuna sense of identity (Howe page number?). The governance

frameworks of the Kuna are integrated with the national government, and their ‘sovereignty’ is contingent on Panama’s continued recognition of it.

There is a significant reciprocal relationship between the national government and Kuna Congresses. Panamanian government representatives, who must speak through translators, attend these Kuna congresses to make requests and discuss policy with the delegates (Howe 1986: 211). Through these congresses, the Kuna debate and decide on questions that will affect their community, from education, development projects and policies towards the national government.

Moreover, villages may make direct requests to the state bureaucracy by sending delegations to plead their case (Howe 1986: 211). In addition, the San Blas district has a governor, a judge, National Guard commandant, three representatives, and a legislator, all of whom are Kuna (Howe 1986: 213). Enrique Villalba emphasizes the assimilative functions of these institutional relationships (177). He writes that for the Panamanian government, the *comerce*, or indigenous reserve, is used to “assign a territory for the enjoyment of native populations ... where a mediating political-legal superstructure can promote the integration of indigenous groups into the national system” (Villalba 177), while indigenous groups see the reserve as an administrative institution through which they can “promote their socioeconomic autonomy, and where they can establish and observe their norms, customs and traditional practices” (Villalba 177). In fact, the establishment of a protected indigenous territory, the San Blas Kuna, was the linchpin of Kuna success, and is a model for indigenous populations elsewhere. Within this territory, the Kuna control the political and economic systems that tie them to the Panamanian government. They remain passionately distinctive yet firmly entrenched in national institutional mechanisms.

### Conclusion

Important observations regarding the success of indigenous activism can be drawn from this paper’s brief examination of Kuna political structures. First, as demonstrated by the Kayapó study, cultural activism unaccompanied by a framework for institutional representation is not a viable solution for long-term activism. For example, although the Kayapó and their international representatives successfully pressured the Brazilian government to cede territory to the indigenous group, it still has not turned over all the indigenous territories promised in the 1988 constitution (Schwartzman, ValZria, Pankarau 38). Second,, there must be strong domestic movements to promote indigenous rights within the state. Brysk argues that the internationalization of Indian rights exemplified by the Kayapó case occurred precisely because indigenous social movements were weak domestically (1996: 39).

Strong domestic support, which has been slowly developing among progressive Brazilians, is crucial for successfully 'marketing' the indigenous cause within the nation and for firmly integrating territorial and political rights. Domestic support for indigenous groups, rather than further social marginalization and antagonism, is crucial for successful interaction of indigenous peoples within the government, thereby creating a politically democratic and culturally pluralistic space.

The Kuna have adapted their self-government structures to the demands of living in a nation-state, and have thus successfully safeguarded their cultural identity. Specific institutions such as the General Congress provide stable forms for interactions with the state, and thus empower the Kuna community. Community members use these mediums to their advantage to secure economic and territorial self-rule. This empowerment has enabled the Kuna to interact with the Panamanian state and the global economy on their own terms and to forge a cultural identity in a protected political space. As is the case with the Kuna, indigenous political institutions must exert decision-making power over the futures of their societies; this requires the nation-state to grant economic and political power to indigenous groups and accommodate them into a pluralistic Latin American society. Similarly, there must be mechanisms in place for negotiating issues of resource management and social services. The Inter-Commission Task Force on Indigenous Peoples describes one striking Kuna example of joint indigenous and government collaboration that could be adapted by a forest-dwelling indigenous group such as the Kayapó; With the assistance of the Panamanian government, the Kuna, who manage 60,000 hectares of the Kuna Yala reservation (IUCN 123), created The Project for the Study of the Management of Wildlife Areas of Kuna Yala (PEMASKY). This project is entirely community based, and actively involves Kunas who act as co-researchers, guides, and informants. Members of PEMASKY also educate the community and patrol the land (IUCN 123). PEMASKY is reviewed periodically at the Kuna General Congress (IUCN 123). This type of locally based program, which actively seeks grassroots involvement, is a prototype of indigenous participation created in order to preserve their cultural and economic lives.

Incorporation into national government means finding strategies that allow indigenous groups to politically represent themselves while remaining culturally autonomous. Only through such multilateral partnerships can Latin American countries truly become democratic, pluralistic, and heterogeneous societies. Moreover, the Kayapó should not be expected to utilize the specific institutional models of the Kuna, but rather to acknowledge the importance of such institutions as vehicles for representation and empowerment and hopefully to create comparable mechanisms for themselves. These types of pan-indigenous interactions have already taken place; Brysk notes

that the Kuna have shared their advice on environmental and territorial issues with other indigenous communities (2000: 276). Groups such as the Kayapó may learn much from the historical successes of the Kuna, and can adapt these procedures to their own cultures.

### References

- Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina Dagnino and Arturo Escobar. *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-envisioning Latin American Social Movements*. Colorado: Westview Press, 1998.
- Brysk, Alison. "Turning Weakness into Strength: The Internationalization of Indian Rights." *Latin American Perspectives* 32.2(1996): 38-57.
- . *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Conklin, Beth A. and Laura R. Graham. "The Shifting Middle Ground: Amazonian Indians and Eco-Politics." *American Anthropologist* 97.4(2000): 695-710.
- Davis, Shelton H. *Land Rights and Indigenous Peoples: The Role of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights*. Massachusetts: Cultural Survival, Inc, 1988.
- Hale, Charles R. "Cultural Politics of Identity in Latin America." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26(1997): 567-590.
- Howe, James. "An Ideological Triangle: The Struggle over San Blas Kuna Culture, 1915-1925." *Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*. Eds. Greg Urban and Joel Sherzer. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997: 207-236.
- . *The Kuna Gathering*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Inter-Commission Task Force on Indigenous Peoples. *Indigenous Peoples and Sustainability: Cases and Actions*. The Netherlands: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, International Books, 1997.
- Jordan, Glenn and Chris Wheeldon. *Cultural Politics: Class, Gender, Race and the Postmodern World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lâm, Maivân Clech (2000). *At the Edge of the State: Indigenous Peoples and Self-Determination*. New York: Transnational Publishers.
- Maybury-Lewis, David (2002). *The Politics of Ethnicity: Indigenous Peoples*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- . *Becoming Indian in Lowland South America. Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*. Eds. Greg Urban and Joel Sherzer. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997: 207-236.
- McCay, Bonnie J. and Louise Fortmann. "Voices From the Commons: Evolving Relations of Property and Management." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 20.1(1996).
- Moore, Alexander. *From Council to Legislature: Democracy, Parliamentarism, and the San Blas Cuna*. *American Anthropologist* 86.1(1984): 28-42.
- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Resolution 2000/22. "Establishment of a Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues." United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2000.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita. "The Indigenous Movement in Brazil: A Quarter Century of Ups and Downs." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 21.2(1997).
- Schwartzman, Stephan, Araujo ValZria, Ana and Paulo Pankarau. "Brazil: The Legal Battle over Indigenous Rights." *North American Congress on Latin America Report on the Americas* 19 (March/April 1996).
- Stevens, Stan. *Conservation through Cultural Survival*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1996.
- Urban, Greg and Joel Sherzer. "Introduction." *Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*.

Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.

Van Cott, Donna Lee. "Explaining Ethnic Autonomy Regimes in Latin America." Paper Presented XII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association. Miami Florida, March 16-18, 2000.

Villalba, Enriqueta Davis. "Pobreza y Migración Indígena Interna en Panamá." *Diversidad Étnica y Conflicto En América Latina*. Eds. Raquel Barceló and Martha Judith Sánchez. Translated by M. O'Donnell-Morales. Mexico: Plaza y Valdés, 1995.

Wilmer, Franke. *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993.

---