♡ AR-ANTHROPOL.(3586R)-16

Ann. Rev. Anthropol. 1988. 17:365–90

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS OF INDIGENOUS ADVOCACY

Robin M. Wright

Conjunto de Antropologia, Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, Brazil; and the Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informação (CEDI), São Paulo, Brazil

One often comes across the idea that social scientists must refrain from expressing opinions which can be characterized as political. It is high time we all recognize this dilemma as part of an old doctrine of academic conduct inherent in contemporary social science. Any concern with politically sensitive issues can be branded as "political," due among other reasons, to the fact that our research draws its data from human reality, which is at the same time the very object of activities and decisions of politicians.

Confronted by a world where genocide, exploitation and deprivation of control over one's own life are constant facts of life for fellow human beings, social science must become the indefatigable eye watching over human inviolability. Only then will the social scientist become anything more than a predator consuming data. And only then will the concept of *responsibility* mean more than a buttonhole flower worn at academic ceremonies.

- *Helge Kleivan* (20)

INTRODUCTION

Up until a few decades ago, it was a rarity for an anthropologist to take a stand on behalf of the tribe from s/he studied. The idea of an unbiased or value-free social science so permeated the profession that it was considered "unscientific" to judge the policies and programs affecting native people, even if these resulted in profound changes in their ways of life. Helge Kleivan, founder and president of IWGIA (the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, one of the first international indigenous advocacy organizations, based in Copenhagen), from 1968 until his death in 1983, sought to challenge the idea

0084-6570/88/1015-0365$02.00

of a value-free social science for its implicit support of the very premises of the established social order.

It took a long time for anthropologists to become aware that their studies have a political relevance for native people. Perhaps the general questioning that took place in the discipline in the 1960s and the overall political climate in the world at that time, together with the outrage of concerned citizens at continuing crimes against native people, forced anthropologists to redirect their thinking towards a more relevant inquiry. But, they first had to recognize and break their ties with colonial ideologies that had, after all, given birth to anthropology. A great deal of damage had by then been done to native people because of this legacy; so, anthropologists had to seek to create a dialog with native people, who by then were organizing into effective political movements—a dialog in which anthropologists would offer their services to native struggles. Nearly 20 years have passed since this revolution in anthropological perspective began to take place, and the task of this review is to evaluate how anthropological advocacy came to be a legitimate undertaking and where it stands today.

Specifically, the numerous advocacy organizations that have sprung up since the 1960s, writings by anthropologists in the same vein, literature of what is called the "Fourth World," and public pronouncements of indigenous spokespersons and groups on public policy towards native people regularly contain anthropological assumptions, claims, and implications. They and the problems that prompt them have the status of anthropological data in their own right and, as such, pose challenges to anthropological theory. Neither this challenge nor the theoretical implications of indigenous advocacy policies have received serious anthropological attention. This review seeks to answer the question of whether and how anthropological theory has made contributions towards the formulation of relevant perspectives and critical guidelines for the politics of native peoples' struggles and the policies of advocacy organizations.

Over the years, native peoples have offered reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of anthropology and anthropologists. Indianist writers such as Vine Deloria (46) have made fun of, insulted, and generally raked over the role of anthropologists in native communities. In many cases, it was important to do so; but it is also instructive to explain how and why anthropologists have done a disservice to native people and how the profession began to review its procedures, goals, and ethics, and to challenge the ways its practitioners conducted their inquiries.

Here I attempt to trace the development and growth of an alliance between anthropological perspectives and native peoples' struggles. Although my discussion begins with 19th-century evolutionism, my emphasis is on the period from approximately the 1940s to the present. Rather than concentrating

on any one country, my discussion seeks to paint, in broad strokes, the concerns of North American, Latin American, and European anthropology, showing, where appropriate, the convergence of thought and its translation into similar theoretical perspectives.

I argue that the ideological underpinnings of 19th-century evolutionism supported the military conquest and colonization of native peoples, while early structural-functionalist models presented native cultures as incapable of self-determination. Acculturation studies, synonymous in some countries with applied anthropology, in general assumed that the processes of integration and assimilation of native peoples into national societies were inevitable and hence supported official indigenist policies. Action-oriented approaches, developing out of North American applied anthropology, began to pay more critical attention to the role of anthropologists in native communities. Ethnohistory also began as a methodology in service to native land claims. The "Urgent Anthropology" of the 1950s and 1960s represented more a crisis in anthropology than a serious questioning of the discipline's ethics and goals. In the late 1960s, ethnicity theories sought to understand the emerging politicization, or "tribalism" of native peoples in several areas of the world. With their critique of the "colonial situation," these anthropologists began to look critically at the legacy and goals of the profession, "awakening" to their ethical responsibilities, and directing their interests to the concerns of native peoples. Continuing crimes of genocide in Brazil, Paraguay, and Colombia pressed these anthropologists to take more definitive stands.

One of the most significant results of this "awakening" was the Declaration of Barbados in 1971, which became the manifesto of anthropology's alliance with the liberation struggles of native people. Indianist writers in various countries also began to define their situation in terms of a "Fourth World" consciousness—the notion that indigenous peoples throughout the world are united by their common situation as disenfranchised people, whose existence depends on a moral claim but who challenge the First World to examine its institutions, structures, and values, which have left indigenous peoples powerless and dependent (80, 89).

The 1970s witnessed a tremendous flourishing of indigenous and advocacy organizations as the consciousness became clearer and the commitment of anthropologists took on more concrete forms. Theoretical issues such as ethnicity were more sharply defined both in practical terms of concrete strategies as well as in longer-range goals of the kind of future, or "concrete utopias," native peoples were struggling for. Anthropological perspectives helped to clarify these issues.

Development theory, long a concern of the social sciences, came to have a new significance. Initially serving to explain situations of dependency in the Third World, analyses were extended to the "victims" of development

or progress, and the government policies of development. Advocacy organizations came to serve the important function of "watchdogs," monitoring the effects of development on native peoples worldwide and bringing cases of human rights violations before international forums. Advocacy became more linked with international human rights law and institutions and the anthropologists' task more oriented to the development of adequate legal codes. At the same time, the critique of development shifted its focus to "alternative models of development" and the possibilities of reformulating development planning to include the concerns of—and even control by—native people. With this direction, the fundamental issue of self-determination found its strongest support. In concluding, I outline several of the ways that the work continues, and certain issues that still need to be addressed.

Given the limitations of space and resources available at the time of writing, it was impossible to include all that could be said about this history, the actors and organizations important to it. I consider, for example, neither the role of the churches in the emergence of indigenous movements nor, to any significant extent, indigenous issues in party politics. Over the period of writing, I also considered several possible approaches to the topic—e.g. the uses of perspectives developed in anthropology by official indigenist agencies; the use of a variety of anthropological perspectives in support of a particular advocacy campaign—but again, limitations of space prevented considering these questions in detail. Finally, numerous subtopics are only mentioned, such as medical and health work, filmmaking and the use of the media.

THE FORMATION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL ADVOCACY

From Evolutionism to Urgent Anthropology

With a few exceptions, the early reflections of anthropologists on the indigenous question can be characterized by two main lines of thought: those emphasizing culturalist analyses and those emphasizing economic analyses. Both of these lines were strongly influenced by the cultural and social evolutionism, or Darwinism, of the mid-19th century. Both viewed indigenous societies as "backward, inferior races" that nevertheless could, through normal evolutionary processes, progress and develop towards the "modern" conditions of Western society, seen as the ideal.

According to the cultural theorists, the "problem" of indigenous people is that their "backwardness" is due to their traditional cultures, which impeded their development as well as the progress of Western society. Where outright military conquest was not used as the "solution," then forced acculturation (that is, the acquisition by native peoples of the traits of the dominant culture

and the concomitant loss of their own cultures), particularly through education, was the principal means for integrating native people into the national society. As Stocking (cited in 77) has pointed out, one of the main themes of 19th century anthropology, that of acculturation, "was not of academic interest alone, for it directly served the interest of colonial penetration." This utilitarian aspect of applied social sciences remained valid both in the "direct rule" stages—i.e. military conquest and colonization—and that of "indirect rule" (17).

The second main line of thought, exemplified by social change theorists, took several forms, the first being Continental anthropology, specifically British structural-functionalism of the early 20th century, which emphasized the uniqueness of cultures and the notion of diversity of cultures. The structural-functionalists not only suggested that it was impossible for one culture to develop into another, "higher" form, but also that cultures had to be studied in terms of their internal structures and functions, statically conceived. In South Africa, where Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski studied the "social change" of "contact" situations, they sought to find ways in which the natives could best be helped to improve and adjust to the colonial status quo. They spoke of "acculturation" and "westernization" to describe the inevitable effects of contact, but sought to preserve, insofar as possible, native cultures from its destructive aspects (77). The methodology of the structural-functionalists not only ignored the analysis of historical relations of power between colonial societies and native people, but also denied that other cultures could and should determine their own futures. It was this denial of the worth and viability of native cultures that explains why there developed so much hostility on the part of native peoples of Africa and the Americas towards anthropologists. Entities disconnected and isolated from each other, native cultures became merely the objects of anthropological possession and the testing of theories (62, 77).

In Latin American anthropology, particularly Mexican in the early 20th century, native cultures were described in terms of a "classist" form of analysis (8, 12, 87), as precapitalist, feudal, or neofeudal; and the objectives of applied social sciences were to integrate native people into the capitalist system so that, later, they could be a part of the future socialist system (8, 12). The integration of the Indian would be accomplished through the "proletarization" or "*campesini-zación*" of the Indian, for peasants and laborers were considered as the only exploited classes. Ethnic questions were unimportant to the objective of the end of economic exploitation and, in fact, impeded progress towards that end (56). In the euphoria of the post-Revolutionary period in Mexico, "who could doubt the convenience of incorporating the Indian into the national society which everyday saw itself as more democratic and just" (12)?

Hence the objective of anthropology in Mexico and elsewhere was the integration of the Indian into national society, which necessarily implied the denial of an autonomous identity. Regardless of the humanistic intent of the First Inter-American Indigenist Conference held in Patzcuaro, Michoacán, in 1940, its goal was strongly steeped in the ethnocentrism of the times. Indians were considered incapable of formulating their own problems; hence anthropologists and indigenists had to speak in their name, as their redeemers. Nolasco Armas (87) has justly criticized applied anthropology, synonymous with indigenism in Mexico, as profoundly colonialist in its objectives (15, 18).

Outside of Latin America, applied anthropology took several forms, differing profoundly in political stance but both important for the directions of future indigenist work. British social anthropology, as in the works of Lucy Mair and Raymond Firth, for example, insisted on a neutrality and technical rigor in conducting applied policy-related studies. It was considered "unscientific" to pass judgment on official policies towards native peoples. In part, this attitude reflected a strategy adopted by anthropologists in light of their own powerlessness and incapacity to intervene in social processes and colonial policies. The anthropologist's role was to fit in, as technical specialists in the colonial process (57, 78).

The second form is represented by the works of George Foster, whose ideology was more assistance-oriented and modernizing: The role of the anthropologist is to describe and undertake community-improvement programs, the ultimate goal of which are "to make the world a better place to live" (58). This voluntary humanitarianism, albeit burdened by ethnocentric presuppositions, contrasts with the non-interventionism of the British.

Finally, the third form might be called "action anthropology" and is exemplified by such projects as the Fox Project, Vicos, and others. Here, the anthropologist's role is most strongly developed, as administrator, decision-maker, and researcher. The key difference from the previous two approaches is that the anthropologist works together with the community, establishes principles to which action must conform, defines priorities and goals, selects forms and areas of intervention, and coordinates technical contributions to projects. A project begins to take shape when, upon evaluation of the cultural characteristics of the group, the possibilities for alternatives are determined. The elaboration of a project seeks to maximize the realization of community interests. To do that, the project has to be thought of and operationalized in alliance with the community, respecting its cultural code and seeking a favorable adaptation to the natural and human environment. The project is not intended to create a new reality but to add to the actual situation of the population, enhancing the possibilities and opportunities that native communities have in their historical situation (51, 109). I have mentioned this third form in detail for I believe it provides a crucial basis for many indigenist

action or assistance programs promoted by advocacy organizations later in the 1970s (51, 52, 67, 84).

Another direction of North American anthropology in the 1950s that proved useful to native people was the study of ethnohistory, which developed as a result of the need for historical research to verify native land claims, subsequent to the passage of the Land Claims Act. Since then, ethnohistory has become a key methodological tool for revising and decolonizing Native American histories, as Trigger has recently pointed out (110).

At the time applied anthropology was being conceptualized, between 1952 and 1968, there arose in the international academic community a plea for "urgent" anthropological studies to be done among tribal societies, because they were considered to be in the process of "disappearing." Hence anthropologists felt a need to "save" the testimony of aboriginal cultures in the face of what was called the "tragedy of anthropology" (59). International committees were formed to translate this need into urgent research projects. But the flurry of research activities that resulted (in Colombia, for example) was more concerned, as Friedemann has pointed out (59), with "data in the process of extinction" than with the well-being of the people studied. It provoked negative reactions from nationals who resented the expropriation of data (59). It was not until the First Barbados Symposium in 1971 that anthropologists began to look seriously at their commitment to the peoples they studied.

Ethnicity and the New Social Sciences

In the late 1960s, ethnicity became the focus of a theoretical concern in social and political anthropology that was to have a profound influence on the direction of work with native peoples. Many factors contributed to this intellectual change: political crises in the Third World, the writings of Franz Fanon and others of newly independent Third World countries, critical currents in First World countries, etc (12, 55). Fredrik Barth's study of ethnicity not only constituted a total revision of the culturalist perspective and studies of acculturation, but also came to serve as a basis for anthropological criteria of ethnic identity and definitions. In countries such as Brazil, it was frequently used in discussions about official "recognition" of indigenous peoples and the criteria of ethnic identity (9, 97). At the same time, Abner Cohen's discussion of ethnicity as the political dimension of organized groups, in the context of the phenomenon of "retribalization" of ethnic groups in urban Africa (27), demonstrated the dynamic and innovative character of these movements (97, 79).

In Latin America, studies of ethnicity predate even the two abovementioned works and can be seen especially in the writings of the Brazilian anthropologist R. C. de Oliveira (48, 49). Departing from a critique of acculturation studies, and taking as a basic object of study "inter-ethnic

contact" (understood as a dimension and result of colonial processes); de Oliveira incorporated concepts and theoretical positions that had also been developing in England, through the monographs of Gluckman and Turner, and which represent a critical revision of functionalist anthropology's treatment of "social change" (49). De Oliveira's model of "interethnic friction" and notion of the "potential for integration"—which seeks to account for the structural variables that direct the perspectives and levels of articulation and participation of native peoples in the national society—provided the basis for a number of significant studies of interethnic relations involving indigenous peoples of Brazil. De Oliveira later developed this model into a theory of ethnic identity (50).

In other countries, such as Mexico and Peru, there was a similar redirecting of anthropological studies towards understanding the ethnic and political dimensions of the indigenous situation (8). Coupled with a profound criticism of the social sciences as a "colonized" and colonizing enterprise, these anthropologists proclaimed their political stance in defense of indigenous self-determination, questioning the power of nation-states to determine indigenous policy, as supported by theories of acculturation and social change (8). Here again, definitions of the "colonial situation" and "internal colonialism" (15, 16, 105) were critical to these analyses.

North American anthropology was similarly going through a process of soul-searching at the end of the 1960s, particularly questioning the legacy of anthropology, the goals of the discipline, and its relations to wider political trends in American society and the world. At the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, and in professional journals, anthropologists raised questions about the social responsibility of their discipline, the ethics of field research, and the relations among anthropologists, communities, and governments. During this time, some anthropologists called for a more relevant type of work that would speak to the pressing social and political issues of the day (71, 62).

Perhaps one of the crucial factors in the crystallization of these new postures was the critical situation of Indians in Brazil and other South American countries at the end of the 1960s. Evidence of genocide in these countries had been compiled in official reports and made known to the international community through the press, publications (61, 70, 91, 120), and pleas from Brazilian anthropologists for international concern. There was an immediate response, particularly from European anthropologists who not only expressed their concern but also took steps to monitor, on a continuing basis, the situation of indigenous peoples worldwide. In 1968, a Resolution was adopted by the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences calling for the protection of native peoples and their cultures from "progress" resulting in ethnocide (cultural destruction) and destruction of

identity, if not genocide. The IUAES appointed an international committee on genocide and forced acculturation, chaired by Fredrik Barth (62). Also in 1968, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs was founded by Helge Kleivan in Denmark. From 1970–1972, several international organizations—including the newly formed Primitive Peoples' Fund (later, Survival International) of London, sent fact-gathering missions to Brazil to observe the conditions of the Indians (66). Brazilian social scientists and North American anthropologists criticized official Brazilian policy towards the Indian, as proposed in the 1970 version of the Indian Statute (43, 120). In response to this international pressure, the President of Brazil signed a spate of decrees and legislation concerning Indian reserves. Despite the effectiveness of this protest, however, and the importance of the gestures by anthropologists, a more penetrating analysis was still needed of the larger economic processes, particularly the integration of South American countries into the international capitalist system, which created situations of genocide and forced acculturation. D. Ribeiro had first pointed in this direction of analysis, later developed by Davis (39, 43; see below for further discussion).

Barbados I

In this context, the World Council of Churches, Program to Combat Racism—long concerned with liberation struggles of indigenous peoples against racism—invited ethnologists of the University of Berne (Switzerland) to organize a Symposium on Inter-Ethnic Contact in South America, the results of which would serve as the basis of formulating church programs and policies. Eleven anthropologists of the Americas (one from Europe), all of whom represented the position of the New Social Sciences, participated in the Symposium. A key document was produced, "The Declaration of Barbados for the Liberation of the Indians" (45, 54). In it, the authors called on states, religious missions, and social scientists, primarily anthropologists, to take action in halting aggression against the Indians of the Americas, and to contribute significantly to the process of Indian liberation. With regard to anthropology, the authors denounced the use of anthropology as an instrument of colonial domination, which has "often rationalized and justified, in scientific language, the domination of some people by others." They specifically criticized three types of positions in anthropological research:

> 1) *Scientism*, which negates any relationship between academic research and the future of those people who form the object of such investigation, thus eschewing political responsibility which the relation contains and implies;
> 2) an *Hypocrisy* manifest in rhetorical protests based on first principles which skilfully avoids any commitment in a concrete situation; and 3) an *Opportunism* that, although it may recognize the present painful situation of the Indians, at the same time it rejects any possibility of transforming action by proposing the need "to do something" within the established order (45, 54).

The new anthropology called for a radical change in its relationship to native peoples:

> In this context, we see anthropology as providing colonized peoples with the data and interpretations both about themselves and their colonizers useful for their own fight for freedom, and re-defining the distorted image of Indian communities current in the national society, thereby unmasking its colonial nature with its underlying ideology (45, 54).

To realize these objectives, the Declaration called on anthropologists to take action in denouncing cases of genocide and ethnocide, and to produce new concepts and explanatory categories based on local and national social realities.

Certain anthropological concepts emerge from the papers presented at the symposium: the notion of "internal colonialism" (15, 48) and class analysis of inter-ethnic relations to describe and explain indigenous realities (54); G. Balandier's definition of the "colonial situation" and Frank's model of underdevelopment to explain the relation of indigenous peoples to national societies; a reexamination of "cultural pluralism" and inter-ethnic relations in light of internal colonialism; "inter-ethnic friction," as used by de Oliveira (48, 49) and P. Casanova, to describe the basic characteristics of the situation of contact.

The message of the Barbados Declaration—that social scientists have a moral duty to inform native peoples of their rights and of the institutional means to regain their rights—was intended to set in motion a process for the Indians that would promote their active incorporation in their own struggles for liberation. In practical terms, this meant that anthropologists would provide the active collaboration and technical assistance that indigenous peoples deem necessary in this struggle. It meant that the anthropologists' responsibility was to act as consultants, not leaders or heroes in the struggle; to sustain a dialog with indigenous movements; and to break down the dichotomy between applied and pure anthropological research (7, 101).

The Barbados Declaration and the work that followed represented a turning-point in the relationship of anthropologists to indigenous intellectuals and militants in the emerging Indian movement of the Americas. It opened a dialog in which indigenous ideologists, with their own reflections on the indigenous situation, could engage in discourse with anthropologists concerning theoretical and practical matters in liberation struggles. Indian intellectuals, especially in Latin America, came forth with statements on the philosophical and historical basis of what they called "Indianness" *(Indianidad)* that made critical use of instruments of Western thought put at the service of the new ideology [see Bonfil Batalla (14) for a collection of some of the more important manifestoes]. *Ideologia y Raza en America Latina*, by the Quechaymara writer Ramiro Reynaga, is one example of Indianist reflections

on "colonialism" that complements, if not criticizes, social scientific reflections on the subject (90, 94, 95).

Within the more traditional academic community of anthropologists, the impact of the Barbados Declaration was somewhat disappointing, as pointed out by the Second Barbados Symposium held six years later (see below; 65), owing to poor understanding of the analyses presented, or failure of anthropologists to recognize the historic role of indigenous peoples in the formation of their own future (65).

The Political Emergence of Indigenous Peoples

The decade of the 1970s witnessed an unparalleled flourishing of indigenous and advocacy organizations throughout the world, as well as regional, national, and international meetings to define and sharpen the new ideology and praxis of the indigenous movement. To mention a few examples: Cultural Survival, founded in 1972; INDIGENA, in 1973; the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, in 1975; the First Indian Parliament of South America, in 1974; and, in 1977, the following events: the First International Indigenous Conference of Central America, the United Nations Non-Governmental Organizations Conference on Discrimination against Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, and the second meeting of the Barbados group [for the conclusions of the indigenous conferences, see Bonfil Batalla (14) and Varese & Rodriguez (92, 93; also 81)]. Without question, a new era was dawning and a favorable international environment existed for the political emergence of indigenous peoples and the protection of indigenous rights.

Several of the indigenous advocacy organizations played key roles in facilitating and documenting the indigenous meetings, such as IWGIA, for the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (98), and the Marandú Project of Paraquay, which organized the First Indian Parliament of South America. In North America, INDIGENA, whose main purpose as a documentation and publication center was to link the nascent Indian movement in South and Central America with the growing international movement, documented and publicized these conferences. Later, the Anthropology Resource Center continued this work (6,). But, outside of these efforts, the response of the North American anthropological community to these events was, again, disappointingly limited.[1]

[1]Bodley (17) provides an interesting, albeit outsider's perspective on the international support movement, proposing a typology of support groups according to ideology and approach: the Conservative-Humanitarian, Liberal-Political, and Primitivist-Environmentalist approaches. This typology produces strange bedfellows, nor are the differences all that clear. For example, recent experience has shown a convergence of interests between the Liberal-Political and Primitivist-Environmentalist approaches, with modifications in each.

Among the most significant documents to emerge from this period are: *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*, by Manuel & Posluns (80); *A Basic Call to Consciousness: The Haudenosaunee Address to the Western World* (63), prepared for the 1977 United Nations Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) Conference by the Six Nations Iroquois; and *Indianidad y Descolonización en América Latina*, documents of the Second Barbados Conference (65).

The "Fourth World," according to Manuel & Posluns, consists of the disenfranchised Aboriginal peoples engulfed by nation-states, and it is these millions of people that were represented at the 1975 Port Alberni Conference that created the World Council of Indigenous People, for which George Manuel served as first President. The existence of the Fourth World depends on a moral claim of the Fourth World on the First, the morality of law and human existence, for "aboriginal peoples can only argue the morality of their case" (80). This dependency is an historical creation that has left Fourth World groups powerless, and is challenged by all Fourth World groups across the world today. This challenge, echoed in the Haudenosaunee's *Basic Call to Consciousness*, is for humanity to reevaluate its beliefs and values, for the "institutions of the world to reexamine their own origins, the beliefs which brought them into being, and the basis of integrity that lies beneath their formal structures" (80). Such fundamental concepts as land, citizenship, and nationhood must be reexamined in light of the cultural values and sentiments expressed in the arguments of the Fourth World (47, 89). It is these areas of values and sentiments that anthropologists must take into account in their descriptions.[2]

Given that moral claims have to be argued in legal and political battles, the categories, concepts, and attitudes created by nation-states to dominate indigenous people must be called into question. Along similar lines, the Haudenosaunee called for a process of critical analysis of "the West's historical processes, to seek out the actual nature of the roots of the exploitative and oppressive conditions which are forced upon humanity" (63). This historical questioning found a superb expression several years later in Wolf's *Europe and the People Without History* (122).

Barbados II

The Second Barbados Conference, held in 1977, represented in several ways the product of the maturing alliance between anthropologists committed to the principles of the 1971 Declaration and the rapidly growing indigenous movement. Over half of the participants represented indigenous organizations, and

[2]The authors honor Franz Boas, for example, for his defense of the potlatch: "Those who deserve the name of friend were the ones who were willing to listen and study and were, therefore, well-informed" (80).

the discussions concentrated, at their wish, not on diagnoses of situations, but on evaluation of strategies—specifically, the possibilities of alliances with other ethnic groups, classes, political organizations, labor unions, etc, and the structural nature of such alliances; and the manner of creating ties of solidarity with other movements and organizations of the Third World. While the indigenous movement stood to gain in strength from alliances, it risked the transformation of its specifically indigenous objectives into other forms of class struggle. In its most dangerous and divisive aspect, this could mean the infiltration of non-indigenous ideologies manipulating and determining the direction and content of indigenous struggles, or, the newly emergent ethnic bourgeois doing the same at the service of the state or dominant ethnic group. Marxist ideologies are an example of the first, not only in Latin America but in North America as well (19, 25). Hence the need was expressed to affirm a specifically indigenous identity as a viable and long-run strategy for liberation, equally viable but distinct from class consciousness (114). Given the wide variety in levels of native organizations, the potentials for political mobilization, as well as collective consciousness, will likewise vary. Hence, several anthropologists proposed establishing typologies of movements, as a way of evaluating potential and appropriate strategies for mobilization (65, 103). In each instance, the meaning of "political" must similarly be examined historically to understand the political capacities of indigenous peoples to be "agents of their own destiny" (60, 65). Ethnicity is constructed historically not only in opposition to the dominant culture, but also internally through ideologies of rebellion and the development of "cultures of resistance" (10).

Finally, through its understanding of ethnic processes, anthropology has the potential for being one of the most important of all humanistic studies, for it has at its disposal the knowledge and methods to show alternative values of human living and organization of the environment, and to make these operable as models of a "concrete utopia" (65). This view was shared by Indianist writers and several other anthropological works published around this time (18).

The idea of "alternative values" was more than a slogan used at the service of the movement, for it implied a specific task of the indigenous movement both of liberation from cultural domination and a recovery of the vital possibilities of indigenous cultures to develop autonomously. That is, the indigenous movement affirms a form of autonomous project, or "Civilizing Project" as Varese has called it (115), as the only viable alternative to extinction. This view implies a radical critique of fundamental tenets of the Euro-Western view of reality—the domination of the natural world, material determinism, rationalization of thought systems, etc (34, 107). It also implies the complete separation of the indigenous struggle as the first step before the eventual unity with other struggles, and it implies a recovery of the fun-

damental civilizing elements of indigenous cultures that have been lost or expropriated over four centuries of domination (115).

Development Theories and Issues of Self-Determination

While analyses of colonialism and ethnicity were the core of anthropological theories offered in support of indigenous movements through much of the 1970s, in the latter half of the decade the question of development and its impact on native peoples assumed a far greater importance for rethinking the question of ethnicity. Clearly, the question of development had been important in the social sciences from the 1950s on; but until the end of the 1970s, much of the thinking on it had been dominated by evolutionist models, as evidenced by "modernization" studies or "directed culture change" projects. When it became clear by the 1960s that the goals of development were actually producing the opposite of what was intended (i.e. increased poverty and environmental destruction), social scientists began to criticize this model, pointing out that the "underdevelopment" visible in Third World countries was due to the international economic system in force since colonial times, and the result of specific economic relations of dependency between industrial centers and peripheral areas (106). These notions then became the object of study and debate not only in academic circles but also in public documentation centers. Jorgensen's (73) analysis of conditions of poverty and underdevelopment on American Indian reservations was the first to explain these conditions in terms of the expanding political economy of the United States. This approach, coupled with an emphasis on studying government and corporate institutions as responsible for much of the powerlessness in the world (Laura Nader's "studying up"), and a continuing concern for the critical situation in the Amazon Basin, produced one of the key works of the decade on development and native peoples—Shelton Davis's *Victims of the Miracle: Development and the Indians of Brazil* (39). The book was, in a sense, the outcome of years of documentation and research begun by Davis at IN-DIGENA; it was also part of an ongoing effort to bring international pressure to bear on Indian policy in Brazil, and on the corporate and government institutions behind the global development strategy for the occupation of the Amazon.

The publication of *Victims* coincided with a particularly crucial moment in the emerging Brazilian Indian movement for, by 1977, the government had announced a plan to unilaterally "emancipate" the Indian from the status as "wards of the state," in order to integrate them as quickly as possible into the national community (33, 120). In the context of Brazil's national development objectives, as well as increasing invasions of indigenous reserves, this policy, like the North American Dawes Act to which it was compared (6), would in effect free the state of any obligation to protect Indian lands, or to

heed the voice of the new Indian leadership. Once again, state policy perverted anthropological understandings of ethnicity to serve its goal of national development. However, an effective campaign, mobilized by anthropologists and other Indian supporters in Brazil, with the support of the international indigenous rights movement then over a decade old (6, 44), succeeded in preventing the "emancipation" project from being passed. As a result of this campaign, a number of pro-Indian defense organizations, consisting primarily of anthropologists and indigenists, were formed in Brazil committed to the struggle for the permanent rights of indigenous people against the integrationist policies of the state (31, 52). This mobilization was important because it focused a great deal of international attention on the situation of Brazilian Indians and, more generally, indigenous peoples; it brought significant pressure to bear on governments to respect internationally recognized rights of indigenous peoples; and it acted as a stimulus for the creation of new indigenous organizations (the Union of Indian Nations) and support for emerging indigenous leaders. The theme of indigenous peoples entered into public consciousness and opinion far more than it ever had before and hence gained a political weight it had never had before in Brazil (21).

The international campaign on behalf of the Yanomami Indians of Brazil is another striking case of the effectiveness of this work. Yet, it also illustrates how "scientistic" anthropology, so criticized in the Barbados Declaration, hinders these efforts. Long the subject of popular anthropological writings, the Yanomami were known to all anthropology students as "the fierce people," and it was not uncommon for such images to reinforce popular prejudices (38). When, from 1979 on, a small group of anthropologists began publicizing the actual situation of the Yanomami, who were being uprooted by highway and mining development and destroyed by diseases, (29), a major effort had to be made to deconstruct the distorted image that had been created and redirect public attention to their actual struggle for land and cultural rights (4, 5).

In these and numerous other cases of flagrant violations of the rights of indigenous peoples due to national development (41, 82, 116, 121), national and international advocacy organizations, many of them directed by anthropologists, served a vital "watchdog" function—perhaps the key to anthropological advocacy. This was evident at the Fourth Russell Tribunal on the Rights of the Indians of the Americas, held in Rotterdam in 1980, which was convened to judge the crimes committed against indigenous peoples; more than half of the jury and advisors were anthropologists (121). Although this fact in itself may have been of dubious importance to the native delegates, it illustrates that, by then, anthropologists had assumed a critical role in evaluating the claims of native people in terms of international human rights law and agreements. In this, and in other public forums, anthropologists were

called on to provide testimony regarding human rights violations; they have influenced, for example, US policy towards governments accused or suspected of such violations (41, 113).

Over the last few years, and largely as a result of the messages indigenous peoples conveyed at these international meetings, the critique of development has emphasized the need for alternative models. As conceived in the social sciences, this approach contains several key elements. First, it seeks to understand how existing cultural traditions can provide the basis for alternative models of development. Second, it defends a respect for the environment, questioning the ecological criteria of monumental development projects funded by international lending institutions and readily accepted by countries of the Third World, more for political reasons than for real economic and social motives. Third, it is based on the use of local human, technical, and natural resources as a way of gaining self-sufficiency in development while protecting the environment. Finally, it emphasizes participant development; that is, populations affected by development should participate more in all phases of planning and implementation, thereby "empowering" base communities instead of accepting the technocratic sort of development planning, for example, of international lending institutions (106).

This approach has been one of the most fruitful directions in recent research and action. The bibliography is already large [see Narby & Davis (86)], and I can do no more than mention a few of the areas on which studies have been done: mega-development projects in Brazil, campaigns to monitor their effects, and proposal of alternatives (118); hydro-electric development, campaigns to modify or halt proposed projects, with proposals for alternatives (3, 30); rainforest destruction, campaigns concentrating on multilateral development banks for policy reforms and more adequate development policies (99, 100). Special issues of the ARC *Global Reporter* and the Cultural Survival *Quarterly* have been devoted to native strategies for resource control as the key to self-determination, and "grassroots development" projects (3, 35, 76). Several of the major international support groups have played fundamental roles in encouraging such grassroots development. (67)

In 1982, several international organizations cosponsored a conference on "Native Resource Control and the Multinational Corporate Challenge," specifically focusing on strategies for monitoring and confronting corporate activities on indigenous lands (72, 108). This was a follow-up to discussions of Transnational Corporations and Indigenous Peoples at the 1981 United Nations NGO Conference on Indigenous Peoples and the Land (107).

A key theoretical question is the right of ethnic minorities to determine their political and economic futures independent of the goals of nation-states. Stavenhagen (106) has proposed this question of what he terms "ethnodevelopment" as the main question for reflection in the theoretical and prac-

tical social sciences in the coming years. What this means, also, is a complete revision of official indigenist policies towards the affirmation of indigenous cultural values and a reevaluation of the position of indigenous peoples in the social structure.

In 1981, a conference on "Ethnocide and Ethnodevelopment in Latin America," sponsored by UNESCO, held in Costa Rica, and attended by anthropologists, linguists, educators, and indigenous leaders, clarified that ethnodevelopment, "an inalienable right of Indian groups," means the following:

> The expansion and consolidation of the limits of culture itself, through the strengthening of the capacity for self-decision by a culturally differentiated society. This society should guide its own development and practice self-determination on every level, according to an equitable and suitable organization of power. This means that the ethnic group is a politico-administrative unit with authority over its own territory and the capacity for deciding the limits of its scope for development within a process of increasing autonomy and self-management. (Principle 4 of the "Declaration of San Jose"; 53.)

At the same time, those present made a plea to several international human rights organizations to take all measures necessary for the full enforcement of the adopted Declaration; and to the scientific community that their work and results may not serve to protect the fallacies that ultimately damage native peoples.

The studies presented at the conference explored the possibilities and limits of the approach in Latin America (13). In several publications, R.C. Smith (102, 104) has laid out the theoretical and practical guidelines for "autonomous development" of indigenous peoples based on South American experience. As further work is done in this area, we can expect the results to be most promising.

A related issue is the ongoing struggle by indigenous peoples to force nation-states to recognize their fundamental right to political self-determination. What self-determination means, of course, varies from autonomy within nation-states to full sovereign independence, yet the overall aim is the same—that of regaining political control over their destinies and challenging the powers of nation-states. For their part, nation-states respond with attempts to neutralize indigenous self-determination. (Forced "emancipation" in Brazil is only one example of many such responses; negotiations with tribal peoples is another frequently used tool to deprive peoples of self-determination.)

Anthropological perspectives on this issue date back to the first considerations of ethnicity but have recently been sharpened in an excellent collection of essays, *Native Power* (20), dedicated to Helge Kleivan. As the authors argue, the complexity of indigenous political strategies vis-à-vis the state depends on a variety of factors—the nature of the colonial situation,

internal cultural and political propensities, relationship to political parties, etc. This results in a tremendous diversity of strategies, although the overall nature and objective of the struggle are the same everywhere. Non-indigenous peoples and institutions may contribute to this struggle through the development of international rules on human rights, by providing forums for airing grievances, or by supporting indigenous legal notions. Any discussion of indigenous self-determination must be based on indigenous understanding of the term, not on external definitions, for indigenous strategies vary from situation to situation. Anthropologists may contribute to these discussions by clarifying indigenous notions of, for example, power (96) and by challenging the view of "political realism" held by nation-states. Native power, conceived of as an important force, which has enabled Fourth World peoples to build and rebuild viable, alternative futures, may provide an alternative vision for political relations among nation-states.

THE WORK AHEAD

I have mentioned a variety of theoretical concerns that have proven useful in the politics of native struggles and the policies of advocacy organizations. By way of conclusion, I outline eight ways that anthropologists and advocacy organizations could continue or extend this work. These represent strategies, as much weapons for the kind of non-armed struggle in which indigenous and support organizations are engaged as suggestions for critical evaluation of work that has already been done. I have culled these from a variety of sources including indigenous organizations, anthropologists, and support organizations whose perspectives have been shaped over years of experience, and from my own involvement with many of them.

Research Movements

Given that official views of indigenous people are, more often than not, highly compromised by state interests, it is crucial to have an alternative view of the current situation that could strengthen indigenous movements. For example, native rights to land and natural resources, as defined by state policies, leave a great deal to be desired. Comparative research and assessments of native claims in several countries could assist native peoples of any one country in developing appropriate strategies for their own situation (44). Also, critical evaluations of existing policies and indigenist legislation can serve as a check against distortions in official statements—for example, on land needs (24, 32)—or as an argument for the reformulation of policies (33).

This sort of research requires the collaboration and contribution of all categories of the indigenous support movement (missionaries, anthropologists, journalists, linguists, etc) in a kind of collective production of

knowledge; but this does not imply the formation of a single point of view. The *Indigenous Peoples of Brazil Program* of the *Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informação* (CEDI) in São Paulo, Brazil, for example, has since 1980 coordinated such a movement to produce a series of more than 20 volumes (of which three have so far been published, while a number of others are in various stages of preparation) surveying the current situation of indigenous peoples in Brazil (22). It has also published an analysis of mining on indigenous lands and a comprehensive survey of the official status of indigenous lands (23, 24). These have had a significant impact on the government, on public awareness, and in support of the indigenous movement. Another example is the Center for Indigenous History and Indigenist Policy, also in São Paulo, whose work is aimed at the recovery of historical documentation and alternative descriptions of the history of indigenist policy (37).

Information Gathering and Distribution

Davis (40) has pointed out that the effectiveness of the worldwide network of indigenous support organizations could be enhanced if there were a greater coordination of activities, especially in the vital area of information gathering and distribution. The literature of indigenous support groups is increasingly used by journalists, human rights groups, and international organizations as key sources (68, 69), but duplication of effort and other problems stemming from a lack of coordination often occur. Davis suggests the formation of a joint documentation project, perhaps modeled after the Human Rights Internet, or the Indigenous Peoples' Network (a computer-based indigenous news service, coordinated by AICOM—Associated Indigenous Communications), which would systematically organize and distribute information on the worldwide situation of indigenous peoples. Again, the emphasis is on a collective documentation effort, consolidating an already existing global network. Other tasks of such a project would include the preparation of a directory, published in several languages, about indigenous peoples, official policies, and the activities of the support movement.

International Organizations and International Law

International agencies such as the United Nations, Organization of American States, and the International Labor Office, as well as international financial institutions have key roles in the development of international codes and policies for the protection of indigenous rights. More systematic efforts could be made to study how these institutions work, to assess their potential for promoting and defending indigenous rights, and to evaluate the scope and effectiveness of international law and legal instruments as they stand today. Particularly as international institutions are concerned with developing more

effective codes, anthropologists and indigenous organizations may serve a useful consultancy role (2, 36, 37, 64).

Coalitions

Those who are concerned with establishing international mechanisms for the protection of indigenous rights stand to gain from working more closely with environmental organizations and other professional associations concerned with conservation and the protection of natural resources. In the United States, over the past several years, a coalition of human rights and environmental groups has proven itself to be an extremely important source for influencing the activities of international development agencies in the Third World (99, 100, 117), and for promoting indigenous-based alternative development projects. Here, the anthropologist's understanding of native subsistence rights and land use patterns complements the environmentalist's perspective on the nature of ecosystems, and both have much to share on the structure, operations, and effects of development institutions and their policies.

There is no implication that the political goal is to "preserve cultures as they are," in static and idealized conditions, because they represent a superior form of adaptation [as critics of the "Primitivist-Environmentalist" approach, outlined by Bodley (17), have suggested]. Rather, it is maintained that, for example, indigenous-based and environmentally sensitive development represents a more viable solution for native peoples and the environment than the sort of top-down, centralized, and technocratic model that is usually proposed (99, 100). Clad (26) has suggested some guidelines and areas for further research along these lines. The strategies adopted need to evaluate the potential of national legislation and current policies for adequately meeting the needs of native peoples while protecting the environment and natural resources.

Consultancies and Assessments

As professional observers, anthropologists are in a critical position to evaluate and assess both the effects of processes on native peoples, and the probable consequences of actions taken by native communities. Anthropologists can translate complex systems and processes into things useful for native struggles, and also put native concerns on the agenda of national and international institutions. This requires that anthropologists "study up" the bureaucracies, national policies, and development ideologies in order to clarify and eventually to influence the processes affecting native peoples. The extent to which the anthropologist then gets involved in politics is a delicate question, which depends not only on temperament or opportunity, but also on assessment of ethnic politics, the different positions and strategies adopted by factions in

local struggles, and their probable consequences. Too much involvement may result in deception, dependency, and other problemmatic situations (88). The ultimate goal of such work, however, should be to help indigenous peoples struggle on their own behalf and conduct their own advocacy (84, 111).

Effects of Advocacy on Native Peoples' Struggles

Anthropologists and indigenous advocacy organizations need constantly to evaluate the effects of their work (as well as official indigenist policies, missionaries, and public opinion) on emerging native consciousness: The specific ways ideas for change have been received and recommunicated by leaders and communities remain little understood. Cultural as well as political dimensions play an important role in the developing political struggles of native peoples to define, assert, and defend themselves and their interests in confrontation with the national society (112). Paine's collection (88) on *Advocacy and Anthropology* addresses these issues, and it is to be hoped that there will be further reflections in the future.

The Role of "Watchdog"

While advocacy organizations have served a vital role as the "conscience" and "eyes and ears of the West" (85) in its relationship to native peoples, often this has not been enough to prevent or alter the continued and increasing campaigns against native people. For example, the Brazilian government may have promised to create the Yanomami Park, and even took the initial steps to do so; but behind the scenes, the all-powerful interests of national security and development were planning the occupation of Yanomami territory (28, 29). Even international protest and international human rights accords were inadequate to prevent the sabotage of health and political work being done among the Yanomami by their strongest supporters, the CCPY.

What remains, then, is Rubinstein & Tax's (96) suggestion to challenge the views of "political realism" and Machiavellian power held by the leaders of the country as ultimately narrow and self-destructive. This challenge coincides with that of Fourth World writers, who call for the need to reexamine the fundamental institutions and values of the First (80). Other fundamental precepts of Western power—including the domination of nature and a materialistic view of natural resources—must similarly be questioned. Anthropologists' descriptions of native concepts of power and of indigenous philosophy may serve to promote this challenge and to argue for the viability and desirability of "multi-ethnic politics" (83, 84).

Renewing Humanism in Anthropology

Finally, in anthropological writings and ethnographies, there is a need to set standards and to expose the sorts of thinking that covertly contribute to

distorted images of native people. Textbooks used in elementary and secondary schools often contain such images, based on anthropological descriptions. These portray native peoples through either romantic views that belittle the human potential of native cultures, or derogatory views that reinforce popular prejudices. The images anthropologists present are, it must be recognized, determinant elements in the course of human events. Nineteenth-century evolutionism portrayed Indians as "savages," fueling the military conquest of scores of tribes. To avoid this happening again, anthropology must constantly affirm its humanistic concerns (38). John Mohawk, Seneca writer and leader, suggests that:

> [Anthropology] could become the discipline which enhances the human spirit, which explores and expands the horizon of human emotional possibilities and experiences. It could become a discipline recognized for its contributions to the broadening of human cultural experiences on the emotional as well as on the "intellectual" planes. But for this to come to pass requires first of all a struggle by anthropologists against the destruction of cultures and people; a struggle which dissolves academic boundaries, and situates the anthropologist as an ally of those whose cultures have for so long been under imperial assault (85).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Terrence Turner for his encouragement and assistance in preparing this review, and for his invaluable guidance and support over many years. It was through his presence at Stanford in the early 1970s that I first became aware of the Brazilian Indian situation and the need for the active involvement of anthropologists. This concern I carried with me into fieldwork in the Northwest Amazon.

I am also grateful to Shelton Davis, Director of the Anthropology Resource Center. Our association began in the days of INDIGENA at Berkeley and was deepened by over three years of working together at the ARC. Through him, I was introduced to the international indigenous support movement, and my perspectives on it have been, in large part, formed through our association.

Finally, I am grateful to Carlos Alberto Ricardo, Director of the Indigenous Peoples in Brazil Program of CEDI, with which I am now associated as staff member and co-organizer of the international project. The resources at CEDI have been invaluable to this article, and my direct experiences and contacts with indigenous struggles through CEDI have contributed to my understanding immeasurably.

Numerous other colleagues and mentors have directly or indirectly contributed to the formation of ideas contained in this review. Among them are: Claudia Andujar, of the CCPY (Commission for the Creation of the Yanomami Park) in Brazil; Nelly Arvelo-Jimenez, of IVIC (Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Cientificas) in Venezuela; Jose Barreiro, of the Indigenous

Peoples' Network; Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, President of the Brazilian Anthropological Association and the Pro-Indian Commission of São Paulo; Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, of UNICAMP; Ailton Krenak, Coordinator of the Union of Indian Nations, in Brazil; Walter Fox Tree, of the University of Massachusetts at Boston Native Studies Program; David Maybury-Lewis, President of Cultural Survival; Richard Chase Smith, of Oxfam; and Steve Schwartzman, of the Environmental Defense Fund.

Support for writing this article was provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

Literature Cited

1. Aaby, P. 1978. What are we fighting for? 'Progress' or 'Cultural Autonomy'? In *Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Identity*, ed. C. Sandbacke, pp. 61–76. Helsinki: Finnish Anthropol. Soc.
2. Alfredsson, G. 1982. International law, international organizations, and indigenous peoples. *J. Int. Affairs* 36:113–24
3. Anthropology Resource Center. 1983–1984. *The Global Reporter. A Journal of People, Resources and the World*. 1(1–4)
4. Anthropology Resource Center. 1980–1982. *The ARC Bull.*, pp. 1–11
5. Anthropology Resource Center. 1981. *The Yanomami Indian Park. A Call for Action*. Boston: ARC,
6. Anthropology Resource Center. 1977–1983. *ARC Newsl.* 1–6
7. Arvelo-Jimenez, N. 1980. Autogestión y concientización. In *Indigenismo y autogestión*, ed. A. Serbin, O. Gonzalez N., pp. 225–37. Caracas: Monte Avilon
8. Barré, M.-C. 1983. *Ideologias Indigenistas y Movimientos Índios*. México: Siglo Veintiuno
9. Barth, F. 1976. *Los Grupos Étnicos y Sus Fronteras. La Organización de las Diferencias Culturales*. México: Fondo de Cultura Economica
10. Bartolomé, M. A. 1979. Conciencia étnica y autogestión indígena. In *Indianidad y Descolonización en América Latina. Documentos de la Segunda Reunion de Barbados*, pp. 309–24. México: Editorial Nueva Imagen
11. Bastide, R. 1971. *Anthropologie appliquée*. Paris: Payot
12. Batalla, G. B. 1984. Del indigenismo de la Revolución a la antropologia critica. In *Los Idios y la Antropologia en América Latina*, ed. C. Junqueira, E. de A. Caravalho, pp. 151–76. Buenos Aires: Busqueda
13. Batalla, G. B. 1981. El Etnodesarrollo: sus premisas jurídicas, polfticas y de organización. See Ref. 53, pp. 30–34
14. Batalla, G. B. 1981. *Utopia y Revolución. El Pensamiento Político Contemporáneo de los Índios en América Latina*. México: Editorial Nueva Imagen
15. Batalla, G. B. 1972. The Indian and the colonial situation: the context of indigenist policy in Latin America. In *The Situation of the Indian in South America*, ed. W. Dostal, pp. 21–28. Geneva: World Council of Churches
16. Batalla, G. B. 1971. El concepto de Índio en América: una categoria de la situación colonial. *An. Antropol.* 6:3
17. Bodley, J. 1982. *Victims of Progress*. Menlo Park: Benjamin/Cummings. 2nd ed.
18. Bollinger, W., Lund, D. M. 1982. Minority oppression: toward analyses that clarify and strategies that liberate. *Latin Am. Perspect.* 4:2–28
19. Bourgois, Ph. 1981. Class, ethnicity, and the state among the Miskitu Amerindians of Northeastern Nicaragua. *Latin Am. Perspect.* 8:22–39
20. Brøsted, J., Dahl, J., et al. 1985. *Native Power. The Quest for Autonomy and Nationhood of Indigenous Peoples*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget As.
21. Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informação, ed. 1980–1986. *Aconteceu Especial—Povos Indígenas no Brasil*. 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16/17. São Paulo: CEDI
22. Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informação. 1981–1985. *Povos Indígenas no Brasil*. 3, 5, 8(1). São Paulo: CEDI
23. Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informaçã/CONAGE. 1986. *Empresas de Mineração e Terras Indígenas na Amazonia*. São Paulo: CEDI
24. Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informação/Museu Nacional. 1986. *Ter-*

ras Indígenas no Brasil. São Paulo: CEDI
25. Churchill, W., ed. 1983. *Marxism and Native Americans*. Boston: South End Press
26. Clad, J. 1984. Conservation and indigenous peoples. *Cult. Survival Q.* 8(4):68–73
27. Cohen, A. 1969. *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
28. Comissão pela Criação do Parque Yanomami (CCPY), eds. 1986–1987. *URIHI*. 1–5
29. Comissão pela Criação do Parque Yanomami. 1979. Yanomami Indian Park, proposal and justification. In *The Yanoama in Brazil 1979*, ed. A. R. Ramos, K. I. Taylor. Copenhagen: IWGIA Doc. 37
30. Comissão Pro-Índio/S.P., eds. 1988. *As Hidrelétricas do Xingú e os Povos Indígenas*. São Paulo: Global. In press
31. Comissão Pro-Índio/S.P., eds. 1982. *Índios: Direitos Históricos*. São Paulo: Global
32. Comissão Pro-Índio/S.P. 1981. *A Questão da Terra*. São Paulo: Global
33. Comissão Pro-Índio/S.P., eds. *A Questão da Emancipação*. São Paulo: Global
34. Consejo Indio de Sudamérica (CISA), eds. 1981. *Pueblo Indio* 1(1). Lima
35. Cultural Survival, eds. 1976–1988. *Cult. Survival Q.* 1–12
36. Daes, E.-I. 1986. Native peoples' rights. *Cah. Droit* 27(1):123–33
37. da Cunha, M. M. C. 1987. *Os Direitos do Índio. Ensaios e Documentos*. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense
38. Davis, S. H. 1976. The Yanomami—ethnographic images and anthropological responsibilities. In *The Geological Imperative. Anthropology and Development in the Amazon Basin of South America*, ed. S. H. Davis, R. O. Mathews, pp. 7–24. Cambridge: Anthropol. Resource Cent.
39. Davis, S. H. 1977. *Victims of the Miracle: Development and the Indians of Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
40. Davis, S. H. 1984. International strategies for the protection of the human rights of indigenous peoples. *Cult. Survival Q.* 8(4):64–65
41. Davis, S. H., Hodson, J. 1982. *Witnesses to Political Violence in Guatemala. Oxfam Impact Audit 2*. Boston: Oxfam America
42. Davis, S. H., Mathews, R. O. 1976. See Ref. 38.
43. Davis, S. H., Menget, P. 1984. Pueblos primitivos e ideologias civilizadas en el Brasil. See Ref. 74, pp. 87–124
44. Davis, S. H., Wright, R. M. 1984. *The International Campaign on Behalf of the Land Rights of the Yanomami Indians of Brazil*. Presented at 14th Ann. Meet. Braz. Anthropol. Assoc., Brasília
45. Declaration of Barbados. 1971. Copenhagen: IWGIA Doc. 1
46. Deloria, V. 1969. *Custer Died For Your Sins, An Indian Manifesto*. New York: Avon
47. Deloria, V. 1974. *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties. An Indian Declaration of Independence*. New York: Delta
48. de Oliveira, R. C. 1978. *A Sociologia do Brasil Indígena*. Brasília. Tempo Brasileiro. 2nd. ed.
49. de Oliveira, R. C. 1964. *O Índio e o Mundo dos Brancos. Uma Interpretação Sociológica da Situação dos Tükúna*. São Paulo: Pioneira. 2nd ed.
50. de Oliveira, R. C. 1976. *Identidade, Etnia e Estrutura Social*. São Paulo: Pioneira
51. de Oliveira Filho, J. P. 1979. O projeto Tükúna: uma experiência de ação indigenista. *Bol. Mus. Nac.* 34:1–39
52. de Oliveira Filho, J. P., ed. 1987. *Sociedades Indígenas e Indigenismo no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Marca Zero
53. DOCIP. 1981. *Etnocidio y Etnodesarrollo*. Documentos de la Reunión de Expertos sobre Etnocidio y Etnodesarrollo en América Latina. San José de Costa Rica: UNESCO-FLACSO
54. Dostal, W., ed. 1972. *The Situation of the Indian in South America*. Geneva. World Council of Churches
55. Fanon, F. 1982. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press. 21st printing
56. Fell, E.-M. 1973. *Les Indiens. Sociétés et idéologies en Amérique hispanique*. Paris: Armand Colin
57. Firth, R. 1961. Antropologia aplicada. In *Tipos Humanos*. Buenos Aires: Editora Universitaria
58. Foster, G. M. 1969. *Applied Anthropology*. Boston: Little, Brown
59. Friedemann, N. S. 1984. Ética y política del antropologo: compromisso profesional. In *Um Siglo de Investigación Social. Antropologia en Colombia*, ed. J. Arocha, N. S. Friedemann, pp. 381–428. Bogotá: ETNO
60. GRAL. 1982. *Indianité, Ethnocide, Indigenisme en Amérique Latine*. Paris: CNRS
61. Grünberg, G., Fuerst, R. 1969. *Kritische Bibliographie zum Genozid in Brasilien (1957–1969)*. Bern: Univ. Bern

62. Hymes, D., ed. 1974. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage
63. Hau de no sau nee. 1978. *A Basic Call to Consciousness. The Hau de no sau nee Address to the Western World*. Rooseveltown: Akwesasne Notes
64. Ibarra, M. 1981. Organismos internacionales: instrumentos internacionales relativos a las poblaciones indígenas. See Ref. 53, pp. 16–29
65. *Indianidad y Descolonización en América Latina: Documentos de la Segunda Reunión de Barbados*. 1979. Mexico: Nueva Imagen
66. INDIGENA & American Friends of Brazil. 1974. *Supysaua: A Documentary Report on the Conditions of Indian Peoples in Brazil*. Berkeley: INDIGENA
67. IWGIA. 1986. *IWGIA Yearbook 1986. Indigenous Peoples and Human Rights*. Copenhagen: IWGIA
68. IWGIA. 1971–1988. *IWGIA Document*, Ser. 1–59. Copenhagen: IWGIA
69. IWGIA. 1980–1988. *Boletin*, Nos. 1–8. Copenhagen: IWGIA
70. Jaulin, R. 1972. *Le Livre Blanc de l'Ethnocide en Amérique*. Paris: Librairie Artheme Fayard
71. Jorgensen, J. G. 1971. On ethics and anthropology. *Curr. Anthropol.* 12 (3): 321–34
72. Jorgensen, J. G., ed. 1984. *Native Americans and Energy Development II*. Boston & Forestville: ARC & 7th Generation Fund
73. Jorgensen, J. G., Clemmer, R. O., et al. 1978. *Native Americans and Energy Development*. Cambridge: ARC
74. Junqueira, C., Carvalho, E. de A. 1984. *Los Indios y la Antropologia en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Búsqueda
75. Kuper, L. 1981. *Genocide. Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
76. MacDonald, T., ed. 1984. *Native peoples and economic development: six case studies from Latin America*. Cult. Survival Occas. Pap. No. 16. Cambridge: Cult. Survival
77. Magubane, B., Faris, J. G. 1985. On the political relevance of anthropology. *Dialect. Anthropol.* 9(1–4):91–104
78. Mair, L. 1965. Applied anthropology and development policies. *Br. J. Sociol.* 7(2):120–33
79. McNickle, D. 1973. *Native American Tribalism*. London: Oxford Univ. Press
80. Manuel, G., Posluns, M. 1974. *The Fourth World. An Indian Reality*. Ontario: Collier-MacMillan Canada, Ltd.
81. Materne, Y., ed. 1980. *The Indian Awakening in Latin America*. New York: Friendship Press
82. Matthiessen, P. 1984. *Indian Country*. New York: Viking Press
83. Maybury-Lewis, D., ed. 1984. *The Prospects for Plural Societies*. Proc. Am. Ethnol. Soc., 1982. Washington, DC: Am. Ethnol. Soc.
84. Maybury-Lewis, D. 1985. A special sort of pleading—anthropology at the service of ethnic groups. See Ref. 88, pp. 130–148
85. Mohawk, J. 1985. In search of humanistic anthropology. *Dialect. Anthropol.* 9(1–4):165–70
86. Narby, J., Davis, S. H. (comp.). 1983. *Resource Development and Indigenous Peoples: A Comparative Bibliography*. Boston: ARC
87. Nolasco Armas, M. 1984. La antropologia aplicada en México y su destino final: el indigenismo. See Ref. 74, pp. 125–50
88. Paine, R., ed. 1985. *Advocacy and Anthropology*. Newfoundland: Inst. Soc. Economic Res.
89. Paine, R. 1985. The claim of the Fourth World. See Ref. 20, pp. 49–66
90. Reinaga, R. 1972. *Ideologia y Raza en América Latina*. La Paz: Ediciones Futuro
91. Ribeiro, D. 1979. *Os Indios e a Civilização. A Integração das Populações Indígenas no Brasil Moderno*. Petrópolis: Vozes. 3rd ed.
92. Rodriguez, N. J., Varese, S., eds. 1981. *El Pensamiento Indígena Contemporáneo en América Latina*. México: SEP
93. Rodriguez, N. J., Varese, S., eds. 1981. *Experiencias Organizativas Indígenas en América Latina*. Mexico: SEP
94. Roel, V. 1979. Indianidad y Revolución. *Cuad. Indios*. 3:1–10
95. Roel, V. 1979. Los sabios y grandiosos fundamentos de la indianidad. *Cuad. Indios*. No. 2. Peru
96. Rubinstein, R., Tax, S. 1985. Power, powerlessness and the failure of 'political realism.' See Ref. 20, pp. 294–300
97. Sampaio, J. A. L. 1986. De Caboclo a Indio: Etnicidade e Organização Social e Política entre Povos Indígenas Contemporâneos no Nordeste do Brasil, o Caso Kapinawá. Projeto de Pesquisa para a Dissertação de Mestrado em Antropologia Social. IFCH-UNICAMP, Campinas
98. Sanders, D. E. 1977. *The Formation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples*. IWGIA Doc. 29. Copenhagen: IWGIA

99. Schwartzman, S. 1984. Indigenists, environmentalists and the multilateral development banks. *Cult. Survival Q.* 8(4):74–75
100. Schwartzman, S. 1987. *Bankrolling Disasters*. Washington DC: The Sierra Club
101. Serbin, A., O. González N. 1980. *Indigenismo y autogestión*. Caracas: Monte Avila Editores
102. Smith, R. C. 1987. Indigenous autonomy for grassroots development. *Cult. Survival Q.* 11 (1):8–12
103. Smith, R. C. 1984. A search for unity within diversity. *Cult. Survival Q.* 8 (4):6–13
104. Smith, R. C. 1982. *The dialectics of domination in Peru: native communities and the myth of the vast Amazonian emptiness*. Cult. Survival Occas. Pap. No. 8. Cambridge: Cult. Survival
105. Stavenhagen, R. 1969. *Las Clases Sociales en las Sociedades Agrarias*. Mexico
106. Stavenhagen, R. 1985. Etnodesenvolvimento: uma dimensão ignorada no pensamento desenvolvimentista. *Anu. Antropol.* 84:11–44
107. Subcomité sobre Racismo, Discriminación Racial, Apartheid y Descolonización del Comité Especial de las ONGs sobre Derechos Humanos (Genebra). 1981. *Conferencia Internacional de las Organizaciones no-gobernamentales acerca de las Poblaciones Indígenas y la Tierra*. Ginebra
108. Swenson, S., ed. 1982. *Native Resource Control and the Multinational Corporate Challenge. Background Documents*. Boston: ARC
109. Tax, S. 1958. The Fox Project. *Hum. Org.* 17(1):17–19
110. Trigger, B. 1986. Ethnohistory: the unfinished edifice. *Ethnohistory* 33(3): 1–8
111. Turner, T. 1979. Anthropology and the politics of indigenous peoples' struggles. *Cambridge Anthropol.* 5(1):1–43
112. Turner, T. 1987. From cosmology to ideology: resistance, adaptation and social consciousness among the Kayapo. Presented at Symp. Pesquisas Recentes em Etnologia e História Indígena da Amazonia, Assoc. Bras. de Antropol., Belém do Pará, Brazil
113. U.S. Congress. 1978. Briefing on Impact of Brazil's 'Economic Miracle' on the Amazonian Indians. *Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Development of the Committee on International Relations*. House of Representatives, 95th Congr., 2nd Sess. Washington, DC: USGPO
114. Varese, S. 1979. Estrategia étnica o estrategia de clase? See Ref. 65, pp. 357–72
115. Varese, S. 1982. Restoring multiplicity: indianities and the civilizing project in Latin America. *Latin Am. Perspect.* 9(2):29–41
116. Weyler, R. 1982. *Blood of the Land: The Government and Corporate War against the American Indian Movement*. New York: Everest House
117. The World Bank. 1981. *Economic Development and Tribal Peoples. Human Ecologic Considerations*. Washington DC: World Bank
118. Wright, R. M. 1983. The Great Carajás Program: Brazil's mega-project for the '80s. *The Global Rep.* 1(1)
119. Wright, R. M. 1982. The Yanomami saga: an end in sight? *Cult. Survival Q.* 6(2):12–15
120. Wright, R. M. 1982. The Brazilian indian movement and the role of national and international support organizations. Presented to Univ. Chicago Anthropol. Colloq.
121. Wright, R. M., Ismaelillo. 1982. *Native Peoples in Struggle: Cases from the Fourth Russell Tribunal*. Bombay: E.R.I.N. Publ.
122. Wolf, E. R. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press