Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

'We Have Always Lived Here': Indigenous Movements, Citizenship and Poverty in Argentina

MATTHIAS VOM HAU* & GUILLERMO WILDE**

*The University of Manchester, UK, **Universidad de San Martin, Argentina

ABSTRACT   *This article explores the nexus between indigenous mobilisation, citizenship, and poverty in Argentina. A subnational comparison of land struggles among the Diaguita Calchaquí in Tucumán and the Mbya Guaraní in Misiones shows that changing global and national opportunity structures, most prominently a new multicultural citizenship regime, set the stage for indigenous mobilisation. In turn, local transformations of capitalist accumulation motivate indigenous mobilising efforts, whereas leadership patterns and state–movement relations shape the capacity to mobilise. Diaguita and Mbya mobilisation reveals that indigenous movements play a central role in the activation of formal citizenship rights and the contestation of dominant notions of poverty. At the same time, the current design of multicultural citizenship and the adverse socioeconomic incorporation of indigenous communities also counteract indigenous mobilising efforts in Argentina.*

I. Introduction

Over the last two decades Latin America – following a global pattern – has experienced a major cultural and political sea change. Ethnicity gained importance in state policies, political activism, and public discourse (Stavenhagen, 2002). In many Latin American countries, constitutional reforms adopted multicultural under-standings of nationhood that granted legal status to indigenous communities and established collective rights (Van Cott, 2000). Across the region indigenous movements demanded self-determination and autonomy and envisioned more inclusive nations that recognised ethnic, cultural and linguistic differences (Sieder, 2002). These changes mark a dramatic departure from previous forms of citizenship and political mobilisation. For most of the twentieth century corporatist arrangements shaped the interest mediation between states and their citizens, and official nationalism emphasised cultural homogeneity as the basis of national unity

and progress. Class identities structured political conflicts and the organising efforts of local communities (Stepan 1978; Quijada et al., 2000; vom Hau, 2008).

Argentina was no exception to this trend. Similar to other countries in the region, ethnic mobilisation was a relatively rare phenomenon until the 1980s, and public discourse and state policies encouraged class-based political identification, con-tributing to the 'invisibilisation' (Gordillo and Hirsch, 2003) of indigenous people. Yet, from the 1990s onwards indigenous movements gained increasing relevance as political actors and engaged in the reconstruction of native languages and cultural practices. The 1994 Constitution defined Argentina as a multiethnic nation and granted a number of special rights to indigenous citizens, representing a dramatic turn from previous conceptions of nationhood, which envisioned Argentina as a 'white nation' of European migrants.

For most of Argentina's modern history indigenous peoples have been among the most marginalised sectors of the population. While the postcolonial state abolished the most blatant practices of exploitation, nineteenth-century liberal state elites first pursued the outright extermination, and later the economic and cultural assimilation of indigenous peoples living within the national territory (Gordillo and Hirsch, 2003). During the twentieth century, public discourse framed Argentina's indigenous population as 'poor' and sought their incorporation through industrialisation and rural development programmes (Carrasco, 2000). In contemporary times, indigenous communities continue to be concentrated in rural areas, territories disproportionally affected by the overall socioeconomic decline during the last 30 years.[1] Indigenous peoples also continue to be found among the most destitute citizens of Argentina.[2]

The intensified mobilisation of this historically excluded and marginalised sector thus poses the following puzzle: What are the implications of the new politics of identity in Argentina? How does ethnic mobilisation relate to citizenship and poverty? Pursuing these questions requires a subnational perspective on the dynamics ethnic mobilisation (see Snyder, 2001). In Argentina, most indigenous mobilising efforts are fundamentally local; they are organised around particular identities; and there is substantial variation. In some cases, highly vocal movements demand the implementation of the new collective rights, such as access to communal lands, and push for the transformation of conceptions of citizenship and political inclusion. In others, ethnic mobilisation remains more fragmented and does not scale up to sustained challenges of established power relations. Moreover, in a federal state like Argentina, provincial autonomy and tensions between different levels of government mean that constitutional changes and national policies are mediated by provincial patterns of governance. A subnational perspective on variations of indigenous mobilising efforts thus sheds new light on conflicts over the terms of national membership and the distribution of rights, and the implications of those variations for citizenship and indigenous poverty.

This article explore the dynamics and consequences of indigenous movements in Argentina by focusing on mobilisation around land rights and territory among the *Diaguita Calchaquí* in Tucumán and the *Mbya Guaraní* in Misiones. Using land struggles as an analytical window enables us to trace indigenous political claims-making across distinct groups and provincial settings. Exhibiting very different histories of engaging the state and larger society, the Diaguita and the Mbya are chosen for this analysis because they constitute likely extreme points in Argentina.

Diaguita communities, historically pastoralists with a long history of interaction with outsiders, are situated primarily in the Andean valleys of the Northwest. Mbya communities, historically highly mobile horticulturalists with only sparse contact to outsiders, live primarily in the lowlands of Northeast Argentina.

To foreshadow our argument. Leaders from both groups mobilise to obtain territorial rights and secure the formalisation of communal land titles. In Tucumán, Diaguita mobilisations resemble an organised social movement. Claims for land and territory are grounded in collective action and a sense of shared mission that crosscut distinct local communities and their concerns. By contrast, Mbya mobilisation is more fragmented and does not scale up into sustained collective challenges. Contentious practices and a sense of common purpose only occasionally move beyond the local level.

These differences indicate that the new global and national opportunity structures – most prominently democratisation, constitutional multiculturalism and a growing concern with human rights – are mediated by the specific local contexts within which indigenous activists operate. We suggest that at least three interrelated factors shape similarities and differences in subnational patterns of ethnic mobilisation. First, local transformations of capitalist accumulation motivate indigenous activists to make use of the new legal frameworks and international support mechanisms. Second, the capacity to engage in sustained collective action is crucially shaped by the presence of indigenous leaders endowed with the civic skills and social networks necessary to mobilise constituencies and broker external support. Finally, how indigenous leaders appeal to constituents and accrue organisational resources depends on their relative autonomy from provincial state agencies.

The distinct patterns of ethnic mobilisation in Tucumán and Misiones have major implications for the experience of citizenship. While changes in the formal terms of national membership open up new possibilities for ethnic mobilisation, indigenous activism plays a central role in transforming multicultural citizenship into 'something more' than a formal institution. The constitutional recognition of communal lands only became meaningful once indigenous social movements actively pursued formal titling. Similarly, ethnic mobilisation around communal lands introduced a new language of 'rights', used even by communities without property titles to protect their access to land. Thus, especially in Tucumán, indigenous activism contributes to the actual activation of the new multicultural rights.

We further suggest that indigenous mobilisation plays an important role in challenging dominant understandings of poverty. Diaguita and Mbya leaders link indigenous poverty to the expanding 'frontier of extraction' in their provinces and new patterns of land commodification. Communal land titles and resource governance are seen as key to overcoming those sources of adverse incorporation.[3] The distinct patterns of Diaguita and Mbya land struggles are related to the extent to which indigenous framings of poverty gain salience in public debates and shape the agenda of state agencies and NGOs in Tucumán and Misiones.

While emphasising the potentially empowering implications of indigenous movements for the exercise of citizenship and the framing of poverty, it is equally important to keep track of the barriers formal citizenship rights and existing forms of destitution establish for Diaguita and Mbya mobilising efforts. As especially the case of the Mbya in Misiones illustrates, historical patterns of poverty and exclusion

impede the formation of a politicised and networked leadership. Similarly, the design of citizenship in Argentina constrains indigenous land struggles. The new multicultural constitution abstains from including more fundamental territorial rights that would challenge the dominant socioeconomic order by establishing indigenous governance over territory and its environmental resources (for example, water, the subsoil).

The methodology employed in this article combines primary documents, semi-structured interviews, ethnographic observation and basic statistical information. We visited local communities in Tucumán and Misiones in October/November 2008 and February 2009 and conducted 38 interviews in total, 18 with indigenous activists (12 in Tucumán/six in Misiones), eight (six/two) with non-activists, four (two/two) with provincial state officials, four with national state officials, and four with economic elites, most importantly large landowners. These interviews were complemented by frequent consultations with anthropologists, sociologists and regional planners from various universities and research institutions in San Miguel de Tucumán, Posadas and Buenos Aires.

The subsequent parts of the article are organised as follows: the next section situates our argument within the broader literatures on indigenous movements, citizenship and poverty. The following section focuses on the recent constitutional reform and indigenous mobilisation at the national level in Argentina. The fourth section moves to the provincial level and compares Diaguita and Mbya mobilisation around land and territory, followed by a discussion of the implications of these mobilising efforts for citizenship and poverty. A final section concludes.

II. Existing Debates

Analysts have developed sophisticated arguments to explain the rise in indigenous movements in Latin America. Some emphasise global and regional factors. Across Latin America, states have adopted multicultural constitutional frameworks that establish new collective rights (Van Cott, 2000). Similarly, the increasing influence of a global human rights regime (for example, Jelin and Hershberg, 1996; Boli and Thomas, 1999) and the emergence of transnational movements and NGOs (for example, Keck and Sikkink 1999; Brysk, 2000) provide crucial support for indigenous claims-making. Others point to national factors, most prominently democratisation and the end of massive state repression (Stavenhagen, 2002), the expansion of secondary education and a new generation of highly politicised indigenous leaders (Gutiérrez, 1999; Wimmer, 2002), and neoliberal restructuring that opened up new political spaces (Sieder, 2002; Yashar, 2005). The majority of these works probe their arguments in light of empirics from the Andean countries, Mexico, and Guatemala. Argentina has been largely ignored in this literature. Comparing Diaguita and Mbya mobilisation thus provides an ideal context to assess the numerous arguments about ethnic mobilisation outside the contexts of their construction. We trace how changing global conditions, democratisation, educational expansion and the 1994 constitutional reform interacted with specific subnational contexts to affect indigenous mobilisation.

This article also engages recent debates around the implications of indigenous mobilisation for citizenship. Some analysts argue that indigenous mobilisation

deepens citizenship. Over the last decades indigenous peoples became political subjects in their own right, without having to give up their ethnic identifications, a major advancement over the assimilationist national projects of the postwar period and their often authoritarian and racist underpinnings (for example, Díaz Polanco 1997; de la Peña 2005). Other scholars suggest that indigenous mobilisation is closely entwined with neoliberal projects of decentralisation (for example, Sieder 2002; Postero and Zamosc 2004). Governments tolerate and sometimes even encourage ethnic mobilising efforts as a deliberate strategy to appease citizens and remove the state from its responsibilities to remedy inequalities and racism (Van Cott, 2000; Radcliffe et al., 2002). Comparing Diaguita and Mbya mobilisation affords an opportunity to engage these perspectives by exploring how subnational variations in indigenous mobilisation are linked to the formal structures and local experiences of citizenship.

Finally, there is a relative absence of works that unpack the nexus between indigenous mobilisation and poverty (see Bebbington, 2007; Bebbington et al., this issue). The existing literature has been primarily focused on describing durable poverty among indigenous peoples in Latin America (for example, Psacharopoulos and Patrinos, 1994; Hall and Patrinos, 2005). As a matter of fact, works concerned with indigenous poverty often lack analytic attention to the agency and political subjectivities of indigenous communities. This literature also tends to narrowly focus on income-based poverty and standardised measurement procedures, and ignores the tensions between internationally dominant conceptions of poverty and indigenous notions of wellbeing and their policy implications. Our analysis therefore is particularly concerned with how indigenous movement activists understand and politicise poverty, and the role of those framings for public debates in Tucumán and Misiones. At the same time, we also trace the implications of distinct patterns of material destitution for local mobilising efforts.

III. Changing Global and National Opportunity Structures

During the 1980s and 1990s indigenous mobilisation in Argentina reached unprecedented levels, indigenous peoples gained increasing visibility in public discourse, and state policy moved towards extending special rights for these populations.[4] Several ethnicities that had been considered extinct since the colonial period, such as the *Huarpes* or the *Ranqueles*, filed for legal recognition and organised around the reconstruction of their culture and past. Similarly, communities that previously mobilised as peasants or workers started to identify as *Kolla* and made claims on state authorities as indigenous peoples (Hermitte et al., 1995; Briones, 2005; Escolar, 2007; Lazzari, 2007).

These pueblos and their organisations were able to draw on new legislations, organisational resources and framing strategies. Significant transformations in global and national opportunity structures facilitated indigenous mobilisation during the 1980s and 1990s. Democratisation ended massive state repression that took place under the military regime (1976–1983). After 1983, in light of the unclear fate of many victims of state terror, new social movements such as the *Madres del Plaza de Mayo* sought legal guarantees that would secure the fundamental right to have an identity (Jelin and Hershberg, 1996). Similarly, state authorities sought to

improve Argentina's human rights record by forming special commissions and opening up police and secret service archives from the military period. This focus on human rights in public discussion and policy making provided indigenous activists with a new rights-based language to frame their identity claims.

Global and regional changes proved equally important. Across Latin America states adopted multicultural constitutional frameworks that established models of how to legislate ethnic rights (Van Cott, 2000). Similarly, international institutions and transnational advocacy networks became involved in the protection of indigenous rights and provided crucial support for national policy making and the legitimation of local claims (Brysk, 2000). Indigenous activists in Argentina could draw on documents like the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention 169, approved in 1989, or the Declaration of the United Nation about the Right of Indigenous Peoples, approved in 1994, and pressure the national government to adopt these legal principles, such as the ethnic and cultural pre-existence of indigenous peoples, their right to self determination, and the recovery of communal territories (Carrasco 2000).

During the 1980s and early 1990s, indigenous mobilisation intensified in Argentina. These mobilising efforts benefited greatly from increased media attention to cultural diversity and strategic alliances indigenous activists formed with student groups, unions, academics and neighbourhood associations. While no single organisation emerged that could claim to legitimately represent the various indigenous groupings in Argentina, this did not become a barrier for the articulation of shared political, economic, and cultural interests. Activists from distinct ethnic backgrounds coalesced into sustained political action, ranging from specific-purpose rallies and demonstrations, such as nation-wide protest marches against the 1992 *Quintenario* celebrations, to more prolonged campaigns and lobbying efforts.[5] The latter included the continuous presence of indigenous lobby groups in the Santa Fe Constitutional Assembly that preceded the 1994 constitutional reform (Carrasco, 2000).

Intensified indigenous mobilisation was closely entwined with dramatic legal changes. During the 1980s, policymakers enacted several laws that treated indigenous communities as legal subjects and granted them a number of special rights. A new national legislation, the *Ley de le Protección y Apoyo a las Comunidades Indígenas* (23,302), passed in 1985 and ratified in 1989, established indigenous communities as carriers of specific rights, guaranteeing them, among other things, the possibility to recuperate lands they had historical claims to (Gordillo and Hirsch, 2003). The 1994 constitutional reform confirmed these new legal norms by depicting Argentina as a pluricultural nation and encoding the ethnic and cultural pre-existence of indigenous peoples. This 'multicultural constitutionalism' (Van Cott, 2000) established distinct indigenous forms of political authority and self-organisation. Obtaining legal status (*personería jurídica*) became uncoupled from registering as civil association, resulting in a dramatic increase of officially recognised indigenous communities in Argentina.[6] Similarly, the constitutional recognition of communal property set the stage for intensified mobilisation around land and territorial rights. Across Argentina local indigenous communities invoked the new right to reclaim communal lands.[7]

The constitutional reform also established new forms of governance to regulate the relationship between the national state and indigenous peoples. The *Instituto*

Nacional de Asuntos Indígenas (INAI) was confirmed as the main national state agency responsible for the implementation of the new legislation. In 1996 and 1997 the INAI supported the *Programa de Participación de Pueblos Indígenas* (PPI), which established a platform for indigenous communities to elaborate shared demands. The organisational structure of the INAI itself became tailored towards indigenous participation. The *Consejo de Participacion Indigena* (CPI), formed in 2004 and composed of indigenous representatives from each province, has advisory and supervisory functions. The expansion of indigenous representation within the agency coincided with an increasing focus on land rights. In response to a recent law (26,160) that stopped the expropriation of lands occupied by indigenous communities and mandated a nation-wide land survey, INAI technical teams seek to collect the necessary information on indigenous land use to establish current and future land claims.[8]

Simultaneously, the 1994 Constitution also established major limitations to indigenous mobilisation around land and territory. First, when guaranteeing indigenous communities 'the possession and property of the communal lands they traditionally occupied' the 1994 constitution speaks of land rights, and not territory, as demanded by indigenous activists. The constitutional focus on land does not specify the rights of indigenous communities to control the exploitation of resources found within their territories, for example minerals or medical plants, and the potential future uses of these resources (Carrasco, 2000). Second, the right to claim communal lands is associated with indigenous *communities*, defined as 'groups of families,' and thus ultimately linked to a specific location or settlement. Such a focus on local communities, and not on indigenous groups, prevents land claims covering large surfaces – that might crosscut national boundaries. The treatment of indigenous communities as bearers of special rights also contributes to the political fragmentation of indigenous groups. From legal status to land claims, it is local indigenous communities that negotiate these rights with state agencies.

IV. Subnational Mobilisation Patterns

In a federal state like Argentina each province enjoys substantial autonomy. Provincial legislation and juridical boundaries tend to shape the articulation of indigenous demands and identities. It is therefore crucial to connect the analysis of national patterns with subnational variations to unpack indigenous mobilisation and its implications for citizenship and poverty. This section explores these dynamics for the Diaguita Calchaquí in Tucumán and the Mbya Guaraní in Misiones. It shows that both Diaguita and Mbya activists invoke the new land rights, yet that the extent of mobilisation varies between the two groups.

Diaguta and Mbya Land Struggles[9]

The majority of citizens who self-identify as Diaguita live in the Andean valleys of Northwest Argentina. National census data from 2004 indicate that 31,753 individuals in Argentina declare themselves as belonging to this group (INDEC, 2004/2005). Half of those, around 15,000, are concentrated in Tucumán.[10] Each of the 16 Diaguita communities located in this province includes between several

330   hundred and 2000 *comuneros*, that is members with voting rights and (potential) entitlements to communal lands. According to census data 8223 individuals self-identify as Mbya Guaraní in Argentina (INDEC, 2004/2005).[11] The majority of them, around 4500, live in approximately 100 communities in Misiones, a province in Northeast Argentina bordering on Paraguay, Brazil and Uruguay.[12] The size of
335   Mbya communities varies between 50 and 450 members.

In both cases identity construction is profoundly racialised (see Omi and Winant 1994). Those who identify as Diaguita and Mbya highlight shared phenotypical characteristics, most prominently facial features and skin colour, as crucial markers of ethnicity.[13] This emphasis on phenotype is entwined with references to a common
340   ancestry, invoking the imagery of a physical connection, of 'having the same blood' that links co-ethnics together. Diaguita and Mbya identity making also builds on discourses that associate indigeneity with special forms of knowledge about nature
10   and an ecologically sound way of life (Cebolla, 2000; Gorosito Kramer, 1982). Another boundary marker of Mbya identity is language. Most of those who identify
345   as Mbya are Guaraní native speakers and use this language in daily interactions.[14] In the case of the Diaguita, the vast majority are monolingual and use Spanish in daily life.[15] Diaguita activists claim that their historical ancestors spoke a distinct language – *kakan* – before Inca and Spanish colonisation, yet outsiders tend not to recognise this language as a signifier of ethnic difference.

350   Yet, both groups are equally engaged in land struggles. Diaguita and Mbya communities increasingly draw on the new constitutional rights and actively seek the formalisation of land tenure. As a female cazique in Tucumán puts it, 'the constitution was the final push to be able to gain our rights'. In both cases, local communities increasingly pursue legal status, a precondition for the filing of formal
355   land claims. Between 2004 and 2008 in Misiones, the number of legally recognised communities increased from 54, or around half of the Mbya communities, to 93
11   communities with *personería jurídica* (DAG, 2008). Over a similar time period Tucumán witnessed the increase from four to 16 recognised Diaguita communities.[16]

Securing land titling is a protracted process that requires legal proofs to
360   demonstrate a continued history of land occupation and a link between land use and 'traditional' forms of communal organisation. A dominant framing strategy employed by indigenous leaders is to represent the Diaguita or Mbya as original inhabitants who occupied the land long before the onset of Spanish colonialism. Land claims usually emphasise the continuity between precolonial and contempor-
365   ary patterns of indigenous land use. As one activist emphasises, 'we have proofs, archaeological traces, that we existed before'. The preparation of maps is also common. In Tafí del Valle the cacique and various council members crafted a map that shows the settlements, ceremonial centres, and pasture areas historically used by the community. Other forms of evidence include legal documents, kinship trees,
370   genealogies of landmark names, and the projection of collective spatial memories onto satellite images and GPS-generated maps.[17]

Diaguita and Mbya activists argue that their main motivation for pursuing formal titling is economic security. Not having a title exposes communities to the risk of possible eviction, even from lands they have lived on for generations. It means 'not
375   to know whether in two or three years the landowner comes and evicts us, and this way I can't secure my existence or that of my children … [whereas] the knowledge

that we are going to live here allows us to farm and raise cattle', as a council member in Tucumán puts it. Land rights also provide the basis for claiming social benefits such as public housing and infrastructural investments, resources that cannot be accessed in the absence of a title.

Another impetus for Diaguita and Mbya efforts to obtain formal titling is the nexus between land and territory. Land rights refer to the possession of a particular circumscribed surface, while indigenous conceptions of territory are broader and claim control over spaces used (or traditionally used) by a community and their environmental resources, such as the air, subsoil, arable lands, rivers and woods. In the words of a cacique in Tucumán, 'when the state says *land* it gives you a specific plot or maybe even the whole valley so you can plant and have your farm. Then tomorrow comes a mining company, and [the state] says 'I said land, not subsoil [rights]!', or they build a factory that contaminates the air and the air is not yours. By contrast, with *territory* we can restrain these kinds of debaucheries'. Activists thus associate contestations for land rights with a more fundamental struggle for the recognition of indigenous territorial rights, which are seen as central to claims for political sovereignty and indigenous resource governance.

The main difference between Diaguita and Mbya land struggles is the extent of mobilisation. In Tucumán Diaguita mobilising efforts resemble an organised social movement. Claims for land and territory are grounded in collective action and a sense of shared mission that crosscut distinct local communities and their concerns. At the provincial level, the *Unión Diaguita* constitutes the main vehicle of interest representation and provides a platform for caciques and community delegates to meet on a monthly or bimonthly basis. The assembly has been crucial for Diaguita mobilisation, most importantly as a co-ordination mechanism for province-wide resistance against paying pasture rents to landlords,[18] and as a channel for support from external advocacy networks and NGOs. Under the umbrella of the Unión, various indigenous communities also work together to protest the environmental effects of mining. By contrast, Mbya mobilisation is more fragmented and does not scale up into sustained collective challenges. Contentious practices and a sense of common purpose only occasionally move beyond the local level, as for instance in the recent occupation of the central square in the provincial capital of Posadas. Usually Mbya mobilisation is more focused on community concerns and indigenous activists do not have a co-ordination mechanism comparable to the Unión Diaguita at their disposal.

Patterns of Capitalist Accumulation and the Motivation to Mobilise

How to account for the emergence and variation of Diaguita and Mbya land struggles? The motivation to push for the implementation of the new constitutionally granted communal land rights needs to be understood within the broader context of capitalist development in Tucumán and Misiones. Over the last three decades the two provincial economies experienced dramatic changes that fostered land commodification, increased the value of land and shifted indigenous subsistence strategies. These transformations prompted Diaguita and Mbya mobilising efforts.

Historically, the economy of Tucumán was primarily oriented toward agriculture. Sugarcane and citrus fruits dominated in the lowlands, while in the Andean valleys

corn farming and cattle herding constituted the main economic activities. Over the last decades the lowlands experienced the large-scale mechanisation of sugarcane production, in the highlands tourism and mining increasingly complemented the dominant agricultural sector. A growing demand for summer homes and a booming hotel industry intensified land sales, and often entailed the enclosure of historically open pastures. While mining did not (yet) become a major economic force in Tucumán, the expanding 'frontier of extraction' (Bebbington et al., 2008) in neighbouring provinces had severe ecological consequences, most importantly by engendering widespread water scarcity.

For most of the twentieth century Misiones was characterised by the expansion of small-scale agriculture and the gradual decline of the Paranaese rainforest. Non-indigenous *colonos* settled on public lands and engaged in slash-and-burn agriculture to produce *yerba mate*. During the 1970s the development policies of the military government – aimed at strengthening Argentina's border regions – increased land values and accelerated deforestation. Motivated by tax breaks, road building projects, and the massive sale of public lands, agro-businesses acquired major land holdings and invested in their commercial use. The result was that pine plantations and soy fields replaced most of the remaining rainforest.[19] This process also entailed the end of small-scale agriculture, as most colonos were forced to move and sell their plots (Gorosito Kramer, 1982).

These changes of capitalist accumulation and their ecological consequences greatly affected the subsistence practices of Diaguita and Mbya communities. In Tucumán, up to generation ago most of those who identify as Diaguita engaged in a combination of livestock agriculture and farming, and produced primarily for self-consumption. To obtain some cash male household members also migrated for temporary work in the sugar cane harvest. Today, the importance of farming and cattle herding has declined and subsistence strategies are primarily built around salaries and wages, most prominently through construction work, public employment or fixed-term contracts in development projects. Households also frequently draw on the support of pensions and social assistance programmes, receive remittances from family members who migrate to major industrial centres such as Buenos Aires, and derive income from selling handicrafts.

In Misiones, up to a generation ago Mbya households predominantly engaged in a mixed subsistence strategy that combined horticulture, hunting, and fishing in the rainforest, planting staple foods and seasonal work as wage labourers in the *yerbales*. Especially in remote areas indigenous communities often maintained a highly mobile way of life and frequently moved the location of their settlements. With deforestation Mbya subsistence activities changed dramatically. Today, indigenous households tend to live off a mix of government-provided food supplies, small-scale farming and salaried work as auxiliary teachers, sanitary agents, or health mentors, and the sale of handicrafts. While communities receive increasing numbers of kin migrating from Paraguay,[20] most Mbya communities now tend to remain in more permanent settlements.

Land commodification, increasing property values, and new subsistence strategies constitute a crucial backdrop for indigenous land struggles in Tucumán and Misiones. In the two cases leaders highlight that changing land use – whether related to the expansion of commercial agriculture, tourism, or mining – entail the enclosure

(*arrinconamiento*) of local communities and the spaces they traditionally used and lived in. A female Diaguita council member emphasises that indigenous property rights would provide 'psychological security' to pursue their livelihoods, especially because the formalisation of tenure would help to secure the free movement of animals, which is undermined by the growing fragmentation of land ownership. A cacique points to the nexus between land rights and tourism: 'Having land would be beneficial for us on the day we start to establish our own tourism corridor. Today our artisans manage to sell some little things, but there is no hotel that is ours'. Thus, formal titling would enable Diaguita communities to partake in the overall transformation of the region, most importantly by providing the necessary planning security to pursue their subsistence activities and run their own economic enterprises.

In Misiones, Mbya leaders see land titles as crucial to secure the economic and cultural survival of their communities. Even if formal titling only means to obtain a few hectares, titles would prevent the sale of communal areas and thus provide a last resort against the literal disappearance of a community. Moreover, especially for communities close to the remaining rainforest, having a land title facilitates subsistence. A cacique suggests that 'a community with land has the option to enter our rainforest and take out materials without being thrown out, because we have the land title. Those that don't have a title, in these cases the owner can say when we can enter, and if we can take out resources'. Similarly, altered Mbya livelihood strategies also entail a more settled existence. Among Mbya households, the growing prevalence of public employment and salaried work, combined with increasing educational aspirations for their children, makes living in a permanent settlement a more paramount goal.

Material Destitution, State–Movement Relations and the Capacity to Mobilise

The distinct salience of Diaguita and Mbya mobilisation is connected to stark differences in material destitution. Specifically, historical patterns of poverty and exclusion that prevail among the majority of Mbya communities in Misiones undermine the formation of a formally educated, politicised, and networked leadership.

Both individual- and community-level evidence shows that material destitution among the Mbya living in Misiones is generally worse than the national average for indigenous peoples in Argentina. Around 29.4 per cent of those who identify as Mbya are illiterate, compared to 7.8 per cent for all citizens of indigenous origins in Argentina, and a national average of 2.6 per cent (INDEC, 2001, 2004/5). Similarly, [12] only 31.7 per cent of the Mbya aged 15 years and older completed primary school, compared to 71.6 per cent of indigenous Argentineans and a national average of 81.1 per cent (INDEC 2001, 2004/5). Community-level data show that most local Mbya [12] communities lack infrastructural means to satisfy basic needs. In 2008, from the 93 communities recognised by the *Dirección de Asuntos Guaraníes* (DAG), 75 (or 81.6%) lack clean water, 63 (or 67.7%) do not have a primary school, 33 (or 35.5%) do not have any healthcare facilities within their community, and 30 (or 32.3%) lack electricity (DAG, 2008). [11]

This aggregate information overshadows that there are dramatic inequalities among Mbya communities in Misiones. The coverage of basic needs is highly skewed. Local communities with access to a health clinic are usually those that also

have electricity, a primary school and a water well, whereas a substantial number of communities lacks access to all of those provisions. Similarly, in better-off Mbya communities caciques and local council members we encountered usually had a professional education and actively maintain ties to INAI officials, municipal agents and NGO representatives, knowing whom to approach for what kind of issue. Worse-off communities tend not to marshal similar 'development brokers' (Mosse and Lewis, 2006) who facilitate the mobilisation for resources, social networks, and political influence.

Comparable data for Tucumán indicate that poverty among the Diaguita is less extensive than the national average for indigenous peoples in Argentina and more closely follows overall national-level trends. According to 2004/5 census data, 2.8 per cent of the Diaguita residing in Tucumán, Salta and Jujuy are illiterate, significantly less than the 7.8 per cent average for all citizens of indigenous origin, and only slightly below a national average of 2.6 per cent (INDEC, 2004/5). Education levels show a similar pattern. 84.2 per cent of the Diaguita aged 15 years and older completed primary school, compared to 71.6 per cent of indigenous Argentineans and a national average of 81.1 per cent (INDEC, 2004/5). While we were unable to obtain comparable community-level data, our fieldwork indicates that even remote local Diaguita communities have access to a primary school, basic healthcare facilities and electricity. Thus, Diaguita communities belong to the comparatively better-off indigenous groups in Argentina and are characterised by less pronounced inequalities among communities.

The distinct Diaguita and Mbya mobilising patterns are also linked to different state–movement relations. In both cases, indigenous leaders conceive of the national state as a potential ally, whereas the provincial state generally appears as a major opponent. Yet, the relative power of national and provincial state agencies varies. In Misiones the influence of the INAI is limited, and the main state actor involved in the governance of indigenous affairs is the *Dirección Asuntos Guaraníes* (DAG), which acts as the primary interlocutor between communities and the provincial state. The power of the DAG derives primarily from controlling the legal register of indigenous communities, and the relationship between this provincial agency and indigenous communities is marked by clientelism and cooptation. Interviewees report frequent incidents of DAG officials manipulating the legally registered size of local communities, with substantial consequences for the allocation of social assistance. Moreover, in response to attempts of Mbya leaders to organise in a more autonomous manner, the DAG created the *Consejo de Ancianos y Guías Espirituales*, an assembly of supposed spiritual leaders that is without much legitimacy among local communities, yet acts as the official Mbya representative organ (Gorosito Kramer, 2007). Especially destitute communities depending on social assistance tend to tolerate these blatant forms of DAG clientelism in exchange for material benefits, while better-off communities maintain a critical (and often mocking) distance to these DAG-sanctioned representatives.

In Tucumán, a comparable provincial state agency does not exist and the INAI plays a more prominent role in managing state–movements relations. Similar to Misiones, Diaguita leaders report tactics of political fragmentation. In the Valley of Tafí INAI officials encouraged the formation of several communities, apparently with the intent to prevent a larger community representing the whole valley from

emerging. At the same time, political clientelism is less prevalent in Tucumán and the Diaguita maintain a more autonomous position. The INAI often works together with representatives of the Unión Diaguita to support local land struggles, for instance by covering the legal costs of lawsuits with landowners.[21]

V. Indigenous Mobilisation, Citizenship and the Framing of Poverty

Indigenous mobilisation around land and territory remains an ongoing process. The majority of Diaguita and Mbya communities actively seek communal lands, yet so far only a fraction have obtained formal titling. In Tucumán, one out of 16 recognised communities, Amaicha del Valle, managed to obtain a title and received around 52,000 hectares of land.[22] Indigenous leaders in Amaicha had the advantage of being able to support their claims with a written legal document from the colonial period, a *Cédula Real* that establishes the precise boundaries of the land title granted by the Spanish Crown. In Misiones around 20 out of 100 communities successfully claimed titles and even fewer actually received these lands.[23]

A major challenge are land tenure structures. Indigenous activists and external observers alike indicate that formal titling is more difficult to obtain if a local community is situated on private lands. Diaguita communities in Tucumán are predominantly located on lands in the hands of a few traditional families. These landholders frequently make use of their political connections in attempts to evict communities pursuing formal titling. The only community with formalised land tenure, Amaicha, was situated on public lands. Misiones is characterised by mixed land tenure. Private landholdings are on average smaller than in Tucumán, and especially in more remote areas where land is public or titles are in the hands of the Catholic Church, protestant churches, and universities – actors that often actively seek to transfer titles to the Mbya communities occupying these lands.

Moreover, both Mbya and Diaguita leaders suggest that the formalisation of land tenure only constitutes a partial solution to improve the wellbeing of local communities and their members. The most tangible outcomes provided by formal titling are new possibilities to demand and obtain basic infrastructure such as public housing, roads, drainages, or water wells. More fundamental territorial rights are required to overcome the conditions of adverse incorporation associated with the dramatic socioeconomic and ecological transformations in Misiones and Tucumán.

Diaguita activists mobilise for the reform of provincial and national laws, arguing that the ILO Convention 169 includes the notion of 'territory' and that this international legal framework – recognised by the national government – has priority over any other form of legislation. In their understanding, territorial rights are associated with unrestricted access to the spaces the Diaguita historically used and occupied, control over ceremonial sites and the archaeological ruins of their ancestors, and indigenous resource governance of the subsoil and water supplies. In Misiones, Mbya notions of territory are tied to the preservation of the rainforest. 'We occupy a cultural space with various ceremonial grounds and cemeteries . . . and there is respect towards nature . . . but we as indigenous peoples are not owners of these lands, we are part of a natural system and it is us who belong here'. Territorial rights mean control over the actual and potential resources derived from the rainforest. Mbya activists mention the local management of logging licences and the

protection of indigenous knowledge about medical plants as possible benefits from territorial rights.

In their struggles for communal lands and territories Diaguita and Mbya activists
615   challenge dominant conceptions of poverty and advance alternative understandings of indigenous wellbeing linked to territorial rights and resource governance. Mbya leaders question narrow definitions of poverty and frequently emphasise that being poor is not confined to the absence of material status symbols. A female leader points out that in the case of the Mbya, conceptions of poverty need to take into
620   account that 'territory is life' and a fundamental source of identity. Poverty is thus closely related to the deforestation and commercial use of the rainforest, which undermines a self-sustained way of life grounded in the combination of horticulture, hunting and some salaried work, and enhances Mbya dependency on outside (13) support. 'One is poor because of not having [access to] the rainforest anymore', a
625   conception that embraces a broader approach to poverty reduction that cannot be reduced to specific targeted interventions and social programmes alone.

Similarly, Diaguita activists draw a close connection between poverty and environmental deterioration. A recurrent theme is the nexus between mining and water scarcity, with immediate effects on farming and cattle herding. The almost
630   universal access to schooling, health care and electricity are seen as necessary, but by no means sufficient to secure the wellbeing of community members. 'I believe that we are rich poor, we have all the natural resources and we could enjoy them in accordance with our worldviews, yet the sovereignty over natural resources that accrues to us as indigenous peoples in our territories has not been recognised so far'.
635   Interviewees thus associate poverty with the absence of indigenous control over territory and oppose the increasing dependence on social assistance programmes. Again, this perspective suggests a broader approach to poverty reduction that focuses on territorial rights, environmental protection and the reorganisation of capitalist accumulation.
640   At the same time, the extent to which Diaguita and Mbya understandings of poverty gain salience in public discourse varies. In Tucumán we found that NGO activists and local academics were largely sympathetic to the nexus between indigenous wellbeing and control over land and territory drawn by Diaguita leaders. For instance, a project organiser at the National University of Tucumán described a
645   close link between communal land rights and local development: 'A land title means that a community can take decisions that should not be taken by the government or someone else [...] For instance, whether and how they want to develop tourism'. Another indicator for the salience of Diaguita framings of poverty is the reaction of economic elites. In interviews large landowners invested substantial efforts into
650   debunking the association between communal land titles and indigenous wellbeing. One interviewee went at length to explain how collective land rights would engender 'anomy' and result in more poverty and underdevelopment for local indigenous communities. We also observed practical support for Diaguita land struggles. A group of activist lawyers provides legal assistance to the Unión Diaguita, and
655   various NGOs, together with staff from the provincial university, provide logistical support for demarcating Diaguita land claims.

By contrast, in Misiones the resonance of Mbya understandings of poverty is more limited. Local NGO activists and academics are more sceptical about the nexus

between communal land rights and indigenous wellbeing advocated by Mbya leaders. For instance, an activist of a Lutheran NGO involved in supporting Mbya communities sees communal land rights as a problem, not a solution to poverty: if communities obtain land, 'they don't know what they are doing with their land and might sell it when they are drunk'. Other NGOs report severe internal struggles whether they should support Mbya land struggles due to similar doubts. NGOs in Misiones are primarily focused on providing social assistance to Mbya communities and are less inclined to actively support the land titling efforts of indigenous communities.

These differences in the capacity to broadcast alternative conceptions of poverty and wellbeing are linked to distinct mobilisation patterns. The ability of Diaguita activists to engage in sustained campaigns for communal land titles and territorial control provides them with a platform to garner public attention and open up new spaces for debate and dissemination. The Unión Diaguita establishes an autonomous indigenous voice that communicates Diaguita claims. By contrast, the fragmentation of Mbya mobilising efforts and the organisational dependence on provincial state agencies undermines the effective dissemination of Mbya framings of poverty and wellbeing. The Mbya leadership association controlled by the DAG does not enjoy much public recognition, and alternative public voices are limited to individual caciques and their often conflicting agendas.

VI. Conclusion

The article has explored the dynamics and consequences of indigenous social movements in Argentina through a comparison of ethnic mobilisation in two provinces, Tucumán and Misiones. Our analysis examined how changes in global and national opportunity structures played themselves out in distinct subnational contexts. Diaguita Calchaquí and Mbya Guaraní land struggles also provided a window at the nexus between distinct mobilisation patterns, citizenship and indigenous poverty.

Our findings point to local patterns of capitalist development as prompting indigenous activists to make use of the new communal land rights provided by the 1994 constitutional reform. Diaguita and Mbya leaders both emphasise the growing insecurity their established forms of land use face in light of the recent expansion of commercialised agriculture, tourism and 'frontiers of extraction'. Intensified land commodification and increasing land values motivate local indigenous communities in Tucumán and Misiones to take advantage of the new legal resources and file for collective land titles.

The comparison between Diaguita and Mbya land struggles has also illustrated significant subnational variation in the salience of indigenous mobilisation in Argentina. The capacity to mobilise is shaped by local leadership patterns and the relations between indigenous activists and the provincial state. In Tucumán, Diaguita leaders are endowed with the skills and networks to navigate complex political relations and enjoy relative autonomy from state agencies. In Misiones, Mbya leaders are frequently co-opted by provincial state elites and often do not enjoy the resources and networks necessary for sustained collective action. Thus, some of the established theoretical frameworks to explain indigenous mobilisation in

the Andean countries, Central America, and Mexico – especially those focused on
education and leadership (Gutiérrez, 1999; Wimmer, 2002) and state-society
relations (Yashar, 2005) – travel well to Argentina. At the same time, these
arguments need to be complemented by close attention to the socioeconomic and
ecological contexts that affect local livelihoods.

This article has also explored some of the consequences of Diaguita and Mbya
mobilisation. Specifically, we have shown that indigenous social movements
contribute to the activation of the new multicultural rights. The constitutional
recognition of communal land rights became implemented once Diaguita and Mbya
communities pursued formal titling by engaging provincial and national state
agencies, fostering connections to potential allies and framing their current situation
as living on 'captive' lands. Similarly, indigenous land struggles introduced a new
language of 'rights'. Even communities without a title employ rights-based discursive
strategies and emphasise historical use and possession to protect their access to land.
Finally, Diaguita and Mbya mobilising efforts challenge dominant conceptions of
nationhood that portray Argentina as a 'white' nation of immigrants, and make
indigenous communities visible as bearers of rights and legitimate political actors. As
such, this study complements arguments that citizenship is not only based on formal
membership, but also on the engagement and exercise of those rights in everyday
practice (Miller-Idriss, 2006; Holston, 2008). In this conceptualisation, citizenship
moves beyond being a bundle of civic, political, social and cultural rights. It also
includes, following Hannah Arendt, 'the rights to have rights', that is, political
membership based on the mutual recognition as moral equals (Somers, 2008; see also
Dagnino, 1998). Social movements constitute a crucial mechanism in this move from
formal membership to the substantive recognition and everyday exercise of
citizenship rights.

Our analysis has also shown that indigenous social movements play an important
role in contesting dominant notions of poverty. Diaguita and Mbya activists
challenge the conceptualisation of poverty as an individual attribute linked to missing
assets or geographical disadvantages. Poverty is nothing endogenous to their way of
life (see Ferguson 1990). Instead, activists associate poverty with a lack of control
over the territories they have historically occupied. As such, this article reinforces
arguments that see the empowering effects of social movements first and foremost in
shifting the nature of public debate around poverty (Hickey and Bracking, 2005;
Bebbington, 2007). While evidence for the impact of ethnic mobilisation on material
indicators of deprivation remains limited, our findings suggest that indigenous
movements are central to poverty reduction initiatives because they introduce a
different language in which poverty is framed and talked about.

The emphasis indigenous movements put on alternative understandings of poverty
opens up new perspectives on the causes of destitution. The focus on the nexus
between territorial rights, resource governance and indigenous wellbeing points to
the poverty-creating processes of recent capitalist transformations. Both provinces
witnessed the intensification of accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2003), in
Tucumán linked to the expansion of mining and tourism, and in Misiones to the
expansion of large-scale industrial agriculture. From the perspective of indigenous
activists, it is not the lack of market integration, but the adverse incorporation of
local communities into these new land and labour markets that threatens their

subsistence strategies and economic security. These claims relate to broader arguments in the literature that poverty is relational – the result of historically developed economic and political relations and the modes of exploitation and expropriation inbuilt in them (Harriss-White, 2005; Mosse, this issue).

At the same time, social movements are no 'magic bullet' (Franco, 2008) and often face severe constraints due to the very socioeconomic, ecological, and political conditions they mobilise against. Especially Mbya mobilising efforts remain fragmented and locally contained and have only limited impact on public discourse and policy making. Our analysis shows that the contained forms of indigenous mobilisation in Misiones are at least partially driven by historical patterns of poverty and exclusion that undermine the formation of a politicised and networked Mbya leadership. Moreover, the patterns of capitalist development that prompt local indigenous activists to engage the new constitutional rights also reinforce the adverse incorporation of Mbya communities. In both Tucumán and Misiones, Diaguita and Mbya livelihoods have changed dramatically over the last decades, largely because of land commodification, rising property values, and the enclosure of spaces these communities historically used and lived in.

Similarly, formal citizenship rules set up substantial limitations to indigenous political claims-making. The current constitutional multiculturalism in Argentina establishes communal land rights, but constrains indigenous movements in their struggles for territory and resource governance. The exclusion of territorial rights from the 1994 Constitution forms a major obstacle to indigenous self determination and the development of local communal spaces. The power to manage and control environmental resources such as water and the subsoil remains with the state. States thus appear to be more responsive to 'integrationist demands' for the accommodation of cultural differences, yet not to 'autonomy demands' that would recognise indigenous territorial governance and imply a major challenge to the dominant economic and political order (Hale, 2002; Richards, 2004).

At the same time, our focus on indigenous mobilisation at the national and provincial levels has its limitations. To begin with, this approach has led us to gloss over the implications of multicultural constitutionalism and ethnic mobilisation *within* distinct Diaguita and Mbya communities. As Mallon (1995) and Li (1996) suggest, the constitution of local communities is a contested process imbued with issues of power. What and who is 'the community' requires close analytical attention. Preliminary evidence indicates that indigenous activists with official posts (that is caciques or council members) and those with close friendship or family ties to them usually represent themselves as speaking in the name of the community. The same local activist networks also tend to embrace the formalisation of land tenure and territorial rights as key to local development. By contrast, those situated outside these informal networks are on average more sceptical about the equation of communal land tenure with indigenous wellbeing, and sometimes advance alternative visions of local development centred on individual property rights.

The analysis presented here has also privileged indigenous social movements in rural settings, largely because the majority of those who identify as Diaguita and Mbya are located in the countryside. Yet, our impressions from fieldwork indicate that Diaguita and Mbya mobilisation also unfolds in urban areas. Interviewees frequently mention indigenous hometown associations, interest groups and social

clubs in Buenos Aires and other industrial centres, while INAI officials report claims for the legal recognition of Diaguita and Mbya communities in these cities. Similar to studies of other indigenous groups in Argentina and Latin America (for example, Radcliffe et al., 2002; Escolar, 2007) we found that activists in urban settings employ the language of indigenous identity and territorial rights when demanding participation in issues such as urban planning or municipal development. Further research is needed to unpack the contrasts and similarities in rural and urban indigenous mobilisation.

Beyond these limitations, what this article does provide is an empirically informed argument about subnational patterns of ethnic mobilisation and their nexus to citizenship and poverty. Our findings suggest that indigenous social movements have empowering effects, especially by activating multicultural rights and challenging dominant conceptions of poverty. Movements constitute an important force that enables disadvantaged groups to gain public visibility and extent their status as members of the political community. At the same time, these gains remain shallow if they are not coupled with a politics of poverty reduction that addresses the conditions of adverse incorporation and engenders a reorganisation of dominant forms of capitalist accumulation. Such a task requires the enforcement of social and economic rights at the local, national and global levels to counteract the overlap of cultural differences with material destitution and economic privilege.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. Over the last two decades inequality and poverty increased in Argentina, even in periods of economic expansion (Gasparini, 2007). In general, poverty is much higher among rural residents. In, 2001, based on data collected before the 2001/2 economic crisis, 33 per cent of the rural population had unmet basic needs, compared to 14 per cent in urban areas (Verner 2006).
2. Census data do not include information on income, whereas the *Encuesta Permanente de Hogares* (EPH), the main household survey in Argentina, only covers urban areas. Human development indicators included in the census show that 7.8 per cent of indigenous peoples are illiterate, compared to 2.6 per cent for the whole country. Moreover, 71.6 per cent of indigenous Argentineans aged 15 years and older completed primary education, compared to 81.1 per cent as the national average (INDEC, 2004/5).
3. The concept captures the (often negative) *terms* of inclusion into wider economic and social networks faced by subordinate groups (Du Toit, 2004).
4. For an excellent historical overview of indigenous mobilisation in Argentina see Gordillo and Hirsch (2003). The history of *indigenista* state policies is well documented in Carrasco (2000) and Quijada et al. (2000).

5. Our conceptualisation of social movements draws on Tilly (2004) and Tarrow (1994).
6. The national-level *Registro Nacional de Comunidades Indígenas* is administered by the INAI.
7. The systematic provision of legal training and advice by NGOs also contributed to the intensification of indigenous land struggles.
8. Interview with INAI official Emiliano Reynoso, Buenos Aires, 9 February 2009.
9. The discussion of ethnicity in this section draws theoretical inspiration from Jenkins (1997) and Rueschemeyer and vom Hau (2009).
10. Significant numbers can also be found in the neighbouring provinces of Salta, Jujuy, Catamarca, San Juan, and La Rioja.
11. There are also Mbya who live in Brasil and Paraguay. Among the three countries, the total Mbya population is approximately 20,000 persons.
12. The precise number of Mbya communities is difficult to determine. We draw here on numbers from the INAI. The *Dirección Asuntos Guaraníes* (DAG) officially recognises 93 communities, while an unpublished study by the *Universidad Nacional de Misiones* speaks of 104 communities in 2008.
13. These classifications are highly flexible and context-dependent, and thus best described as 'phenomyths' (Escolar 2007).
14. Census data indicate that around 97 per cent of self-identified Mbya speak or understand Guaraní. Among those aged 30 years or younger there is a growing percentage that is bilingual.
15. According to census data almost 100 per cent of the Diaguita speak Spanish at home.
16. Interviews with INAI officials María Paz and Matilde Sacco, Buenos Aires, 9 February 2009.
17. For the production of the latter, local communities rely on support from NGOs and universities.
18. Up to a decade ago it was common practice that landlords received rents in staples from farm lands and often charged indigenous communities for animals passing through their landholdings. Today almost all of those who identify as Diaguita stopped paying these rents.
19. Compared to 1900, only 1.2 per cent of the Paranaese rainforest remained in 2000. Most of these 12,000 sq. km are situated in Misiones (Wilde, 2007).
20. Historically, there has been substantial Mbya movement between Paraguay, Argentina, and Brazil. Over the last two decades, Mbya migration from Paraguay to Misiones increased because in the former social assistance programmes are basically non-existent.
21. Similar patterns can be detected for the relations between indigenous communities and NGOs. In Misiones, NGOs – many of them with an explicit confessional orientation – provide important support, yet their involvement is concentrated on only a few communities and often imbued with a paternalistic attitude. In Tucumán, Diaguita communities are less dependent on NGO support.
22. Amaicha has around 2500 comuneros and is composed of 14 base communities.
23. The DAG claims that 39 Mbya communities obtained formalisation of land tenure, yet several other sources, including anthropologists and state officials from other provincial agencies, treat this number as inflated and provide own estimates of around 20 communities with land titling.

References

Bebbington, A. (2007) Social movements and the politicisation of chronic poverty. *Development and Change*, 38, pp. 793–818.

Bebbington, A., Humphreys Bebbington, D., Bury, J., Lingand, J., Muñoz, J.P. and Scurrah, M. (2008) Mining and social movements: Struggles over livelihood and rural territorial development in the Andes. *World Development*, 36, pp. 2888–2905.

Briones, C. (1997) *La alteridad del 'cuarto mundo'. Una deconstrucción antropológica de la diferencia* (Buenos Aires: Ed. del Sol).

Briones, C. (ed) (2005) *Cartografías argentinas. Políticas indigenistas y formaciones provinciales de alteridad* (Buenos Aires: Antropofagia).

Brysk, A. (2000) Democratizing civil society in Latin America. *Journal of Democracy*, 11, pp. 151–166.

Carrasco, M. (2000) *Los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas en Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Vinciguerra).

Castells, M. (1997) *The Information Age* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Dagnino, E. (1998) Culture, citizenship, and democracy: changing discourses and practices of the Latin American Left, in: S.E. Alvarez, E. Dagnino and A. Escobar (eds) *Cultures of politics/politics of cultures: re-visioning Latin American social movements* (Boulder: Westview Press), pp. 33–63.

Diaz Polanco, H. (1997) *Indigenous Peoples in Latin America: The Quest for Self-Determination* (Boulder: Westview).

Du Toit, A. (2004) 'Social exclusion' discourse and chronic poverty: A South African case study. *Development and Change*, 35, pp. 987–1010.

Escolar, D. (2007) *Los dones étnicos de la Nación. Identidades huarpe y modos de producción de soberanía en Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros).

Ferguson, J. (1990) *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Franco, J.C. (2008) Making land rights accessible: Social movements and political-legal innovation in the rural Philippines. *Journal of Development Studies*, 44, pp. 991–1022.

Gasparini, L. (2007) *Monitoring the Socioeconomic Conditions in Argentina, 1992–2006* (La Plata: CEDLAS, Universidad Nacional de la Plata).

Gastón, G. and Hirsch, S. (2003) Indigenous Struggles and contested identities in Argentina histories of invisibilization and re-emergence. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, 8, pp. 4–30.

Gorosito Kramer, A.M. (1982). Encontros e desencontros. Relacoes interétnicas e representacoes em Misiones (Argentina). Masters dissertation, Universidad de Brasilia.

Gorosito Kramer, A.M. (2007) Liderazgos guaraníes. Breve revisión histórica y nuevas notas sobre la cuestión. *Avá, revista de antropología*, 9, pp. 9–27.

Hale, C.R. (2002) Does multiculturalism menace? Governance, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 34, pp. 485–524.

Hall, G. and Patrinos, H.A. (2005) *Pueblos indígenas, pobreza y desarrollo humano en América Latina: 1994–2004* (Washington: World Bank).

Harriss-White, B. (2005) Destitution and the poverty of its politics – with special reference to South Asia. *World Development*, 33, pp. 881–891.

Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hau, M. vom (2008) State infrastructural power and nationalism: comparative lessons from Mexico and Argentina. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43, pp. 334–354.

Hermitte, E. (1995) *Estudio sobre la situación de los aborígenes de la Provincia del Chaco y políticas para su integración a la sociedad nacional* (Posadas: Editorial Universitaria).

Holston, J. (2008) *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos de la República Argentina (2004/5) Encuesta Complementaria de Pueblos Indígenas. Internet source available at http://www.indec.mecon.ar/webcenso/ECPI/index_ecpi.asp (accessed 12 October 2008).

Jackson, J.E. and Warren, K.B. (2005) Indigenous movements in Latin America, 1992–2004: Controversies, ironies, new directions. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, pp. 549–573.

Jelin, E. and Hershberg, E. (eds) (1996) *Constructing Democracy: Human Rights, Citizenship, and Society in Latin America* (New York: Perseus Books).

Jenkins, R. (1997) *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage).

Lazzari, A. (2007) Identidad y Fantasma: situando las nuevas prácticas de libertad en el movimiento indígena de La Pampa. *Quinto Sol. Revista de Historia Regional*, 11, pp. 91–122.

Li, T.M. (1996) Images of community: discourse and strategy in property relations. *Development and Change*, 27, pp. 501–527.

Mallon, F. (1995) *Peasant and Nation: the Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Miller-Idriss, C. (2006) Everyday understandings of citizenship in Germany. *Citizenship Studies*, 10, pp. 541–570.

Mosse, D. and Lewis, D. (2006) Introduction: theoretical approaches to brokerage and translation in development, in D. Mosse and D. Lewis (eds) *Development Brokers and Translators: the Ethnography of Aid and Agencies* (Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Books). pp. 1–26.

Occhipinti, L. (2003) Claiming a place land and identity in two communities in Northwestern Argentina. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, 8, pp. 155–174.

Omi, M. and Winant, H. (1994) *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge).

Peña, G. de la (2005) Social and cultural policies toward indigenous peoples: perspectives from Latin America. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, pp. 717–739.

Postero, N. and Zamosc, L. (2004) Indigenous movements and the Indian question in Latin America, in: N. Postero and L. Zamosc (eds) *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* (Sussex: Sussex Academic Press), pp. 1–31.

Quijada, M., Bernard, C. and Schneider, A. (2000) *Homogeneidad y Nación. Con un estudio de caso: Argentina siglos XIX y XX* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).

Radcliffe, S.A., Laurie, N. and Andolina, R. (2002) Reterritorialised space and ethnic political participation: indigenous municipalities in Ecuador. *Space and Polity*, 6, pp. 289–305.

Radovich, J.C. and Balazote, A.O. (eds) (1992) *La problemática indígena. Estudios antropológicos sobre pueblos indígenas en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: C.E.A.L.).

Richards, P. (2004) *Pobladoras, Indìgenas and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press).

Rueschemeyer, D. and Hau, M. vom (2009) Social identities, in: D. Rueschemeyer (ed.) *Useable Theory: Analytical Tools for Social Research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 228–242.

Sieder, R. (ed.) (2002) *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Snyder, R.O. (2001) *Politics after Neoliberalism: Reregulation in Mexico* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Somers, M. (2008) *Genealogies of Citizenship: Markets, Statelessness, and the Right to Have Rights* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Stavenhagen, R. (2002) Indigenous peoples and the state in Latin America: An ongoing debate, in R. Sieder (ed.)*Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity, and Democracy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 24–44.

Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tilly, C. (2004) *Social Movements, 1768–2004* (New York: Paradigm Publishers).

Van Cott, D.L. (2000) *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press).

Verner, D. (2006) Rural poor in rich rural areas: poverty in rural Argentina. Policy Research Working Paper No. 4096, Washington, DC, World Bank.

Wilde, G. (2007) De la depredación a la conservación. Génesis y evolución del discurso hegemónico sobre la selva misionera y sus habitantes. *Ambiente e Sociedad*, 10, pp. 87–106.

Wimmer, A. (2002) *Nationalist Exclusion and Ethnic Conflict: Shadows of Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Yashar, D. (2005) *Contesting Citizenship: Indigenous Movements, the State, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press).