Rezensionen


The intention of the series “Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Belonging in Latin America” is to promote an international scientific dialogue about these three concepts and their social, political, and cultural implications. The results of the dialogue will be published in four volumes; the book under review, which is subtitled “Practices, Theory and Spatial Dimensions,” is the first volume. It is a result of the first international symposium on the subject, organized by the Research Network for Latin America; three more symposia will follow between 2011 and 2013. As becomes clear with these few words, the claim made by the Research Network and the editors of the volume is quite ambitious and substantial, therefore, part of this review will be to analyze whether the editors and authors achieve this goal.

The volume consists of an introduction and three main sections. The first section discusses the genesis of ethnicity and citizenship, while the second section examines ethnic and spatial aspects of citizenship. The third and main section deals with belonging and spatiality. A special feature of the book is that some of the articles are written in Spanish and some in English, but there seems to be no special logic that determines in which language an article is written.

In the introduction, the four editors analyze the three key concepts which guide the whole scientific enterprise, postulating that as Latin America is an extremely heterogeneous subcontinent, these concepts have proved especially useful to investigate phenomena of inclusion and exclusion. According to them, ethnicity and citizenship are well-known concepts, while belonging has a short history as a theoretical term. The editors offer some definitions of each of the three concepts, definitions that will be found similarly in some articles of the book. Finally, they give a brief summary of the articles and their authors.

“Ethnicity and Citizenship in Historical Perspective,” the first section of the volume, consists of three articles written by Karoline Noack, Wolfgang Gabbert, and Cecilia Méndez and Carla Granados Moya. As the title suggests, this section basically seeks to establish the genesis of ethnicity and citizenship as social processes.

In a short and quite interesting contribution, Noack analyzes ethnicity and citizenship in colonial Peru using a special set of documents. The author parts from the widely assumed “fact” that Peruvian colonial society consisted of clear-cut castes. She criticizes this idea as fiction, developed and maintained by the colonial bureaucracy in order to facilitate the process of governing. The case analyzed by Noack is the early colonial society of the city of Trujillo on the Peruvian north coast in the years between 1539 and 1619. Like others before, she uses documents in order to gain insight into colonial society, but unlike others, she does not use official documents, like birth or death certificates but instead documents concerning everyday life, like last wills, deeds of donation, warrants, and the likes. This inventive method allows her to severely modify the idea of the heavily segmented caste society. She concludes that in the early colonial society of Trujillo representatives of all categories of residents interacted and that, therefore, colonial Trujillo was a homogeneous society with a homogenous history, not a society composed of impassable castes. In this society there was just one clear-cut ethnic group: the supposed “Whites,” with their claim of a common culture, common origin and common skin color.

Ethno genesis and the difference between “ethnie” and “ethnic group” is the concern of Gabbert, whose examples are the Miskitu and Creoles on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua. The author describes the development of the Miskitu from a population that originally based its loyalty on locality and (fictive) kinship towards an ethnie: a group in an ethnically homogeneous territory with access to the basic means of production. This process, resulting in an ethnie is characterized by external adscription and internal self-awareness. The same process leads to the development of the Creoles from a locally dominant group to an ethnic group, that is to say, a group depending on the interaction with the wider society in order to fulfill its basic needs. The author maintains that ethnie and ethnic groups are important concepts in order to understand the social foundations and political potentials of ethnic communities. Gabbert’s contribution is well-structured, with clear and well-based conclusions. However, many readers may already be quite familiar with the arguments, which have already been presented by Gabbert in several earlier articles.
The chapter written by Méndez G. and Granados M. seeks to rescue the alleged civil wars that lead to Peruvian independence from having supposedly fallen into oblivion, linking them with the conflict of the 1980s and 1990s (Shining Path) and discussing the concepts of citizenship and belonging along these lines. The authors concentrate on the contribution of the rural Andean population to the establishment of the Peruvian Republic and try to show the important role communities and their leaders fulfilled in supporting different fighting troops. Unfortunately, the article contains very few information beyond the fact that rural communities supported the troops in some cases with more, in other cases with less enthusiasm and, respectively, needing more or less coercion. A civil war per definition requires something like a nation or state whose civil society members fight in different bands. Nothing like that existed in Latin America during the wars that lead to independence. The two authors claim that the quarrels that finally led to Peru’s independence from Spain had the character of civil wars, when in fact they were fights between different dominant groups, one controlled by Spain, the others by several internal colonial elite groups. Those groups used—or better: abused—local Andean communities to their own ends. The authors’ confusion about the character of a civil war may be responsible for their assumption that the conflict of the 1980s and 1990s was a civil war similar to the supposed civil war of independence. The unscrupulous leader of the terrorist group Shining Path and his fanatic followers struggled to establish a state of fear and submission among the Andean peasants by use of terror. The reaction of the state, too, was characterized by a good dose of terror of police and armed forces, sent to fight Shining Path, against the very victims of Shining Path. Taking this terrorism as civil war in the best of cases seems overinterpreted. It certainly does not help to learn neither about citizenship nor about belonging.

“Ethnic and Spatial Aspects of Citizenship” is the headline of the second section, which consists of three chapters from Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Santiago Bastos, and Manuel Buenrostro Alba.

Stavenhagen tells us the history of indigenous people’s struggle to be recognized by Latin American states as subjects with their specific cultures and societies, and how they have been excluded from those states and their dominant societies. He also reviews how intellectuals have been trying to explain the obvious problem of exclusion of indigenous people, thus hoping to contribute to a solution. “Indigenismo” has become the best known intellectual current, especially in Mexico but also in Peru and Bolivia. Stavenhagen mentions the errors but also the successes of the struggle of indigenous people and their sympathizers, which finally lead to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007 and to plurinational or multinational nations (Bolivia is an outstanding example). Substantial progress has been made in the discussion regarding citizenship in pluri- and multinational Latin American states and in the analysis of societies based on the very concept of citizenship. Stavenhagen’s contribution nicely reviews the struggles for the rights of indigenous people, but readers familiar with the author will hardly find anything new in it.

Bastos writes about the Mayanists of Guatemala. He analyzes different strategies aiming at reconstructing, fostering, or extending being Maya, identifying three main positions: syncretism, modernism, and mayanism (mayanista in Spanish). Syncretism is based on a local (communal and municipal) level; modernism on the effort to overcome backwardness through individual efforts, while mayanism aims to live modernism based on the idea of cultural differences and is focused not on a local but on a national level. Bastos analyzes the three positions with regard to education, religion, politics, and culture; he identifies contradictions between the positions and analyzes similarities or interfaces. He concludes that all three of them aim for a fulfilled identity, with the mayanistas seeking full citizenship with the right to their own cultural characteristics, which, therefore, cannot be used as a means of exclusion. Bastos’ article is not only very interesting but also one of the contributions that touch the very core of the series’ aims, namely: practices, theory, and spatial dimensions of ethnicity, citizenship, and belonging.

Another interesting article about the Mayas comes from Buenrostro Alba. He centers his argument on the opposition of collective citizenship of indigenous people versus individual citizenship that ignores cultural differences. Buenrostro A. writes about the Maya of Quintana Roo (Mexico) and the “traditional justice judges,” created through the indigenous justice law, in force since 1997. The traditional justice judge, elected by each community, is a completely new legal instrument that neither existed in traditional Maya communities nor in the regular legal system. Due to this new beginning, the judges first had to define their field of work and gain the necessary authority to fulfill their tasks. Notwithstanding, they base their decisions on Maya traditions. Buenrostro states that today, traditional judges are accepted as part of the Maya culture and their existence contributes to the characteristics of a Maya citizenship.


Geschiere writes about autochthony, citizenship, and exclusion, stating that autochthony always demands exclusion. His interest is fostered by the paradox of a more and more globalized world with a growing demand for belonging. Autochthony plays a key role in this. In order to familiarize the reader with his subject, Geschiere makes a semantic and historic excursion to the Classical Greeks which is far too long. Highlighting the current situation with examples from Europe and Africa, the author then asks about the relevance of autochthony, citizenship, and exclusion for Latin America, stating that the notions “indigenous” and “autochthonous” seem to be parallel, which would make one of them redundant. But, according to him, the meaning of indigenous’ is nowadays controversial at least in Latin America, while autochthony,
which is used more in regions outside of Latin America, is more ambiguous. The author’s main interest is to show that both terms, autochthony and indigenous, are problematic and far from being self-evident. He also suggests that the task for social sciences should be to understand when and why these concepts acquire high mobilizing power in actual events. The length of some parts of Gé­-schiere’s contribution can make reading exhausting, but it is surely one of the volume’s highlights for its well-done analysis of the central terms, the context in which they are imbedded, and the conclusions drawn by the author.

In the next contribution, Pfaff-Czarnecka’s main objective is to distinguish clearly between the concepts “identity” and “belonging.” She states: “‘Identity’ is a categorical concept while belonging combines categorization with social relating. Identity is relational in the sense that it positions itself vis-à-vis the other. Belonging’s relationality consists in forging and maintaining social ties and in buttressing commitments and obligations. Identity caters to dichotomous characterizations of the social while belonging rather highlights its situatedness and the multiplicity of parameters forging commonality, mutuality and attachments. Identity relies on sharp boundary-drawing, particularism, and is prone to buttressing social divisiveness” (203). It is arguable whether this distinction is plausible in this sense. The reviewer holds that her definition of “identity” is much too narrow, concentrating too much on collective identity. Notwithstanding, the author argues on a very high level.

Concerning the politics of belonging, the author identifies three trends: 1) the so-called third wave of democratization after the fall of the Berlin Wall, which enormously encouraged the actions of civil societies of Eastern European countries. 2) The global movement of indigenous people, beginning with the First People Movement in North America and leading to a temporary highpoint with the UN declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007. 3) The evergrowing interconnections of different world regions through intensive interchange of capital, goods, and people, enhanced by neoliberal politics. Finally, she states: “The concept of belonging provides us with a tool to think of social practices of negotiating collective boundedness as in continuous flux, selection, and combination between diverse parameters of belonging” (216). Pfaff-Czarnecka’s text is characterized by its briefness, denseness, and convincing arguments, surely one of the most important texts of the whole volume.

The subject of Viteri’s article is the role food plays in relation to belonging and nostalgia. She investigates among Ecuadorian migrants in New York, obtaining her data from interviews with individual migrants and from a multimedia installation consisting of objects, photos, sounds and words. Its title “Al locro lado” is a play on words: locro is a typical Ecuadorian potato dish while “Al otro lado” means “on the other side.” The author can actually show how belonging is (re)-created by consuming specific food, not necessarily as a process of one-sided nostalgia but, depending on the specific situation and history of the migrants, also as a process of transformation, adaptation and reorientation of one’s culture. She states: “I see food as a particularly rich arena in which to explore such complexities of memory [conflation of food, memory and nostalgia in relationship to identity (232)], considering at its forefront the notion of experience in reference to the past” (233). This is correct and in her contribution she has made a good start. The approach promises to be fertile, and hopefully will only be the beginning.

All Souls Day or Memorial Day (día de los muertos) in Mitla, Oaxaca, Mexico, is the example used by Dühr to show how social praxis generates belonging, marking differences, and fostering cultural identity. She develops her arguments around food and death, first distinguishing between belonging and identity. Both terms include limitations in relation to others, but belonging is specific: “By focussing more on connections and linkages than on categories confronted by other categories, such as ‘Other’, attention is shifted from boundary creating processes to the production of attachments and relationships” (240).

Mitla is a prospering town with textile enterprises, artisans and university graduates which comprise a growing group of professionals, often with migration experience, which gains ever more influence in town dealings. These professionals are situated on various geographical, economic, social, and cultural locations and, therefore, redefine the criteria for social inclusion and belonging. An apex of the social praxis of belonging is the already mentioned All Souls Day, when local residents and migrants meet their dead relatives and through collective food consumption and the sharing of memories enact togetherness and belonging, re-establishing social ties but at the same time altering them for the migrants who belong to other contexts as well. For the author: “… the festival still unifies and incorporates the townspeople in sharing, performing and representing significant linkages with deceased community members and the past, thus re-integrating heterogeneous actors” (254). With her contribution she illustrates how All Souls Day with its social practice of sharing food, conversation, memories, and so forth, enacts social and cultural relations of different social groups of Mitla and through this, fosters or reestablishes belonging. In the study of belonging, like in the contribution discussed here, it would be valuable if social sciences would focus more and more on the perspective of social practice.

“Cine Indígena” (Indigenous Cinema) and the role the production of videos plays in the “emergence of novel, shifting and multifaceted forms of indigenous collective identity and subjectivity” (260) is the theme of Kummels. Cine indígena has its origins in indigenous migrants from Mexico living in the USA, as an expression of indigenous cultural identity, but also as a defense against racial and cultural discrimination by Anglo-Americans and also Chicanos (Mexican Americans). Taking as example the Mixtecs of Mexico, Kummels describes the development of the genre since the 1990s, mentioning the internal conflicts about the definition of cine indígena. She concludes: “Cine Indígena as part of the field of popular culture and media has now become an important public sphere for the negotiation of multiple belongings related to local community, nation and transnational spaces” (278). The ar-
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The last chapter is called “Local Responses to Transnational Migration. Citizenship, Belonging and the Case of Latin American Migrants in Madrid.” Due to the fact that it is written by two of the four editors, Lara Jüssen and Eva Youkhana, and because of its quite promising title, the reader expects something like a conclusion of section III. The two authors introduce us to the Latino world, and specifically Ecuadorian migrants in Madrid, inform us about migrant problems since the crisis in 2008 and how they try to solve them (as street vendors, for example). They tell us about how Ecuadorian migrants cluster in a special quarter of Madrid’s city center, how they establish a cultural and social center through civil society groups in one of the Latino immigration districts, how a church serves as a center to tighten ethnic and family relationships among Latinos, particularly those with Ecuadorian background. Unfortunately, the reviewer feels disappointed about this chapter, which offers little more than a description of some characteristics of migration already very well-known from so many other studies about the subject. The rather pretentious title does not at all match the meager contents.

The volume as a whole has two shortcomings and several strengths. The shortcomings: First, there are several chapters where the reviewer does not understand why they have been included. Their conception is weak and/or they are only marginally related to the general theme of the volume. The space they occupy could have been used for other contributions or for a final reflection on the contributions of the volume. The second shortcoming is more general: sometimes there is a very weak connection or none at all between different contributions and the texts show quite different ideas about what ethnicity, identity, or belonging is. Had the differences been identified and analyzed in the introduction or even better in a final, conclusive chapter there would have been no harm in this. Unfortunately, a conclusive chapter is completely missing. Surely the readers would appreciate it if in the following volumes of the series a final chapter would analyze consistencies, disagreements, and their reasons, in order to improve the arguments and give hints for future investigations. The good news is that, notwithstanding, the volume shows its strength in that it contains some truly pathbreaking contributions that seize, define, and discuss concepts which, surely, in the near future will be even more significant for social sciences in our ever more globalized world.

Harald Mossbrucker


Mit ihrer Ankunft in Sarawak am 7. Juni 1949 beginnt Monica Freeman Tagebuch zu schreiben: “I found the people, their personalities, their interests and enthusiasm, the events, the sounds, the environment and everything that I was seeing utterly fascinating. I just had to record what I saw ...” (xvii). Ihr Mann konzentriert sich bald auf seine Feldnotizen und überlässt das Tagebuchschreiben ganz seiner Frau. Sie erfüllt diese Aufgabe mit großer Hingabe und Genauigkeit. So stellt das Tagebuch einen detailgetreuen Bericht der Feldforschung von Monica und Derek Freeman dar und dokumentiert, was sie unternommen, wen sie getroffen und welche Rituale sie beobachtet haben. Dabei erfährt der Leser viel über das Alltagsleben im Langhaus *Rumah Nyala* sowie Besuchen zu anderen Langhäusern und den umliegenden Feldhäusern, in denen die einzelnen Familien einen großen Teil des Jahres verbringen. Die Beschreibungen von Monica Freeman enthalten aufschlussreiche Informationen zu verschiedenen Aspekten der Iban-Kultur, besonders jedoch zur Landwirtschaft und dem vielseitigen rituellen Leben. Geschrieben aus dem Blickwinkel einer Frau enthalten die Tagebücher auch interessante Details aus dem Alltagsleben der Iban-Frauen. Damit stellen die Tagebücher eine wertvolle und einnehmende Dokumentation der Iban-Kultur in der Mitte des 20. Jh.s dar.

Sie gewähren auch einen interessanten Einblick in die Höhen und Tiefen der Feldforschung des Ehepaars Freeman. Beide arbeiten hart und fordern viel von sich, was sie wiederholt an den Rand ihrer physischen Kräfte bringt. Darüber hinaus erfährt der Leser etwas über die Spannungen, die offensichtlich zwischen Derek Freeman und den beiden anderen Forschern, die ebenfalls zeitgleich vom britischen “Colonial Social Science Research Council” mit Studien in Sarawak beauftragt wurden, geherrscht haben. So bezeichnet Monica Freeman sowohl Stephen Morris, der bei den Melanau forschte, als auch William Geddes, der über die Bidayu arbeitete, als Dereks “Rivalen” (54, 573). Über einen Besuch von Ste-