

REPORT ON CULTURAL IDENTITY, RACE AND ETHNICITY IN LATIN AMERICA

Rodolfo Stavenhagen

"Latin America" is more of a political and cultural concept than a geographical one. For all practical purposes, it formally includes the countries south of the United States plus the Spanish and French-speaking states in the Caribbean (Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic). The English-speaking Caribbean islands are now added to the region, at least as considered by the United Nations, but relations between the Caribbean and continental Latin America have been traditionally tenuous, if not entirely non-existent. Latino and Caribbean cultures have also spread north, and ethnic minorities from these regiones are becoming an increasingly important demographic, cultural and political phenomenon in the United States.

The cultural unity of Latin America is firmly rooted in the colonial history of the region. The Catholic Iberian tradition, imposed by the Castillian and Portuguese-speaking colonists in the sixteenth century, established itself firmly on American soil and shaped local society for three hundred years, before political independence in the nineteenth century. The encounter of the Iberian invaders and the native American societies, and its aftermath, generated a cultural conflict which has not yet been resolved five hundred years later. Brazil, which occupies more than half of the South American land mass, has its own particular historical background and ethnic mix, as a result of the African slave trade and the persistence of a slavocratic

society till the end of the nineteenth century.

Spanish-America is often called a continent of mestizos, that is, of racially and ethnically mixed populations. And indeed, racial mixture has taken place ever since the conquest and colonization by the Spanish crown in the sixteenth century. This biological and cultural process should not detract, however, from the fact that aside from the mestizos the region's population consists of native Amerindians (also referred to as Indians or indigenous peoples), populations of African ancestry, brought in slavery, as well as ethnic Europeans (descendants of the early settlers and later immigrants), and more recently Asian immigrants and their descendants (East Indian laborers, Chinese coolies and traders, Japanese farmers, Levantine merchants).

When we speak about ethnic pluralism in Spanish America, reference is generally made to the existence of circa 40 million Indians, belonging to over 400 distinct linguistic groups, who coexist with mestizos, whites and Afro-Americans. The modern national state that arose in the nineteenth century, became the political successor to the Spanish and Portuguese colonial empires. After the abolition of slavery (early in the century in the Spanish-speaking countries, not until the late nineteenth century in Brazil), formal legal distinctions between different ethnic groups were abolished in most states. Equal citizenship was proclaimed, though in fact discrimination against indigenous

populations remained deeply imbedded in the social and economic structures. In some countries a special legal status for Indians was maintained even after independence, thus effectively barring indigenous peoples from full citizenship in their own countries.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, European ideas of the Enlightenment as well as the democratic principles of the American revolution penetrated Latin America's elites. The latter's political consciousness was awakened through the influence of the French revolution, the Napoleonic invasion of Spain and political upheaval in the latter country at the turn of the nineteenth century. As has happened so often in history, the popular masses arose in arms at the call of the leaders of the independence movements (Bolivar, Hidalgo and others) but they did not reap many benefits from the demise of the Spanish empire. The local ruling classes, particularly the landowners, were able to transform political independence into a victory over the popular classes. Political independence was appropriated by the old and new ruling classes of the landowning oligarchy and the nascent urban bourgeoisie. The place of the Spaniards who were expelled or emigrated was soon taken over by merchants and traders from France, England and the United States who along with their wares and capital also brought their European cultural models.

Political independence posed an enormous challenge to the new rulers: how to integrate coherent societies and polities, how to forge new nations, how to be accepted by the "civilized

nations" of the world, how to govern heterogeneous and dispersed populations in a vast and hostile geography. The answer was the development of a nationalist ideology, not exempt of idealism and romanticism, which characterized political philosophy and the educational systems in Latin American well into the twentieth century.

Latin America's intellectuals took it upon themselves in the nineteenth century to build their national cultures or rather, as it might be said today, to invent them out of the ruins of the Spanish empire and out of the multitude of regional and fragmented micro-societies which made up the new republics but which could hardly be considered as finished and coherent nations. The liberals and positivists were inspired by the United States and northern Europe; the conservatives looked for their model in traditional Spain and France. Both currents however had in common that they spoke for the interests of the minority ruling classes and in that they partook of an elitist, limited vision of society. The ethnic and cultural heterogeneity of the Latin American nations was considered to be an obstacle to national integration and progress.

The disintegration of the colonial economy and administration contributed to the fragmentation and atomization of social and economic space. The area's reintegration into the world market was only to come again years later, towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the expansion of capitalism.

National society continued to be economically and socially highly stratified despite the adoption of formally democratic institutions. The landed oligarchy based its power on the concentration of landownership and this only increased with the introduction of new export crops and the attendant exploitation of rural labor. Caudillismo, caciquismo and other types of patron-client relationships became the most common form of political domination and social control, and are now a permanent element of political culture in Latin America.

The intellectual elites despaired of the contradictions between the "formal" country (republican, democratic, institutional, legalistic) and the "real" country (backward, violent, hierarchical, traditional). They soon adopted racially and geographically deterministic ideologies, borrowed from Europe and the United States, to attempt to explain the perennial instability and backwardness of their nations. They no longer blamed the colonial heritage of Spain, but also the hostile geographic environment with its mountains, jungles and deserts and, above all, the ethnic characteristics of the Indian stratum of the population which was still the majority in many of the republics at the beginning of the twentieth century. Liberals and conservatives agreed that the indigenous peoples and cultures which still existed in Latin America had to disappear.

The national project which these ideologues and early "nation-builders" generated excluded the indigenous peoples. In

the Southern Cone countries this vision turned into genocidal military campaigns against the Indians, in the service of the landowners and the European settlers, reminiscent of the American Frontier. In other regions the official language and culture was imposed on the Indian peasantry by way of the religious and state sponsored educational systems. Positive national law became the only recognized legal system, the traditional political and legal authorities and institutions of the indigenous communities, as well as their communally held lands, were disregarded and taken over by the state or turned over to private landed interests. By accelerating a rapid process of assimilation and incorporation of indigenous peoples into the new nations being formed, the cultural destruction of the Indians was hastened. This was carried out in the name of progress and civilization. Today we call this process ethnocide. In the new national culture invented and fostered by the urban elites there was no place for the cultures of the native, aboriginal peoples of America.

In order to hasten the process of "nation-building" as imagined by the criollo governing elites, numerous countries promoted immigration from Europe. This policy coincided with the expansion of the agricultural frontier and the introduction of new export crops such as coffee and cotton which required large amounts of labor. Foreign immigration was also expected to "Westernize" and "whiten" the local populations. The racist theories which had become popular in Europe during the second

half of the nineteenth century provided ideological justification for such policies in Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Mexico and other countries. (A slightly different pattern emerged in the British Caribbean countries, including Guyana, where East Indian plantation labor was introduced in the nineteenth century).

The racial ideology has by no means disappeared from the elite culture in Latin America, but for obvious reasons of recent history, it has been largely discredited. What many of the home-grown racists preferred to forget, was that in the view of the North European racial pseudo-theorists the "Latin" races themselves (to which of course these ideologues belonged) were to be considered as inferior by Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Aryan or Teutonic standards (to mention but a few of the racial categories which became politically charged value judgements). It has sometimes been stated that racism was absent from Latin American history (in contrast to the situation in the United States), and that the mixing of the races began early in colonial history. While the latter is of course true, the former is not. A strong undercurrent of racist thinking characterized the cultural evolution of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and contributed to a cultural profile, effectively wielded by the ruling classes, from which the subordinate Indian peoples (with their languages, customs and traditions, world-view and social organization as well as artistic achievements) were practically

excluded.

The major ethnic fact of the twentieth century, in the countries where the Indians had not been completely exterminated, was the rapid growth of the mestizo, i.e., the biologically mixed, population. The "pure" whites (if there ever was such a category at all, and of course the concept of white race itself corresponds to no known scientifically established fact), were rapidly diminishing in numbers, as was the relative proportion in the total population of the "pure" Indians. The mestizo population also occupied the middle rungs of the social and economic stratification system and has been increasingly identified in recent years with the growing Latin American "middle classes". It did not take long for the intellectuals to discover formerly unknown virtues in the mestizos. Soon, they were considered to have incorporated the best features of the two original races (the white and the Indian) which had intervened in their make-up. They became the bearers of the new concept of nationality which evolved together with the strengthening of the nation-state. The rise of the mestizo, now extolled in literature, social science and political discourse, coincided with the growing political presence of middle class parties and social movements which by the middle of the twentieth century had practically displaced the more traditional oligarchic parties from the center of the stage. José Vasconcelos, a Mexican philosopher and educator of the early twentieth century called

the mestizos a "cosmic race" and augured a major role for Latin America in world history.

"Mestizo-America" was a concept which anthropologists liked to use in order to distinguish those countries with large Indian populations from the mainly Southern Cone countries from which the Indians had practically disappeared. The term mestizo nowadays refers not only to the process of racial mixture, but rather to the process of cultural synchretism or acculturation, whereby the two great cultural traditions which clashed in the sixteenth century have become meshed in a single emerging global culture, which in each one of the countries concerned is now considered to be the "national" culture. At least so goes the argument wielded by those who see in the figure of the mestizo the kernel of nationalism and national unity.

To the extent that the "racial" (or rather, racist) solution to the problem of ethnic and cultural diversity (as considered by the ruling elites) has fallen out of favor, emphasis has increasingly come to be placed upon cultural issues. Indigenous peoples are no longer considered to be racially inferior to whites and mestizos, but Indian cultures are thought to be backward, traditional and not conducive to progress and modernity. Furthermore, the existence of a diversity of Indian cultures, distinct from the dominant, Western, urban culture of the wielders of political and economic power, has been considered as undermining efforts towards national unity and development.

Thus, the "solution" found by governments and social scientists in the twentieth century, has been to further what has variously been called acculturation, assimilation, incorporation or integration. For this purpose, governments have set up specialized institutions and have followed specific policies in the educational, cultural, economic and social fields designed to "integrate" the Indian populations into the so-called national mainstream.

In modern Latin America, the concept of national culture was predicated upon the idea that Indian cultures do not exist. When, as in most countries, their existence cannot be simply wished away, it was stated that they have nothing or little to do with "national" culture and that, at any rate, they have nothing or very little to contribute to national culture (their greatness, if any, lies in the historical past). Indigenous cultures, if they were recognized as such at all, were considered only as diminished remnants of their former splendour and were thought to be naturally disappearing; therefore, the best which an enlightened government could do was to hasten their demise. In this fashion, so the argument went, was not only national culture and unity strengthened but the indigenous peoples themselves were to benefit greatly in terms of material and spiritual development, modernization and progress.

By the twentieth century, the myth of progress and development, couched in the terminology of "national integration"

and modernization, led to government policies designed to assimilate and integrate indigenous populations into the so-called national mainstream. Despite concerted efforts by the state and the Catholic Church to destroy them, Indian cultures have survived to the present, partly as a result of physical isolation, and the burdens imposed on Indian peoples by the unequal and highly stratified land tenure and social system. In fact, Indian communities have long lived in a situation of internal colonialism. It is often stated that contemporary Indian cultures are the result of the adaptation of the original indigenous societies to five centuries of colonialism and modern capitalism. Therefore indigenous identities are said to be but a mirror image of the wider economic and political structures in which they continue to exist. Others argue that indigenous peoples have been able to resist passively and to a certain extent successfully the pressures of the wider society. Resistance was not always passive; as the history of Latin America is dotted with Indian uprisings and rebellions. The massive destruction of indigenous peoples also accompanied the expanding capitalist agricultural frontier.

The situation of the indigenous peoples in Latin America varies from region to region. In the Andean countries and parts of Mesoamerica (Mexico and much of Central America), Indian peasantries are stable agricultural populations, integrated into the economic system. In the Amazon Basin and other lowland areas,

they are more isolated and live in relatively self-contained economic and social units. Even this is changing rapidly, however, as the globalization of the economy increasingly affects even the formerly most marginal geographical regions.

State policies have taken the form of indigenismo, the official continental ideology of assimilation and national integration, crystallized in international agreements and national legislation. Indigenismo is practiced through the educational system, language and cultural policies, as well as technological and economic activities. It is part of the ideology of development, modernization and nation-building that characterized Latin America since the second world war.

Indigenismo has a noble academic pedigree in applied anthropology. Indeed, social and cultural anthropologists have been the intellectual creators of indigenist policies, and very often also their practical implementors. Most Latin American states have government supported research and training institutes in which studies on indigenous populations are carried out, indigenist policies are developed and evaluated, and specialists are trained. Many academic institutions are also closely linked to the implementation of these policies.

In recent years several changes have challenged the traditional indigenist ideology. Indigenous movements and organizations have emerged and their leadership questions official state policies. Innovative tendencies among certain

sectors of the Catholic Church (such as the theology of liberation) and many evangelical Protestant denominations that became active in the seventies and eighties, generated new awareness and identities among indigenous communities. Also, younger generations of social scientists became critical of earlier positions and have proposed new solutions. Above all, the social and political conflicts of the last two decades have deeply affected the indigenous peoples and their relationship to the state.

Let a few examples suffice.

1) In the eighties the Sandinista revolutionary government of Nicaragua faced a serious challenge by the Miskito Indians on the Atlantic seaboard, within the framework of the contra war engineered by the United States. Though violent at times, the conflict was resolved peacefully after the adoption of a new constitution that recognizes the "autonomy" of the communities of the Atlantic Coast.

2) A violent, bloody civil war has opposed the Maya peasants to the mestizo ruling landowner class and military regimes in Guatemala for more than ten years. Massive human rights violations have occurred in this country, drawing the attention of international human rights groups, the Organizations of American States and the United Nations. Hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons and external refugees add to the complexity of the situation. The "ethnic question" is now

addressed by both sides as an important issue in this conflict, and militant indigenous organizations have emerged as major actors in the political scene. At the same time, religious cleavages (between Catholics and evangelical Protestants) emerge, and a new "Maya identity" is becoming a politically mobilizing issue. Peace talks are currently underway but the outcome is uncertain, though recent developments in Central America (particularly the peace accord in El Salvador) give rise to some degree of optimism.

3) The massive ecological destruction of the Amazon Basin, a major issue of international concern, has involved all of the indigenous peoples in the area. Rural violence and human rights abuses affecting the indigenous groups are widespread. Ecocide and ethnocide go hand in hand. The Brazilian government and international agencies actively engage in attempting solutions to these problems. After years of struggle, the new Brazilian constitution of 1988 includes (for the first time) a chapter on indigenous peoples and their rights.

4) During the dictatorship of Pinochet in Chile, the Mapuche people in the southern part of the country were particularly hard-hit by the repressive policies of the military regime. After the return to civilian rule, the Mapuches have begun to organize themselves politically and are demanding increasing government attention to their land rights, cultural concerns and autonomy.

5) While the political violence in Peru, involving a

triangular conflict between the State, the drug-lords and the Shining Path guerrillas, is not usually thought of as an "ethnic conflict", the profound historical cleavage between the majority Indian peasantry and the small mestizo and white ruling groups is undoubtedly a "structural" factor in the dynamics of the war.

All the conflicts mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, as well as others, have been studied by researchers from national and foreign academic institutions. Where indigenous populations are concerned, anthropologists continue to play a leading role, because of their traditional professional interest in Indians. As conflicts spread and persist, other social sciences step into the arena. The wars in Central America in the eighties, because of their international implications (super-power involvement, mercenary military forces, revolutionary organizations, arms trade, cold-war ideologies, human rights issues, etc.) received the attention of political scientists, international relations specialists and legal scholars. Ecologists and economists. among others, pay attention to the ecological and ethnological issues in the Amazon. Land tenure issues and rural development continue to receive attention by sociologists, economists and agronomists. The questions of language policy, education and culture are dealt with by linguists and educational specialists. Thus, the ethnic issues involved in so many of the political and social conflicts in Latin America in recent years have spilled over narrow disciplinary boundaries and are being looked at by an array of

professional disciplines. Yet anthropology has a traditional head-start and a well-established legitimacy in the field.

As mentioned before, the early approaches to the so-called indigenous problematique were based on the paradigms of development, modernization and nation-building, as defined by the state and by mainstream social science concerns. This approach was challenged by new intellectual currents in the sixties and seventies, among which Marxism had pride of place. The earlier "culturalist" approaches of the anthropologists were criticized and replaced by new analytical models. "Class analysis" became the dominant paradigm in the social sciences. Ethnic and cultural issues were considered insignificant, an irritant sidetracking from the more urgent tasks of class struggle and revolution. Such analyses found their way into political and revolutionary organizations (frequently staffed by young intellectuals and academics; the universities being, after all, the seed-beds of much revolutionary activity at that time).

The neglect of ethnicity in class analysis and by the revolutionary organizations had a high political cost. It led to serious soul-searching and re-evaluation in the seventies and eighties. As suggested above, it has now found its way back into political discourse and activity. Also, the world break-down of any real-life models for revolutionary activity in Latin America has thrown the parties of the left into disarray, challenging the earlier unquestioned adherence to relatively simple models of

class analysis. Though the structural conditions leading to social unrest and political upheaval in Latin America remain relatively unchanged (unequal land tenure systems, massive poverty, rural and urban exploitation of labor, marginalization of masses of the population, economic stagnation etc.), the new analytical approaches can no longer ignore cultural and ethnic factors. In fact, within the context of "post-modern" currents in philosophical and cultural thinking, "culture" has recently re-emerged as a new, dynamic concept equally used (or manipulated) by the right and the left, by the revolutionaries and by the state. Currently, the indigenous organizations and their varied and often unstructured ideologies, are riding a crest of sympathy and interest liberally expended by academe, governments, the churches, the media and the political parties. Whether this is a transitory phenomenon or not, and what long-term effects it may have on the situation of the indigenous peoples themselves, remains to be seen.

Academic resources

As a result of over a decade of military dictatorships and civil wars in South and Central America during the sixties and seventies, numerous academic institutions and intellectual communities were devastated in several countries. Thousands of Latin American academics went into exile. Those who remained behind were severely hampered in their activities. In some cases,

international foundations came to their aid. As the return to democracy accelerated in the middle eighties, the reconstruction of academic institutions began. But this is a long process and will undoubtedly take many years to complete.

During the sixties and seventies the formerly highly regarded academic institutions in Argentina, Brazil and Chile were almost completely dismantled and their independent activities severely curtailed, especially in the social sciences. Venezuela, Costa Rica and, above all, Mexico, became the new centers of Latin American social science. Besides well known national institutions, several international organizations were decisive in maintaining the level and quality of research and training in the social sciences in the region. Particularly relevant here has been the role of the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO), an intergovernmental organization, with branches in several countries. Since the late sixties the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO), an independent organization grouping over one hundred academic research and training institutions in the social sciences, fostered comparative research across national boundaries. It also developed a support network for exiled and persecuted scholars and students. Both CLACSO and FLACSO have begun to carry out activities in the field of ethnicity and cultural identity. These issues, as mentioned above, have until recently remained more or less consistently the domain of professional anthropology.

Foreign interest in the social sciences in Latin America has always been great. Anthropology, in fact, was originally fostered by the involvement of researchers and institutions in the United States as well as, to a lesser extent, some other countries. Funding from U.S. foundations has also played a significant role in supporting research and training activities. For some, this has been a mixed blessing, because while financial and technical cooperation is always welcome in relatively poor countries, the danger has been that research agendas and theoretical orientations may have been determined or at least defined and conditioned by external interests. International cooperation in the social sciences is on the whole a fruitful and positive development.

Latin America has long been the focus of attention of academic institutions in other areas of the world. Several Latin American studies centers in the United States administer long-term programs of cooperation with counterparts in Latin America, involving research, training, exchange of students and scholars, documentation and dissemination. European centers have also been active for many years. Professional associations of "Latin Americanists" and "Americanists" meet regularly around the world. Ethnic relations, cultural identity, national integration and related issues now figure distinctively on their agendas. Still, in the early nineties the overall picture is complicated by the effects of the economic crisis (the debt burden, adjustment

policies, retrenchment of the state) that has affected the financial stability and prospects of academic research institutions, especially in the social sciences.

Research on Latin America's indigenous populations has a long and respected history. In time, it covers pre-historic settlements, pre-Columbian cultures and civilizations, colonial and nineteenth century history, and the contemporary period. Geographically, it includes the Andean and Mesoamerican peasant societies as well as the more isolated groups of agriculturalists, hunters and gatherers in the peripheral areas. More recently, researchers have followed Indian peoples in their migrations to the large metropolitan centers, the commercial plantations and into other countries (including the United States). Thematically, ethnographic descriptions were early standard fare. Attention had shifted to community studies by the nineteen forties. Emphasis here is placed on socio-economic structures and changes. More recently, the analysis of meanings, representations and ideologies, within the framework of cultural studies, has become fashionable. Due to policy concerns about development and modernization, anthropology in Latin America soon acquired a practical bent. Since the sixties the "social aspects" of development and the process of acculturation became both an academic and an applied concern. The tensions, contradictions and conflicts between indigenous communities and non-indigenous populations arising out of economic and political changes

prompted closer attention by social scientists to issues of administration of justice, legal pluralism, conflict resolution, the structural determinants of violence, and related topics. In a more applied vein, research on educational issues was related to curriculum development, bilingual education, socio-linguistics, teacher training and so on.

The public and private universities have traditionally been the centers of research and training on ethnic studies. When public universities were hard hit by repressive military policies in some countries in the sixties and seventies, alternative institutions, through external support, took over some of their functions. To be sure, "non-political" research fared better than training. Still, a minimum level of academic activity continued, and other countries as well as international institutions provided a helping hand. I have already mentioned the role of FLACSO and CLACSO.

Despite much research on the indigenous peoples of Latin America, a clearly defined academic field of "ethnic studies" has not yet emerged. In recent years, the organizations of indigenous peoples have voiced their dissatisfaction with the traditional anthropological approaches, and here and there efforts have been made to train indigenous social scientists and to develop an "indigenous" social science. For example, in Mexico a special program for the training of indigenous "ethnolinguists" has been quite successful, though it had to be interrupted for lack of

funds. At a UN-sponsored seminar some years ago, the idea of an "indigenous university" in Latin America was floated, but nothing came of it.

Increasingly, applied research on rural development, carried out by international aid and financial agencies, now includes studies on the cultural consequences of development projects, besides the now more general assessments of their environmental impact. The World Bank commissioned a paper some years ago on economic development and tribal peoples, and now continues to take these issues into account in developing its programs. Several international organizations now have professionals on their staff who look into the cultural issues related to development financing. Attention has also been focussed in recent years on migration flows from rural to urban areas. Earlier studies spoke of the "peasantization" of cities. More recently, we learn about changing identities in the urban environment and the emergence of new cultural identities. Similarly, the U.S.-Mexican border area, which is the only part in the world where the First World and the Third World share a common frontier, is a hothouse of new transnational identities and cultural hybridization, which has attracted the attention of numerous researchers in the field of anthropology and cultural studies.

Not only indigenous populations are a fertile ground for research. Peoples of African origin have certainly not received the same scholarly attention as the Indians. An early exception

to this were the cultural studies of black populations in Cuba
1 and in Brazil. Recently, interest in race relations between
blacks and dominant whites and mestizos re-emerged in several
2 countries. The whole field of "black studies" has received a new
impetus in Brazil, among other countries, after many decades
3 during which the academic institutions had more or less
uncritically accepted the official myth of "racial democracy" in
4 that country. Research on different immigrant ethnic groups is
routinely undertaken by scholars, but these are not generally
5 considered as focal points for the study of cultural identity or
ethnic conflicts in Latin America. (There are exceptions: anti-
6 Chinese sentiment, Jewish identity and antisemitism in some
countries).

7 The massive migrations from the region to the United States
in recent years have helped change the ethnic and cultural
8 panorama in that country too. Latino (and Caribbean) cultures
have expanded rapidly, and issues of cultural identity are of
9 some import in the fields of education, linguistic policy, the
mass media, entertainment, administration of justice, legal
10 issues, political representation and the economics of marketing.
Anthropologists have detected the emergence of new transnational
11 communities, linking members of distinct ethnic groups, villages
and extended families across the international borders. Thus, for
12 example, several groups of Kanjobal Indian refugees from
Guatemala are settled in various parts of the United States, and
13 they maintain links to their original communities. Likewise,
Mixtec workers from Mexico migrate back and forth between

California and Oaxaca, supported by extensive family and village
1 networks. A number of villages and regions in Latin America
survive economically through regular remittances from their
2 kinfolk abroad. These networks contribute to rapid social and
economic change at the local level (the "Americanization" of
3 consumer culture, for example), at the same time that they
disseminate Latino cultural patterns in the United States.

4 Inquiries into the development of national identity and
nationalism have occupied the attention of historians, social
5 psychologists, literary critics, anthropologists and
philosophers, who have contributed their share of essays and
6 theories on the formation of different national identities, the
"essence" of what is specifically unique to this or that national
7 being, or what is common in an emergent Latin American or Ibero-
American identity. Art, music and literature have been analyzed
8 in this sense from various perspectives. Recently, the field of
"popular culture" is receiving some attention, including the
9 images and models transmitted by the mass media, emerging youth
cultures in urban areas, gender issues and women's identity
10 movements (often linked to class and political mobilization).

11 Some relevant research centers: (Including some areas of
expertise or specialization)

12 International Institutions:

13 FLACSO-Chile (cultural studies in Chile and Southern Cone)

FLACSO-Costa Rica (changing urban cultures and regional

integration in Central America)

1 FLACSO-Ecuador (emerging indigenous identities in Andean
countries)

2 FLACSO-México (national identity and cultural change in Latin
America)

3 Instituto Indigenista Interamericano (Mexico) (Indian cultures of
Latin America)

4 Universidad Centroamericana (Central America) (Indian cultural
changes in Central America)

5

Argentina

6 Centro de Estudios Avanzados, Universidad de Buenos Aires
(Indigenous peoples of Argentina)

7 CEDES-Buenos Aires (Ethnic, gender and cultural identities in
Argentina)

8

Brazil

9 CEBRAP (National and regional identities in Brazil)

10 Universidade de Sao Paulo (Indian and other social movements;
regional identities in Brazil)

Universidade de Brasilia (Indian peoples of Brazil)

11 Universidade de Campinas (Indian movements and other social
movements in Brazil)

12 Universidade de Salvador de Bahia (Afro-Brazilian culture)

Universidade de Recife (Afro-Brazilian culture)

13 IUPERJ (Instituto Universitario de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro)
(Race relations in Brazil)

14

15

1 Costa Rica

Universidad de Costa Rica (Indian cultures of Costa Rica)

2

Guatemala

3 IRIPAZ (Guatemala) (Ethnic conflict in Central America)

4 Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala (Guatemalan native
cultures)

5 Mexico

Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM (indigenous
6 movements)

7 Instituto de Investigaciones Antropologicas, UNAM (indigenous
communities)

8 Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia (Mexico)
(indigenous cultures in Mexico)

9 Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana (indigenous identities,
migration patterns)

10 CIESAS-Mexico (indigenous identities and cultural changes)
CIESAS del Golfo (Indian cultures)

11 CIESAS Sureste (Changing cultural identities, refugees, border
problems)

12 El Colegio de Mexico (ethnic identities and conflicts)

El Colegio de Michoacan (regional cultural changes)

13 El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (culture in the border areas)

Instituto Nacional Indigenista (Mexico) (Indian communities of

14

15

Mexico)

1

Nicaragua

2 CIDCA-Managua (Indian cultures and ethnic movements in the
Atlantic Coast)

3

Paraguay

4 Centro de Estudios Antropologicos, Universidad Catolica, Asuncion
(Indian cultures and identities in Paraguay)

5 Centro de Estudios Sociologicos, Asuncion (Indian migratory
movements in Paraguay)

6

Peru

7 Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (Indian cultures in Peru)
Universidad Católica de Lima (Cultural change among Indians in
8 Peru)

9 Venezuela

Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Cientificas, Caracas
10 (Indigenous cultures in Venezuela)

11

12

13

14

15