of indigenous peoples against creoles locked in a tightly choreographed dance where the costumes change but the steps remain the same, as all dance to the loud music of the brass band. But Dunkerley warns against the seductiveness of such a simplified view since the ethnic politics of Bolivia defies such a vision. Ethnic identity in Bolivia has never been clear-cut and indigenous people have long had a profoundly ambivalent relationship with the mestizo-creole state, including significant moments of supporting and maintaining it as well as those of undermining it. This rather messier view of historical momentum has the dancers less visible, the costumes damp with each other's sweat, and when the cold light of an Andean dawn arrives everyone is drunk on the floor, arms and legs entwined in an uncomfortable but intimate embrace; and it is by no means clear that there were ever only two groups dancing. As in all good Bolivian fiestas the band plays on, if not always in tune, and the bleary-eyed participants reach for another beer to cure their hangover of historic proportions and carry on dancing.

*University of Essex* ANDREW CANESSA

*J. Lat. Amer. Stud.* **41** (2009). doi:10.1017/S0022216X09005781

A. Kim Clark and Marc Becker, *Highland Indians and the State in Modern Ecuador* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007), pp. x + 348, $39.95, hb.

Ecuador's indigenous peoples' movement attracted international media and scholarly attention in the 1980s as massive demonstrations forced Ecuador's fragile state and wobbly democratic regime to cede control over public education. Massive uprisings in the 1990s convinced the state to collectively title more than one million hectares of indigenous community land and to reverse economic policies unacceptable to peasant farmers. In the 1990s the movement was among the first to form a viable political party (Pachakutik), which in 2002 was the first such party to enter a presidential administration, albeit as a junior partner and for less than a year. This new, interdisciplinary, edited volume provides an in-depth account of the historical development of indigenous-state relations from the early nineteenth to the early twenty-first centuries, as well as a comprehensive appraisal of contemporary issues in indigenous-state politics. Taken together the chapters belie the common impression that Ecuador's indigenous peoples achieved sustained attention from the state only recently; on the contrary, indigenous peoples have engaged the state continuously since the independence era. The collection features 14 chapters by scholars who primarily employ historical, anthropological, and political science approaches. It also includes an indispensable bibliographic essay by Becker.

The historical chapters feature analyses of the development of citizenship rights in republican laws and constitutions, the role of gender ideologies in constructing indigenous identities and social status, the development of liberalism and indigenismo as dominant state-formation ideologies, as well as the crucial relationship among indigenous communities, landlords, agrarian policy, and labour conditions in rural areas. Aleezé Sattar investigates how indigenous communities used their distinct legal status as tribute-paying Indians to pursue economic interests and protect themselves from abusive local elites. Derek Williams probes changes in the role of indigenous communities as a captive labour force within the context of changing agrarian power relations. Erin O'Connor examines how gendered images of the indigenous were used to subjugate indigenous men as 'helpless children' or 'undeserving patriarchs'. Michiel Baud examines changes in the rhetoric of

liberalism following the 1895 Liberal Revolution, arguing that the indigenous selectively appropriated this discourse to defend land rights and promote their political agenda. Kim Clark shows how indigenous strategies for interacting with the state changed in the early twentieth century as Indians learned to appropriate aspects of state discourse to pursue their interests. And Marc Becker illuminates a period of remarkable indigenous political activity surrounding the 1944–45 Constituent Assembly, which resonates with more successful indigenous constitutional reform efforts in 1998, as well as with the most recent populist constitutional reform, in which indigenous organisations played a minor role.

William Waters examines the era of agrarian reform in the 1960s and 1970s. Significant transformations in the rural economy subsequently had profound consequences for the emergence of contemporary indigenous rights organisations. Building on Waters' interpretation of the agrarian reform era, Amalia Pallares provides a concise analysis of the rise of contemporary ethno-nationalist movements in the 1980s and 1990s and their successful insertion into state policy-making processes. Brian Selmeski contributes an exploration of the relationship between Ecuador's progressive military and indigenous conscripts and explains the unusually cooperative nature of military-indigenous relations in Ecuador compared with other Latin American countries. Military service is a key institution for the production of indigenous citizens and the construction of the Ecuadorian state. Whereas all of the preceding chapters focus on highland indigenous-state relations, Juliet Erazo illuminates the Amazonian experience, emphasising the role of religious missions in providing basic services in the absence of a secular state presence. She also examines how differences in economic production led to different styles of indigenous organisation.

Three chapters provide comparisons with other Latin American cases. Shannan Mattiace examines the implications of the emergence of indigenismo in distinct contexts in Ecuador (Liberal revolution) and Mexico (sociopolitical revolution). Nevertheless, in both countries in the late twentieth century indigenous movements made a marked shift from classist-peasant modes of discourse and organisation toward more ethno-autonomist claims in the context of an indigenous-led backlash against neo-liberalism. José Antonio Lucero compares Ecuadorian with Bolivian indigenous organisations, emphasising distinct contestatory styles and organisational structures. Picking up on themes introduced by Erazo, Lucero partly attributes these distinctions to the sequencing of Amazonian versus highland indigenous mobilisation. He teams with Maria Elena García to rebut misperceptions of the Peruvian indigenous movement that confuse localised organising and a focus on uncommon themes with the 'absence' or 'failure' of a Peruvian movement. In many ways distinct from and comparable to Ecuador's indigenous movements, Peru's have succeeded on their own terms – for example, participating in the movement that ousted President Fujimori in 2000 and electing four indigenous congresswomen in 2006.

Equally as interesting and significant as the Ecuadorian indigenous movement's rise and challenge to the Ecuadorian state is the rapid decline since 2002 of its principal organisations – the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) and the Pachakutik Plurinational United Movement. This topic does not receive sufficient attention here or elsewhere in the literature. How did President Gutiérrez cripple the movement and party that brought him to power? How did President Correa so quickly usurp the leadership of the indigenous and popular

movements? Why has Ecuador's movement not produced leaders with national cross-ethnic and cross-class appeal as occurred in Bolivia? As the first 'highly successful' indigenous movement to suffer such a serious loss in influence, these questions deserve more systematic examination.

Highland Indians and the State in Modern Ecuador is an outstanding contribution to the interdisciplinary literature on Latin American indigenous movements. It is the most comprehensive and authoritative text available on the historical development and contemporary implications of Ecuador's fascinating indigenous social movement and the challenges it presents to a fragmented state and volatile democratic regime. It constitutes an excellent starting place for scholars interested in politics and development in Ecuador.

*University of Connecticut* DONNA LEE VAN COTT

*The editors and staff of the Journal have been deeply saddened to learn of the death of Professor van Cott since this review was submitted for publication.*

*J. Lat. Amer. Stud.* **41** (2009). doi:10.1017/S0022216X09005793

Lisa Hilbink, *Judges beyond Politics in Democracy and Dictatorship: Lessons from Chile* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. xvi + 299, £45.00; $80.00, hb.

Lisa Hilbink's book presents us with a puzzle. The 1973 coup that placed General Pinochet in power left the judiciary intact: the executive was usurped, Congress was suspended; but the judges, appointed by prior democratic presidents of left, right and centre persuasions, remained in place. And yet, Lisa Hilbink writes, 'Chile's judges cooperated fully with the authoritarian regime' (p. 5). They colluded more fully than their counterparts in neighbouring dictatorships, and they did so in face of a mounting international movement to end the Pinochet regime's human rights violations. What's more, this illiberal judicial performance outlasted the military regime. Even after the 1990 transition to a multi-party democracy – and even as the Hungarian and South African courts forged strong constitutional cultures in the wake of authoritarianism – the Chilean judiciary remained quietly conservative, loath to defend rights and to challenge the executive.

Hilbink's thoughtful, engaging study aims to uncover the roots of this illiberal tendency. After an introduction and framing chapter, each subsequent chapter explores a historical stage of the Chilean judiciary, from its colonial founding through to 2000, with greater attention given to the more recent years. Supported by interviews and archival work, Hilbink carefully constructs the theory that the Chilean judiciary's weak defence of constitutional rights – in dictatorship as in democracy – is best explained by institutional factors. The judiciary was designed in the nineteenth century to embody the ideal of a complete separation of law and politics, or 'judicial apoliticism'. The product, however, is a hierarchical structure and culture that systematically suppress expression of liberal qualities of mind in its judges, while classifying conservative values as apolitical. Their reproduction is ensured by a hierarchy that polices and penalises lower judges who fail to toe the Supreme Court line. In the end, attempts to seclude the judiciary from the political realm yielded an institution so insular that it failed to support liberal democratic politics.