Reterritorialisation of Schooling in the Ecuadorian Indigenous Context

Tuija Veintie[1]

Abstract

This paper explores how the forces of globalisation affect the organisation of education for the indigenous people in Latin America, and particularly in Ecuador. Globalisation from 'above' is explored through the heritage of colonisation and the imposition of Western schooling on the indigenous people. Globalisation from 'below' is examined through the transcultural networking of the indigenous organisations and their efforts to reform the state education for the indigenous people. When global schooling is reterritorialised - or reinterpreted and customised - in the local context, multidirectional flows of influences converge to create new hybrid forms of education, such as the Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE). It is argued that the new indigenous leaders' and educators' role in this hybridisation process is crucial. Furthermore, this process is affected by the historical relations of power between the 'West' and the 'indigenous.'

Introduction

Western schooling has expanded all over the world as part of the globalisation process. Many authors see the mainstream schools as locations of a world culture or a world system: spread from the same sources to begin with, and becoming even more similar over time with the international educational reforms that promote adopting common educational principles, policies, and practices (Meyer and Ramirez 2000; Lindblad and Popkewitz 2003; Masemann 2003; Pineau 2000:751; Schriewer 2005). Jürgen Schriewer (2005:317) claims that in educational policy and in the organisational structures and reform discourses the degree of global standardisation is extremely high compared to any other area of public policy. According to the arguments of world culture theory, there is a 'common model of schooling,' meaning that the school systems all over the world share some ideals (for example education as a universal human right), basic structures (for instance a centralized educational policy), forms of educational institution (such as schools with graded classes), contents (for example a core elementary curriculum) and instruction (incorporating whole-class lectures and recitation with seatwork) (Anderson-Levitt 2003:5). However, Kathryn Anderson-Levitt (2003:3) emphasises that both similarities and differences can be seen across countries depending on

the level of abstraction of the analysis. Whereas global educational discourses can endorse the fabrication of common model of schooling through parallel reforms, these reforms are often resisted locally in the educational ministries, communities and classrooms. This means that similar kind of reform or model can induce different kinds of local translations. In the end, there tends to be a big gap between the educational model and the actual practice in the schools. (Anderson-Levitt 2003:3, 16.) Furthermore, alternative models are often presented, for example, by homeschoolers, and by the different philosophical schools and indigenous minorities as being in opposition to the mainstream educational model (Masemann 2003:130).

In this paper I will explore the dialectics between the global and the local from a Latin American perspective, based on the literature on educational reforms in Latin America in general, and in particular, on the indigenous movement and the formal education for the indigenous people of Ecuador. I will start by examining the different approaches to the global-local relations. This will involve discussing how sometimes globalisation is understood predominantly as a homogenisation that originates in the hegemonic relations between the centre and periphery. Nevertheless, the relation between the global and local can also be interpreted as increasing intercultural connectedness and hybridisation, resulting in both homogenising and heterogenising effects. The next issue I will discuss is how globalisation imposes the Eurocentric ideologies of schooling on the indigenous people. Thereafter I will turn to globalisation as a transcultural networking between the different indigenous and the non-indigenous social movements and organisations, and comment on the development of Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) as an alternative to the colonising school in Ecuador. Finally, in the discussion, I will recapitulate the previous themes and discuss the IBE as a reterritorialisation of schooling in the Ecuadorian indigenous context.

What is Globalisation?

One of the most cited definitions of globalisation is the one by Anthony Giddens (1990:64), who claims it to be "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa." As the choice of the word 'intensification' suggests, the worldwide social relations have not emerged with the recent globalisation processes, they have just

become more intensive and extensive (Nederveen Pieterse 1994:164). In fact, the more recent intensifying of cross-cultural contact in the diverse fields of life has brought the international and transnational influences closer to the everyday experiences of a growing number of people around the globe (García Canclini 2005:xxxvii; Schriewer 2000:305). Globalisation can therefore be seen as a changing experience of time and space in the sense that the world seems to be 'shrinking,' as the modern telecommunication allows data to be transmitted globally at the speed of light, and long-distance travelling is habitual to many and not restricted merely to the elite (Harvey 1989:240; Inda and Rosaldo 2002:5-8). Thus Jonathan Inda and Renato Rosaldo (2002:9) summarize that: "globalisation can be seen as referring to those spatial-temporal processes, operating on a global scale, that rapidly cut across national boundaries, drawing more and more of the world into webs of interconnection, integrating and stretching cultures and communities across space and time, and compressing our spatial and temporal horizons. It points to a world in motion, to an interconnected world, to a shrinking world."

These webs of interconnection are being constantly reshaped, and at the same time they are always related to the continua of the historical processes in the distant, interconnected localities. Moreover, the pre-existing asymmetric power relations between the localities incur that some localities tend to carry more weight than others in terms of shaping "events occurring many miles away." Hence, globalisation is an uneven process, and "not everyone and everyplace participates equally in the circuits of interconnection that traverse the globe" (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:4). The long history of colonialism, for example, weighs heavily on the extent to which the colonisers and the colonised influence each other in this web of worldwide relations. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999:95-97) claims that globalisation is part of the new vocabulary for the incessant European imperialism. This view on globalisation holds the assumption that certain cultures dominate others and consequently impose their culture on the rest and as a result impose cultural homogenisation across the globe, and thereby eliminate cultural differences. Polly Toynbee (2000:19) sketches a vivid image of cultural globalisation as Americanisation, where North American cultural influences spread all over the world like a giant strawberry milkshake that covers the whole planet with a pink coating that tastes the same "from Samoa to Siberia to Somalia." The assumed hegemony of the United States is mainly related to the imposition of a "mass-mediated monoculture of consumption" (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:13), or to the unregulated free market for the press,

broadcasting, films, internet, music and tourism (Toynbee 2000:201-202), or science, technology and popular culture (Hannerz 2002:39).

The reading of globalisation as Americanisation or Europeanisation, ignores the multiplicity of centres. First of all, the cultural centres of the world do not necessarily coincide with the political and economic centres (Hannerz 2002:38). Secondly, there are influential regional centres, and many global cultural encounters take place between the countries of the 'peripheries' without the intervention of European or North American countries that are recognized as 'centres' in the 'West'. Compared to the cultural influences coming from Europe or the U.S., these regional centres can have a more substantial impact on the cultures of the countries of the region.[2] (Appadurai 2002:50; Hannerz 2002:39.) Thirdly there are also counter-currents that carry influences from the 'peripheries' towards the 'centres,' and these have heterogenising effects on the centres. As a result, the criss-crossing of the flows blurs the boundaries between centre and periphery, West and non-west, here and there. (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:21-22; Nederveen Pieterse 1994:169.) Furthermore, whenever foreign cultural forms and the ideologies and values embodied in them are introduced to a culture, they are not plainly absorbed, but interpreted and customized according to local conditions. Even the 'consuming subject' is an active constructor of meaning. Thus, the fact that Western commodities are found all over the world does not prove the world is altogether homogenised. (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:16-17; Toynbee 2002:208.)

The multidimensional relations between global and local cannot be explained simply with a centre-periphery model and an unequivocal hegemony. (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:25-26; Popkewitz 2000:7.) Inda and Rosaldo (2002:26) suggest that we should view the world as a complex "dislocated cultural space." Culture has traditionally been understood as the culture of a specific society or group, with a strong connection to a specific territory (Nederveen Pieterse 1994:176; Inda and Rosaldo 2002:11). With the intensified global interconnectedness and flows of cultural influences the connection between culture and a certain territory consequently becomes weaker, and cultures become 'dislocated.' At the same time, the cultural influences are reinterpreted and customized in other localities, and accordingly they become reterritorialised. Inda and Rosaldo introduce the term de/territorialisation to stress that they are not speaking of two different processes, but of a 'double movement' where cultural subjects and objects are simultaneously dislocated from a certain context and then relocated in new cultural settings. (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:12.)

If dislocation, mobility and interconnectedness of cultures are conceptualised in terms of hybridisation, the focus is shifted more towards the mixing of cultures and towards the in-between-spaces where the mixing occurs. Homi K. Bhabha claims that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in the "third space of enunciation." This means that cultures have never existed as clearly defined entities, instead every culture is basically a hybrid culture (Bhabha 1994:37; Huddart 2007:22). Nestor García Canclini (2005:xxv) sees hybridisation as "sociocultural processes in which discrete structures of practices, previously existing in separate form, are combined to generate new structures, objects, and practices." However García Canclini (2005:xxv) continues that the discrete structures have been formed in prior hybridisations and "cannot be considered pure points of origin." Moreover, some scholars argue that although hybridisation can be understood as natural development of cultures, it is not to be forgotten that this development takes place in an unequal world of asymmetric relations. In fact many hybrid forms have emerged as a result from violent clashes and oppression. (Mabardi 2000:12; Nederveen Pieterse 1994:170.)

Stuart Hall (1991:33) proposes two forms of globalisation that are struggling together: "an older, corporate, enclosed, increasingly defensive one which has to go back to nationalism and national cultural identity in a highly defensive way, and to try to build barriers around it before it is eroded. And then this other form of the global post-modern which is trying to live with, and at the same moment, overcome, sublate, get hold of, and incorporate difference." Richard Falk (1999; 1991) is credited for introducing the analysis of 'globalisation from above' and 'globalisation from below.' Globalisation from above refers to an autocratic top-down process of imposition, that is driven by powerful states, corporations and international agencies. Globalisation from above is contested by globalisation from below through transnational movements, coalitions, people at the grassroots, who interact and join forces to proclaim their views. (Brysk 2000:12; Brecher et al. 2000.) The following two sections consider the division to globalisation as being from above (as an imposition of the Eurocentric ideologies of schooling) and from below (as a transcultural networking of the indigenous organisations).

Imposition of Eurocentric Ideologies of Schooling in Latin America

Spanish colonisation is an overarching factor for all of Spanish-speaking Latin America. The native Latin Americans already had, of course, intercultural relations before the colonisers arrived, but the encounter with the European conquerors has certainly been a most violent and far-reaching change in the history of the whole continent. Even though each Latin American state has its own particularity, they share many features that derive from their common colonial history. Latin American states have typically had strong state-centred policies, but weak nation-state sovereignty ever since their formation. Furthermore the Latin-American states can be characterised by their peripheral position in the global economy, and by their political and economic dependence on Europe and the United States (Arnove et al. 2003:314; Freeland 1996:168; Popkewitz 2000:13; Valtonen 2001:190-191, 217-218). Besides the external pressures, the Latin American states have experienced pressure from within due to their social and ethnic fragmentation. When the Latin American states became independent in the early 19th century, the indigenous peoples continued to be marginalised. The local elites were mainly comprised of the *mestizo* (mixed European and indigenous) population that largely adopted Eurocentric views and power structures. The Latin American political economy has typically favoured the maintenance of a hierarchical distribution of power, with the exclusion of the subordinate groups. (Arnove et al. 2003:314; Freeland 1996:168; Quijano 2000:229.)

The marginalisation of the indigenous peoples has meant that indigenous identities, cultures and languages have been systematically undervalued by the dominant group. In the colonial era, the Spanish language and Spanish ways were imposed on the indigenous people in the name of the empire. The subsequent independence from Spain initiated the process of nation-building. The concept of nationhood and national identity included an aspiration towards an ideal of a unifying language, namely Spanish, and the indigenous languages were therefore subverted. (Freeland 1996:169; Langer 2003.) Indigenous land rights have also been ignored, and in many places, the native lands have been exploited and eroded first by the *caucho* (rubber) producers and later by the multinational oil companies and logging companies (Langer 2003; Barham and Coomes 1994). Thus, the colonisation of the indigenous peoples and their territories did not come to an end with independence from Spain. The reason is that the coloniser can be internal, such as the Spanish-speaking *mestizo* elite, or external, like the

multinationals[3]. Education has been one of the focal arenas of colonisation. Pablo Pineau (2000:750) refers to Adriana Puiggrós (1996), claiming that Latin American pedagogy first emerged when the Spanish conquistadors upon their arrival to the 'new world' exercised a ritualised reading of the *requerimiento* (requisition). This document declared that the Pope, as a representative of God, had authorised the Spanish crown to occupy the land, and that resisting this order would lead to a war and to enslaving the natives. "According to Puiggrós, the pedagogical relationship between Spanish and native people was one of domination, so the condition that they had to fulfil to keep some elementary rights was to unconditionally accept the dominant culture, language and thinking" (Pineau 2000:750).

Colonial schooling has served to marginalise colonised people by using two different techniques: assimilation and segregation. The assimilation technique is based on the imposition of the coloniser's culture, language, knowledge, etc. in order to motivate the colonised to deny their indigenous identities and to become more similar to the coloniser. The most stark examples of assimilating through schooling were the boarding schools where children were transferred to in order to separate them from their parents and the influences of the indigenous culture. The use of this kind of assimilation techniques is not something of the remote past only, since for example in Ecuador, many people among the indigenous working population of today have experienced boarding schools and them prohibiting the use of their native language at school or on the streets. The segregation technique relies on mechanisms that restrain those who are colonised from participating or from having access to certain spheres of society, thereby assuring that peripheral situation of the colonised is maintained. For example, if the schooling of the colonised does not offer instruction of the dominant language or other knowledge or skills necessary in the dominant society, then this education reproduces the colonised as subjugated citizens. (See Masemann 2003:121-122; Tuhiwai Smith 1999:64.) In the Andean countries, the indigenous social movements initiated the first projects of indigenous education in the indigenous languages in the 1930s with an intention to find alternatives to the Westernising model of formal schooling (Aikman 2003:66; Aikman 1996:155). However, the first wide-ranging education programme of the indigenous population in Latin America was initiated by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), a North American organisation that functioned in several Latin American countries starting in the 1940s and 1950s. The SIL combined missionary work with linguistic research, and promoted the substitution of the 'unhealthy' aspects of the indigenous cultures with Christian values. (Freeland 1996:172.)

A general optimism of the dominant society prevailed in the mainstream discourses around the social reforms after World War II. The non-industrialised nations were presumed to be easily put on the 'road to development.' As part of this development, formal education was considered to be an essential part of lessening the inequality among and within nations. In the 1950s and 1960s, the human capital theory put education at the centre of optimistic vision: education was seen as being an investment opportunity, and the availability of education was expected to produce social benefits, increasing the total amount of wealth and improving its distribution. (Farrell 2003:146-147.) Concerning Latin America, the quality of education, especially higher education, was emphasized in the educational policies since the 1950s. However, no special attention was paid to the equality of educational opportunities. By the 1970s, the conceptions of development and education had changed to one that promoted democratizing and equalizing opportunities for the majority of citizens. However, the 1980s debt crisis threw Latin America into an economic downturn, which also inflicted significant decreases in the public expenditures in education. Due to this lack of funding, the educational reforms that were designed in the 1970s and 1980s were regularly not implemented. The neoliberal policies that were adopted after the debt crisis increased poverty, and further widened the gap between the rich and poor sectors. (Arnove et al. 2003:323-326.)

The significant differences in the equality of educational opportunities and outcomes in modern-day Latin America are related to social class, ethnicity, gender and place of residence. The least privileged people are found where these factors intersect: the poor indigenous women living in rural areas. Income inequality is striking in Latin America, and climbing up the socioeconomic ladder is difficult. Moreover, the number of grade repeaters and drop-outs is extremely high in the rural primary schools, as well as in the inferior urban schools. (Arnove et al 2003:315-317) Robert Arnove et al. (2003:317) observe that "rural schools in Latin America, typically, are dilapidated and overcrowded, and they lack educational materials. Rural teachers are as a rule the least qualified, the most overburdened in terms of student-teacher ratios, and the most poorly paid." When educational materials are indeed available, as a rule they are not socially and culturally relevant for the rural children or indigenous population. Furthermore, for indigenous children, the language of instruction is often not their indigenous mother tongue, but Spanish (or Portuguese in Brazil). (Arnove et al. 2003:317-320.)

The elites of colonised countries have traditionally been educated in the elite schools of the colonised country or in the mother country. Either way, the elites are formed in a way that connects them more to the coloniser than to the peripheral populations of their own country. (Masemann 2003:122.) Thus multiple forms of structural inequality positions the youth of the poor, the lower social classes and the indigenous, at a disadvantage in the competition for secondary and higher education and the labour market, in comparison with the urban elite and upper middle class youth. There are also certainly indigenous people who do well in the national education system, and become highly educated in urban areas. These people are the new indigenous elite, who from some indigenous people's perspective, have been seduced by the 'Western ways' and have become estranged from the indigenous values or even have become betrayers of their own people (Fanon 2004:9-13; Grande 2008:234; Tuhiwai Smith 1999:70-72, 99). Hence, the educational system is seen as a form of mental colonisation: the colonisers' ideologies eventually become adopted by the colonised themselves.

Nonetheless, indigenous peoples are not merely passive victims of colonisation and the imposition of foreign rules. Over the years under domination, the indigenous peoples have sought and found different strategies to fight for or to negotiate for their positions and identities (Freeland 1996:169). The intensification of worldwide relations has brought new arenas and new ways for this negotiation, and the indigenous movements are active players in the global webs of interconnection.

Transcultural Networking for Intercultural Bilingual Education

Social movements tend to contribute to educational reforms. This is because educational policies and practices often have their place on the agenda of general social movements, and sometimes educational institutions become sites of social movement activity. In some social movements, the educational practices form the basis of the whole movement as, for example, in '*educación popular*' (popular education), or in critical pedagogy. The different social movements have different impacts on educational policies. (Morrow and Torres 2003:103-105.) In the following I will focus on the Latin American indigenous movement, with particular emphasis on Ecuador. In Latin America, the indigenous organisations started to form in the 1970s. The number of small-scale organisations increased at the local level during

the 1980s and 1990s, and the national level organisations also emerged step-by-step. At this time, identity politics, the attempts to recover indigenous peoples' dignity, brought the celebration of cultural difference, ethnic identity and ethnic pride into a central position in many indigenous organisations starting in the 1980s. This ethnic revival has also had its drawbacks in terms of creating tension and dissension among the indigenous peoples. This tension has increased in part due to some ethnic groups trying to define themselves as being superior to others, and some have been oppressed by others before. The complexity of this issue is exacerbated by the diversity of the indigenous peoples' languages, cultures and living environments, which means that different indigenous groups may have very diverse concerns even if they live in the same country. These differences pose great challenges for the effective organising of the indigenous peoples at the regional and national levels. (Langer 2003:xvii.)

At the same time the increasing global interconnectedness through telecommunications, regular contacts with foreign citizens, the ease of travelling and so forth, has enabled indigenous organisations to establish contacts with national and international nongovernmental organisations. The Latin American states have not necessarily responded to the concerns of their indigenous populations, such as addressing the question of the Amazonian indigenous peoples' land rights, and the multinational oil companies appropriating and polluting the lands. Meanwhile a growing number of international NGOs have been interested in indigenous issues, human rights and environmental questions, and have given their support to indigenous organisations. (Brysk 2000:10; Mato 2000:350; Langer 2003:xiv.) In 1992, the indigenous counteractions to the Columbus Quincentenary celebrations and the indigenous participation in the Rio Summit in the same year were important milestones for the indigenous movements. Both were big media happenings that provided the indigenous people a forum to reach wide international audiences for their cause. That success was preceded by several years of careful preparation and working, both to join forces within the fragmented field of indigenous organisations, and to make connections with and find funds from the international NGOs. (Brysk 2000:102; Langer 2003:xv-xvi.)

The indigenous population of Ecuador is very diverse[4], and is organised in multiple, overlapping organisations based on ethnic, regional, linguistic or on other grounds (Brysk 2000:38; Langer 2003). Despite this fragmentation, many of the organisations form part of one of the three regional federations, of the Amazonian CONFENIAE (Confederación de las Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonia Ecuatoriana), of the Highlands area's

ECUARUNARI (Confederación de los Pueblos de Nacionalidad Kichua del Ecuador) or of the coastal area's CONAICE (Confederación de Nacionalidades y pueblos Indígenas de la Costa del Ecuador), which since 1986 have been allied as the national federation, CONAIE (Confederación De Las Nacionalidades Indigenas Del Ecuador). (CONAIE 2007.)

Today CONAIE is the leading force for indigenous movement at the national level, and its political wing, Pachakutik, has representation in the Ecuadorian government. The Ecuadorian Indigenous movement is considered to be one of the strongest in Latin America, and its strength is at least partly related to the collaboration between the different groups at the local, regional, national and transnational levels (Brysk 2000:73; Langer 2003:xvii). The most influential transnational regional organisation is a coalition between nine organisations from the nine Amazonian countries, COICA, with CONFENIAE as the representative of Ecuadorian Amazonia (COICA 2008). Nonetheless, transnational *ethnic* movements have not flourished, even though many indigenous ethnic and linguistic groups span across different states, such as Shiwiar, Secoya or Shuar-Huambisa who inhabit Ecuador and Peru. Langer (2003) argues that this stems from the states success in conditioning people to define themselves as being citizens of the nation state instead of emphasising their ethnic bonds. (Langer 2003:xvii.) Other regional confederations link indigenous organisations throughout all of Latin America (e.g. Fondo Indígena). Furthermore, the indigenous organisations from throughout the world are connected by groups such as The World Council of Indigenous Peoples, the International Alliance of the Indigenous-Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forest, and the Indigenous Initiative for Peace. Furthermore, the pan-indigenous movement blossomed during the aforementioned anti-quincentenary campaign of 1992 (Brysk 2000:97, 102).

A central theme for the indigenous movement to promote indigenous identities has been to institute educational reform and to fight the assimilating effects of colonial schooling (Aikman 1996; Brysk 2000). The indigenous movement in Ecuador has not pursued an exclusive indigenous model for education, but a model of intercultural bilingual education (IBE) that stresses both maintaining the uniqueness of the indigenous people and the importance of their relations with the dominant society (Useche Rodríguez 2003:101-102). CONAIE declares that one of the main objectives of the organisation is the struggle for the IBE as the model for indigenous people's 'proper education' (CONAIE 2007). In Ecuador the IBE and its administrative body, the DINEIB (Dirección Nacional de Educación Intercultural

Bilingüe del Ecuador), achieved a formal status as the national educational system for the indigenous population in 1988, and were ratified again in the latest constitution in 2008 (art. 57 and art. 347). The DINEIB functions as part of the Ecuadorian Ministry for Education, but it is staffed and controlled by the indigenous movement. In the subordination of the national administration body, there are three regional administrative units: the Amazonia, Highlands and Coast. These are divided into 17 provincial administrative units (for example, in Amazonia: Sucumbios, Napo, Orellana, Pastaza, Morona Santiago and Zamora Chinchipe). In addition, the organisation also includes six administrative units that are organised according to the indigenous ethnic groups (such as the Achuar, Huaorani and Siona-Secoy-Cofán organisations in Amazonia). (DINEIB 2008.) Alison Brysk (2000:258) calls the DINEIB a "harbinger of democratic participation and decentralization" owing to the local educational advisory councils that consist of parent and community representatives, and due to the provincial directors being elected by local members. The DINEIB collaborates at the regional and provincial levels in the production of the curriculum documents and educational materials for the institutions under its jurisdiction. At present the country has over 2000 IBE elementary schools and five IBE teacher education institutes. Jane Freeland (1996:169) claims that education is one of the main arenas of indigenous cultural defence today, and Brysk (2000:258) depicts the IBE as a central achievement of the indigenous movement in Ecuador.

Evidently there are many reasons behind the rise of the IBE and the overall improvement in the indigenous people's rights. Jean Jackson and Kay Warren (2005:552-553) present three hypotheses about the domestic reasons behind the Latin American social reforms considering indigenous people: 1) the state is signalling its citizens that it attends to their interests; 2) the state cooperates with certain indigenous groups to reject more radical ones; 3) the state is forced to negotiate by a strengthened indigenous movement. At the same time, the indigenous groups' international networking, and actions taken by international organisations, have all put external pressure on governments to take cognisance of the indigenous demands (Langer 2003:xix). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) was a path breaker in 1957, when it adopted the Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention, the first international convention that addressed the social problems and the rights of the indigenous and tribal people. Later, the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations was established in 1982. Then in 1990, the World Declaration on Education for All addressed indigenous peoples along with other vulnerable groups. The UN also took special notice of indigenous peoples by declaring 1993 Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples, followed by the Decade of Indigenous Peoples. The

UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues was subsequently formed in 2000. The most recent international declarations related to indigenous peoples are the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007.

Apart from putting pressure on governments, the international allies provide indispensable financial support to indigenous causes. Brysk (2000:258) argues that DINEIB is "chronically underfunded," but European aid programmes provide significant support. The Danish NGO, Ibis Dinamarca, and the German cooperation agency (GTZ) among others, have provided remarkable aid for the IBE in Ecuador. (Brysk 2000:121-122.) In addition Finland is currently funding a significant IBE project in Amazonia (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2008). The different projects are funded by many other European states as well as by the EU, UNDP, the Inter-American Development Bank and other donors. (Brysk 2000:123.) International collaboration is necessary for the IBE to maintain financial support. However, this support is not unconditional. Foreign governments, NGOs and other agents, all have their own education and economic agendas, and they pose their rules and restrictions by which the disbursements are directed to specific purposes (Arnove 2003:2; Mato 2000:356). According to Arnove (2003:2), in order to have access to the necessary funds, the education policymakers often have no other choice than to implement the reforms suggested by the major international donors. These development partnerships have not been studied as to the specific case of the collaboration related to the IBE in Latin America, but presumably there are some parallels with other relationships of the same kind. For instance, Tiina Kontinen (2007:172-173) analysed the actual interaction between the representatives of the Tanzanian and Finnish NGOs in the negotiations over development collaboration, and noticed that the Tanzanian representatives assumed the role of important decision makers, but the final decision was in the hands of the Finnish representatives. To some extent, within this interaction, the Finnish were constructed as the 'knowledgeable donor' and the Tanzanian as the 'ignorant recipient.'

International relations, efficient networking and fund-raising requires specific competences, skills and characters from the indigenous peoples. In order to be heard by potential allies and sponsors, the indigenous people need to 'speak the right words' and to deliver their message using the right tools and presenting it in the right kind of package[5]. The international arenas (media, meetings, governing bodies) may turn out to be profitable when one is prepared to use the international agent's rhetoric and vocabulary, and to speak in terms of global concerns,

biodiversity, and quality education etc. Towards this end, performing the ethnicity or indigenousness forms part of the package. The claims presented by the indigenous peoples who appear as indigenous in front of their potential international allies (e.g. dressed in traditional costumes) may attract more attention than the ones presented by indigenous people who do not perform their cultural distinctiveness in such ways for the international public. (Mato 2000:345-354.)

Often the indigenous leaders of today are "young, Western-educated cultural brokers" who fit the requirements of international interconnectedness better than the traditional community leaders (Brysk 2000; 39, 274). While speaking in international or national arenas on behalf of indigenous peoples, the indigenous political leaders perform their indigenousness and build up new representations of the indigenous identities. In a similar way, the transnational indigenous organisations and coalitions, when representing multiethnic groups, shape the representations of collective identities such as 'Amazonian indigenous,' 'Latin American indigenous' or 'pan-indigenous' people (Brysk 2000:17, 35; Mato 2000:354). The 'unity in diversity,' as the CONAIE slogan goes, gives strength and leverage to this movement. The drawback is that diversity can also be lost in the unity if 'indigenous people' as an all-embracing epithet comes to replace other more subtle identifications. The Ecuadorian indigenous leader Nina Pacari (Interview by Langer and Muñoz 2003:204) has discussed this issue: "In the indigenous movement there is no real uniformity. Among the indigenous peoples of Ecuador there exist various nationalities. That is undeniable. That is why we see ourselves as indigenous. We believe that we have an identity. But I believe that we should not keep on saying that we are 'indigenous peoples' without overcoming the homogenizing reductionism and develop ourselves as much as we can as the collective identities that we have as the Shuar, Chachi, or Quechua people."

As for the IBE in Ecuador, the particularity of the different indigenous groups is taken into consideration. The regional administration of the IBE in the Amazon region has been active in customising the national model for the IBE and for developing the MEIBA (Modelo de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe de la Amazonia) as a regional model to better meet the needs of the Amazonian indigenous peoples. Educational materials are also produced for the different language groups at the primary school levels. However, the production of culturally pertinent educational materials for each of the indigenous peoples, in their native languages, demands hard work.

Concluding Remarks

In several Latin American countries the IBE has been developed as an alternative to the Western-based formal schooling. The IBE in Ecuador is today a national level schooling system, and it resembles the global 'common model of schooling' in many respects. At the same time, it is also a very specific kind of a model, a reinterpretation of schooling, customised by indigenous peoples, and reterritorialised in the Ecuadorian indigenous context. But the question remains, who are the actual people in charge of the reterritorialisation, and what is the indigenous context? The Ecuadorian indigenous peoples constitute a multitude that is far from being homogeneous. In fact a standardised model of the IBE for all the indigenous peoples of Ecuador raises doubt concerning the cultural pertinence of the model for the different indigenous peoples. However, as the IBE is a reterritorialisation of schooling in the Ecuadorian indigenous context, likewise the curricula and directions produced by the IBE national administration are again reterritorialised by the regional and provincial administration, as well as by the administration that is based ethnicity. The final reterritorialisation then takes place at the local level of the particular communities, schools and classrooms.

The reterritorialising process is not just a top-down cascading of ideas (from global to national to provincial and so forth.), but involves multidirectional flows of influences. The indigenous organisations and the IBE are influenced by the global discourses owing to the economic dependence on international agencies. Nevertheless, the indigenous organisations, both national and regional, have also influenced the global through their connections with their international allies, namely the NGOs and foreign governments. In a similar way, the national level influences and is influenced by the local, provincial, regional and ethnicity based, as the educational ideas are dislocated from their specific ethnic- or territory-based locations to be reterritorialised in the regional or the national IBE curricula. Here de/territorialisation (Inda and Rosaldo 2002:12) becomes a useful concept to describe the double movement of the simultaneous dislocations and relocations that take place between the different levels.

The negotiations on the educational ideals and practices occurs in the in-between spaces, where different flows of influence converge and become mixed together to form new hybrid

formations. If we simplify the picture, we could say that the question is about the globalised Western-based education that meets the Ecuadorian local indigenous education, creating something new, that is neither Western nor indigenous education, but a hybridisation. Nevertheless, this hybridisation is not a straightforward process between two entities ('western' and 'indigenous'), but a complex of many simultaneous processes occurring in different places. Both the 'western' as well as the 'indigenous' are interpreted in multiple ways during these processes. Especially crucial are the interpretations of the indigenous. What or who represents indigenousness? Are the present-day young and educated indigenous leaders, educators and the IBE policy makers the appropriate representatives of indigenous culture and the connoisseurs of indigenous knowledge? Actually they can be viewed as a threat: as a somewhat suspicious new indigenous elite that has grown away from the tradition based indigenousness, and align themselves with the western intellectual tradition instead. Or they can be seen as the hailed front-liners who are decolonising an intellectual space for the indigenous peoples.[6]

The relations of power affect the processes of de/territorialisation and hybridisation. As discussed in the beginning of this paper, many authors ignore the counter-currents, and view the international relations predominantly as one-way relations of the domination of the powerful over the powerless. It is indeed debatable as to whether the claims of, for example, an Amazonian indigenous community affect the development of the provincial, regional and national IBE policy and practice, or to what extent an Ecuadorian indigenous organisation can affect global policies. Evidently, the non-Western ideas have not influenced substantially the above-mentioned 'common model' of formal education. Timothy Reagan (2005:19) suggests that Western educators develop educational ideas by learning more from non-Western educational traditions. Strengthening the current of influences from indigenous towards the 'western' can be seen at least from two different angles. On the one hand, it can be interpreted as the colonisers' attempt to once again take advantage of the indigenous population and to hunger for the knowledge that indigenous people would rather claim as their own. On the other hand, if the different indigenous educational ideas actually contributed to the Western educational thinking and to the common model of schooling, presumably the claims of indigenous peoples would be more likely heard by the international agencies and by the decision-makers who are in control of the global financial resources.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Gunilla Holm and the members of the Thursday seminar group, Laia Saló i Nevado, Chia-Chien Chang and Harriet Zilliacus, for their valuable comments on the previous versions of this article. I would also like to thank Docent Juan Carlos Llorente and Professor Hannu Simola for their helpful guidance.

Notes

1) Tuija Veintie (tuija.veintie@helsinki.fi) holds an MA in Cultural Anthropology and is a PhD student at the Department of Education at the University of Helsinki.
2) Arjun Appadurai (2002:50) claims that instead of worrying about Americanisation, people in Korea can be worried about Japanisation, or in Cambodia, about Vietnamisation, etc. In Ecuador some indigenous people have experienced 'quichuisation,' a process where the original language and culture of one indigenous population has to a large extent been replaced by the Kichwa language and culture.
3) On internal and external colonisers, see Masemann 2003:124; Quijano 2000; 223.
4) The latest census in Ecuador (2001) identifies 13 groups of indigenous people. The population identified in the census as indigenous or as speakers of an indigenous language amount to a total of 830,418 persons, comprising 6.8% of the total population of Ecuador. (Chisaguano 2006.)
5) Kristiina Brunila (2008) speaks of 'discourse virtuosity' as a competence and agency that is built with the knowledge and experience of the effective situational ways of acting and speaking in order to be heard.
6) The indigenous intellectuals' dilemma between an indigenous identity and their close relation with 'western' education is discussed by indigenous authors such as Sandy Grande (2008:234) and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999:70-72, 99).

References

Aikman, S. 2003. *La educación indígena en Sudamérica. Interculturalidad y bilingüismo en Madre de Dios, Perú.* Lengua y sociedad 19. Lima: IEP.

Aikman, S. 1996. Globalization of Intercultural Education. *Compare* 26(2): 153-165.

Anderson-Levitt, K. 2003. *Local Meanings, Global Schooling. Anthropology and World Culture Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appadurai, A. 2002. Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy, in Inda, J. and Rosaldo, R. (eds.), *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, pp. 46-64. Oxford: Blackwell.

Arnove, R. F. 2003. Introduction: Reframing Comparative Education, in Arnove, R. and Torres, C. (eds.), *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local,* pp. 1-23. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Arnove R. F., Franz, S; Mollis, M, and Torres, C. A. 2003. Education in Latin America: Dependence, Underdevelopment and Inequality. In Arnove, R. and Torres, C. (eds.), *Comparative Education. The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*, pp. 313-337. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Barham, B. and Coomes, O. 1994. Reinterpreting the Amazon Rubber Boom: Investment, the State and Dutch Disease. *Latin American Research Review* 29(2): 73-109.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Brecher, J. and Costello, T. and Smith, B. 2000. *Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Brunila, K. 2008. From Knowledge-market to Aporia. Politics of knowledge in Educational Research. The new goal-orientation of research strategies - NERA conference 2008, 6.-8.3, Copenhagen.

Brysk, A. 2000. *From Tribal Village to Global Village. Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chisaguano, S. 2006. *La Población Indígena del Ecuador. Análisis de estadísticas socio-demográficas*. Quito: Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos.

COICA 2008 <http://www.coica.org.ec> [19.12.2008].

CONAIE 2007. *Historia. Qué es la CONAIE?* (Actualización 19-Jun-2007) <http://www.conaie.org/es/di_fo_historia/index.html> [19.12.2008].

DINEIB *Autoridades Del Sistema De Educacion Intercultural Bilingue Del Ecuador*. <http://www.dineib.edu.ec> [7.1.2009]

Falk, R. 1999. *Predatory Globalization: a critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Falk, R. 1991. *Explorations at the Edge of Time: The Prospects for World Order*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fanon, F. 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.

Farrell, J. P. 2003. Equality of Education. A Half-century of Comparative Evidence Seen from a New Millenium. In *Comparative Education. The Dialectic of the Global and the Local,* in Arnove, R. and Torres, C. (eds.), pp. 146-175. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Freeland, J. 1996. The Global, the National and the Local. Forces in the Development of Education for Indigenous Peoples - The Case of Peru. *Compare* 26(2): 167-196.

García Canclini, N. 2005. *Hybrid Cultures. Strategies for entering and leaving modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grande, S. 2008. Red Pedagogy. The Un-Methodology, in Denzin, N.; Lincoln, Y and Tuhiwai Smith, L. (eds.), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, pp. 233-254. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hall, S. 1991. The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity, in King, A. (ed.), *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, pp. 19-39. London: Macmillan.

Hannerz, U. 2002. Notes on the Global Ecumene, in Inda, J. and Rosaldo, R. (eds.), *The Anthropology of Globalization. A Reader*, pp. 37-45. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Huddart, D. 2007. Hybridity and Cultural Rights: Inventing Global Citizenship, in Kuortti, J. and Nyman J. (eds.), *Reconstructing Hybridity. Post-colonial Studies in Transition*, pp. 21-41. Textxet: Studies in Comparative Literature 51. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Inda, J. and Rosaldo, R. 2002. Introduction: A World in Motion. In *The Anthropology of Globalization. A Reader*, in Inda, J. and Rosaldo, R. (eds.), pp. 1-34. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jackson, J. and Warren, K. 2005. Indigenous Movements in Latin America, 1992-2004: Controversies, Ironies, New Directions. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 549-73.

Kontinen, T. 2007. *Learning Challenges of NGOs in Development. Co-operation of Finnish NGOs in Morogoro, Tanzania*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Education.

Langer, E. D. 2003. Introduction, in Langer, E. and Muñoz, E. (eds.), *Contemporary Indigenous Movements in Latin America*, pp. xi-xxix. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources.

Lindblad, S. and Popkewitz, T. 2003. Comparative ethnography: Fabricating the new millennium and its exclusions, in Beach, D. and Gordon, T. and Lahelma, E. (eds.), *Democratic Education. Ethnographic Challenges*, pp. 10-23. London: Tufnell Press.

Mabardi, S. 2000. Encounters of a Heterogeneous Kind: Hybridity in Cultural Theory, in De Grandis, R. and Bernd, Z. (eds.), *Unforeseeable Americas: Questioning Cultural Hybridity in the Americas*, pp. 1-20. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Masemann, V. 2003. Culture and Education, in Arnove, R. and Torres, C. (eds.), *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local,* pp. 115-132. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Mato, D. 2000. Transnational Networking and the Social Production of Representations of Identities by Indigenous Peoples' Organizations of Latin America. *International Sociology* 15(2): 343-360.

Meyer, J. and Ramirez, F. 2000. The World Institutionalization of Education, in Schriewer, J. (ed.), *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*, pp. 111-132. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2008. Regional: Eibamaz - Intercultural Bilingual Education in the Andean Region. <formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=104442&nodeid=35690&contentlan=2&culture=en-US> [13.1.2009]

Morrow, R. and Torres C. 2003. *Reading Freire and Habermas: Critical Pedagogy and Transformative Social Change*. New York: Teachers College.

Nederveen Pieterse, J. 1994. Globalisation as hybridisation. *International sociology* 9(2): 161-184.

Pineau, P. 2000. Education and globalisation: a Latin American perspective. *History of Education* 37(6): 743-755.

Popkewitz, T. S. 2000. Globalization/Regionalization, Knowledge, and the Educational Practices: Some Notes on Comparative Strategies for Educational Research, in Popkewitz, T. (ed.), *Educational Knowledge: changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community*, pp. 3-27. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Puiggrós, A. 1996. Presencias y ausencias en la historiografía pedagógica latinoamericana, in Cucuzza, H. (ed.), *Historia de la Educación en Debate*, pp. 99-102. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.

Quijano, A. 2000. Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology* 15(2): 215-232.

Reagan, T. 2005. *Non-Western Educational Traditions. Indigenous Approaches to Educational Thought and Practice*. Third Edition. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schriewer, J. 2000. World System and Interrelationship Networks. The Internationalization of Education and the Role of Comparative Inquiry, in Popkewitz, T. (ed.), *Educational Knowledge: changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community*, pp. 305-343. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Shohat, E. 1992. Notes on the 'Post-Colonial'. *Social Text* 31/32: 99-113.

Spivak, G. 1996. Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography, in Landry, D. and MacLean, G. (ed.), *The Spivak Reader*, pp. 203-235. London: Routledge.

Toynbee, P. 2000. Who's Afraid of Global Culture?, in Hutton, W. and Giddens, A. (eds.), *On the Edge. Living with Global Capitalism*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Useche Rodríguez, R. 2003. *Educación Indígena y Proyecto Civilizatorio en Ecuador*. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolivar.

Valtonen, P. 2001. *Latinalaisen Amerikan historia*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Public documents
The Constitution of Ecuador. 2008, art. 57.
The Constitution of Ecuador. 2008, art. 347.