

Introduction

On a sunny day in April 2017 I accompanied Roberto Angola, an AfroBolivian¹ *cocalero* (coca farmer) from Cala Cala to the recently finished structure of the *Centro de Interpretación de la Hoja de Coca, Café de Altura y Cultura Afroboliviana*, a museum built within the territorial boundaries of the *comunidad*² *Nogalani*, in the Yungas of Bolivia.³ Several people from Nogalani, “*los de arriba*” (lit. “the ones from above”) as Roberto usually referred to them, were busy with preparations for the visit of a commission from La Paz, led by the vice minister of tourism. The purpose of the visit was the final inspection of a project that people had been engaged in for the

- 1 To refer to my interlocutors, throughout the book I mostly use the term AfroBolivian/*Afroboliviano/a* or the very common and colloquial *Afro*, since this is the term most AfroBolivians prefer. I use *blanco/a*, *negro/a*, *moreno/a*, *zambo/a*, ‘black’ and ‘white,’ as well as any other terms connoting phenotype and race only in direct quotations or in cases where I want to highlight that my interlocutors explicitly referred to an individual’s phenotypical appearance or skin color. I use the term *Afrodescendiente*/*Afrodescendant* in the context of dealing with specific political discourses and self-positioning practices. In Bolivia, *Afrodescendiente* is a term mainly used in political and legal language and not in everyday conversation.
- 2 I speak of *comunidad* or *comunidades* to refer to a very specific type of collective in the Yungas, *la comunidad cocalera* or *campesina*, which exhibits many particularities that are of great importance to my discussion of AfroBolivianity (see chapter 3). I will only use the term “*comunidad Afroboliviana*” in direct quotes, since in Bolivia, there is only one example of a *comunidad* in the sense outlined above that can be described as AfroBolivian. For referring to abstract, contingent notions of (AfroBolivian) collectivity in particular localities or nationwide, I will therefore use the English term community. Differentiating terminologically between *comunidad* and community allows for the fleshing out of some important aspects of the relation between an ethnoracially articulated sense of community and other forms of collectivity and belonging. AfroBolivians from Cala Cala, for instance, often refer to themselves in collective terms as “*los Afros de Cala Cala*” (which I translate as “the AfroBolivian community of Cala Cala”); yet they also belong to a *comunidad* that transcends this ethnoracial collective (see chapters 3-5).
- 3 Cala Cala is a small conglomerate of houses located downhill from Nogalani. It was once a small estate (*estancia*) inhabited exclusively by AfroBolivians but has been a part of the *hacienda Nogalani* since the end of the 19th century. I will clarify the relation between Cala Cala and Nogalani in later chapters.

last four years. The minister and a team of experts (architects, lawyers, and accountants) had travelled the four hours from Bolivia's highland metropolis of La Paz to oversee the final stages of equipping the *Centro de Interpretación*.

As I arrived at the scene with Roberto, several people were busy mopping the floors, assembling different kinds of local produce (coca, tangerines, oranges and coffee) in representative bowls. Víctor, another Afrobolivian community leader, was carrying four *saya* drums into a corner of the museum and placed them on a podium underneath some photographs showing Afrobolivian *saya* musicians and dancers in their colorful dresses. The museum was already equipped with flat screen televisions attached to the walls, and with information panels on coca and coffee cultivation, as well as on aspects of Afrobolivian culture.

Suddenly, more people started entering the building and announced the arrival of the first members of the commission. From a luxurious Toyota Land Cruiser emerged "el arquitecto," the architect responsible for the construction and equipping of the museum. He informed the crowd that the minister had been held up in Coroico, another village in the Bolivian Yungas, where he had inspected the completion of another *Centro de Interpretación*, but that he would arrive shortly. He ordered some of the men to help him carry the last pieces of equipment he had brought with him at the last moment. From the trunk of his car, they unloaded a male and a female mannequin and various bags of clothes and carried them into the museum. There, they set them up next to the drums, unpacked the clothes – that turned out to be Afrobolivian *saya* dress – and hastily dressed them. The two mannequins and the drums Víctor had placed in the corner were the main attraction of the exhibition on Afrobolivian culture in the museum. At the opposite side of the room stood another statue of a man with visibly 'black' features stretching out his hand and holding a coffee plant, wearing traditional clothing associated with the region.

The preparations were just finished when another luxurious 4x4 vehicle emerged on the steep road leading up to the area where the *Centro de Interpretación* had been built. This time, it was the vice minister, accompanied by a member of the *Asamblea Legislativa Plurinacional*, Bolivia's parliament. The assembled *comunarios* (members of the *comunidad*) lined up in front of the main entrance, greeted the vice minister with warm words, welcoming him to Nogalani and thanking him on behalf of all its members for making the construction of the museum possible. He responded equally enthusiastically, commenting on the stunning beauty of the climate and landscape of the Yungas, and expressing his satisfaction at how nicely the museum had turned out. He was then invited to take the first ever tour of the brand new museum. The basics of coca cultivation were explained to him and his companions, and they were offered a gift of dried coca leaves that the *comunarios* had prepared for them. They went on to the section explaining the cultivation of organic high altitude coffee, and the process of peeling, roasting and grinding the beans. Eventually, it was time to move on to the Afrobolivian section, where Roberto

Figure 1: Mannequins with *saya* dress and Cala Cala's *saya* drums (left) and the statue of an AfroBolivian coffee cultivator (right) in the Centro de Interpretación (photographs by the author)



was given the task of explaining the *saya* exhibits and introducing the commission to “AfroBolivian culture.”

Roberto was visibly nervous that day, despite the fact that I knew him to be a very calm, confident man with an astonishing gift of self-reflection, leadership, spirit and eloquence. As he stood in front of the assembled community and the visitors from La Paz, he pointed at the *saya* drums and said:

“I have known this since I can remember. So it’s very old. I mean in comparison with the *saya* of today” (he now pointed to the pictures on the wall accompanying the exhibition of the drums) “that came up only later, right? In those moments. I am forty-four years old now and those drums must be from the 60s or 70s, look, right? So they are very old, but they still have their strength, right? Yes, I think that’s it.”⁴

-
- 4 “Desde que yo tengo uso de razón, yo he conocido eso. Entonces es súper antiguo. O sea en comparación con la *saya* de hoy que recién salió después, ¿no es cierto? En estos momentos. Yo hasta ahora tengo 44 años y aproximadamente esos son de los años 70 o 60, mira, ¿no? Entonces son súper antiguos, pero todavía siguen mostrando, digamos, su fortaleza, ¿no es cierto? Sí. Yo creo que eso nomás.”

Through his statement, Roberto linked the drums – a material representation of Afrobolivian culture – with his biography, highlighting how important they were for him since “they have been there since I can remember.” For him, the drums say something about who he is and while they are indeed “very old,” they maintain their strength (“*fortaleza*”) up to the present. He juxtaposed the drums people were looking at with “the *saya* of today” (“*la saya de hoy*”), often a shorthand description for referring to Afrobolivian culture more generally. Through this juxtaposition he revealed a tension between what he considered important about being *Afroboliviano* and the representation of Afrobolivianity put forth through the museum. When I later spoke to the vice minister and some members of the delegation, they expressed a similar concern, but from the opposite perspective. The vice minister himself remarked apprehensively that the presentation of the *saya* drums needed to be “improved and deepened” (“*mejorado y profundizado*”), failing to acknowledge that Roberto had intended just that: giving the display of ‘Afrobolivian culture’ a meaning beyond the museum, expressing what it means for people like him. For the delegation from La Paz, the exhibition was based on a representation and performance of Afrobolivianity that, from their perspective, Roberto was not able or willing to produce at that moment. The mutual disappointment was based on diverging concepts and ideas of what it means to be Afrobolivian – to different people, institutions and the state – and how Afrobolivianity ought to be expressed and represented.

As the guests of honor were led into the adjacent auditorium for lunch, I sat with Roberto and Víctor at the entrance to this remarkable building, chewing coca in complete silence. Roberto and Víctor seemed to be quite overwhelmed and as we sat, I thought about the first time people in Cala Cala had told me about the tourism project they were in the middle of developing. In 2014, nobody was talking about a museum and people were discussing only the remote possibility of being granted government funds to develop a small community-based tourism project. In fact, people in Cala Cala initially hadn’t even thought of community tourism at all when they approached the *Mancomunidad de Municipios* – the regional confederation of municipal governments – in order to ask for funds to build a simple, one-room building where they could hold community meetings. The officer at the *Mancomunidad* had told them that he unfortunately did not have any funds available, but that the “office down the hall” (“*la oficina al fondo*”) had just received a multi-million dollar grant from the Interamerican Development Bank (IDB) to fund the *Programa Nacional de Turismo Comunitario* (PNTC, National Community Tourism Program) and that they should ask there. The people from Cala Cala took that lead and, four years and innumerable meetings later, we were sitting in front of a large museum during a visit by the vice minister of tourism, an outcome nobody in Cala Cala would have been able to foresee.

People in Cala Cala often emphasized how strange and surprising many of the developments and the eventual construction of the museum in Nogalani were to them – a generalized feeling people expressed and something that goes well beyond the ‘professional puzzlement’ of the ethnographer. Not only had the people of Cala Cala and Nogalani – a *comunidad* of only about 150 households – just inaugurated a museum project worth tens of thousands of US dollars while the high school right next to it was in a deplorable condition; it was also quite remarkable that Nogalani was singled out as the site of a *Centro de Interpretación de la Cultura Afroboliviana*. There are only eleven Afrobolivian households in the entire *comunidad* – as opposed to over 100 Aymara households. Of these eleven Afrobolivian households, only two were actively engaged in the tourism project.⁵ And – as we have seen – even one of the most engaged individuals was not able to produce a representation of ‘Afrobolivian culture’ deemed adequate in the eyes of the vice minister and his commission. What is more, the ‘Afrobolivian culture’ depicted in the museum was just thirty years ago expected to be ‘lost’ in the near future and despite efforts at revitalization, it hardly played a role in Cala Cala’s everyday life or its residents’ sense of being Afrobolivian (see chapter 3).

I argue, however, that this situation, as unlikely as it might seem at first glance, is by no means a mere coincidence, as Roberto sometimes contemplated when he tried to make sense of the journey that led him and Cala Cala from the “office down the hall” to the doorstep of the finished museum. The *Centro de Interpretación* is just one material representation of a wider set of processes set in motion by Bolivia’s proclaimed ‘re-founding’; it is an outcome of plurinational governance and development. The journey of Cala Cala’s inhabitants from wanting to have a place to socialize to becoming engaged in a museum project based on ‘Afrobolivian culture’ is only one example of the processes this book will describe and analyze. Cala Cala’s journey is deeply entangled with a particular political, cultural and social conjuncture – Bolivia’s plurinational moment – where an “indigenous state” (Postero 2017) engages with its subjects through politics, law and development in novel ways. In this plurinational conjuncture, discourses of cultural diversity and indigenous rights dating back to the 1970s have reached a preliminary peak in importance. For Afrobolivians in Cala Cala, the discourses of plurinationality are most strongly felt when engaging the legal entitlements and novel avenues for political enfranchisement associated with the recognition of *el pueblo Afroboliviano* (“the Afrobolivian people”) in Bolivia’s 2009 Plurinational Constitution. Since then, the concept of *el pueblo Afroboliviano* has become a central pillar of Afrobolivian identity politics, as well as an important discursive device for framing demands vis-à-vis the state. Without going into much detail here (see chapter 9), it is important to introduce some

5 See chapter 3 for details on the number and composition of households in Cala Cala.

key features of the concept. On the one hand, addressing AfroBolivialians as a *pueblo* implies the assumption that AfroBolivialians all over the country share definable characteristics that unite them as a collectivity, while at the same time clearly differentiating them from other *pueblos*. In the language of the Constitution, those characteristics have to do with “cultural identity,” “language,” “historic tradition,” “institutions,” “territory” and “world view” (see Article 30 of the Bolivian Constitution of 2009). In the example of the opening vignette, those purportedly unique characteristics form the basis for an exhibition on AfroBolivialian ‘culture,’ but the impact and the scope of the *pueblo* concept are not limited to museum projects. On the other hand, invoking *el pueblo AfroBolivialiano* leads to the assumption that AfroBolivialian demands ought to be accommodated by the Plurinational State within the framework of collective rights also applied to indigenous groups in the 2009 Constitution. As will become clear throughout my study, both assumptions and their myriad ramifications are often problematic and subject to severe criticism. Yet they also serve as new reference points and provide an additional sphere of resonance for articulating AfroBolivialian claims. Beyond formally granting AfroBolivialians special collective rights equal to those of indigenous groups (“*pueblos indígena originario campesinos*”), constitutional recognition has meant a great deal of attention for the category *AfroBolivialiano* in national politics, as well as from international development actors and the media.⁶ As a consequence of these developments, local notions of identity, community and belonging are changing. In the opening vignette, we have already encountered references to various collective identifications (*Afros, cocaleros, comunarios, and “los de arriba”*). These local terms relate in different ways to the broader categories *Afro(bolivialiano)* and Aymara, as well as to specific places in the local ethnographic context (Nogalani and Cala Cala). As will become clear in subsequent chapters, they furthermore specifically relate to concepts of indigeneity and blackness on a national and global scale.

Beyond hinting at the multiplicity of collective identifications in Cala Cala, this short episode introduces another important aspect of my argument, namely that the meanings of AfroBoliviality itself are contested. The depiction of AfroBoliviality in the exhibition heavily focuses on the aspect of ‘AfroBolivialian culture’ expressed by the explicit reference to “*Cultura AfroBolivialiana*” in the museum’s name, but also by the overarching importance *saya* is given in the exhibition’s concept. Yet it is clear that AfroBoliviality is also related to ideas of race and racialized difference.

6 Article 31 of Bolivia’s 2009 Constitutions reads: “The Afro-Bolivian people enjoy, in everything corresponding, the economic, social, political and cultural rights that are recognized in the Constitution for the nations and the rural native indigenous peoples.” (“*El pueblo afrobolivialiano goza, en todo lo que corresponda, de los derechos económicos, sociales, políticos y culturales reconocidos en la Constitución para las naciones y pueblos indígena originario campesinos.*”) Unless otherwise noted, the translated passages from the Constitution are from the English translation provided by www.constituteproject.org.

The phenotypical appearance of the Afrobolivian mannequins serves as a material expression of this very widespread racialized perspective on Afrobolivianity. The fact that the mannequins' phenotype was neither explicitly addressed during the planning stages of the project, nor mentioned in the information pertaining to the exhibition, serves as a reminder of the "absent presence of race" (Wade, Deister, et al. 2014) in Bolivia and Latin America more generally. Moreover, as Roberto's short statement quoted at the beginning vividly exemplifies, there are also local understandings of what it means to be *Afroboliviano*. Those understandings of Afrobolivianity are often rooted in individual biographies, local history and kinship relations and reflect a different perspective on processes of collective identification, difference and community, and on the place of Afrobolivianity in plurinational Bolivia.

In what remains of this introduction, I will sketch my theoretical approach to Afrobolivianity as developed through my long-term involvement with people in Cala Cala and my engagement with the literature on Afrodescendants and indigenous people in Latin America. I will then provide an overview of the structure of my argument and how this is reflected in the ethnographic chapters that follow. In the next chapter, I will outline my perspectives and my methodology, including a reflection on my roles in the field and some general comments on the danger of reification when studying categories of identification.

Theoretical framework

My study of Afrobolivianity is situated within the recently emerging field of studying indigeneity and *Afrodescendencia* in Latin America within a common analytical framework. Similar to most of the studies I will introduce in the following paragraphs, my project was from its inception designed to be situated at the intersection of different disciplinary and regional areas of interest. Therefore, instead of being able to draw from a well-established canon of theoretical approaches and concepts, the analytical tools, perspectives and interpretative stances come from a variety of sources. I take my main cues from theoretical approaches that have – in some way or another – paved the way for decentering established notions of certain areas of inquiry. My basic understanding of the politics of difference with regard to Afrodescendants in Latin America is derived from Peter Wade's work, which has shown the complex interrelations of race, ethnicity, and nation in Latin America (Wade 2009a; Wade 2009b; Wade 2010). From Wade's work I take the fundamental understanding that there are myriad conceptual overlaps between race and ethnicity, blackness, indigeneity, and mixture (*mestizaje*) in Latin America, but also important rifts, separations and contradictions. This is why I embrace his approach of maintaining the terminological distinction between race and ethnicity

in Latin America in order to address empirical and conceptual entanglements as well as separations. At the same time, I follow Mark Anderson's proposal to use the term "ethnoracial" in order "to highlight how identity categories often entangle notions of biological and cultural differences" (Anderson 2009:29), whenever my ethnographic data shows that references to ethnicity (broadly understood by most of my interlocutors to refer to a group identity based on cultural characteristics) and race (equally broadly understood as a group identity based on physical appearance and/or perceived biological descent) are not neatly separable. Viewing race and ethnicity, as well as blackness and indigeneity as inextricably linked in Latin America, I draw on scholarship on blackness and indigeneity in an equal manner, highlighting the possible avenues of cross-fertilization of these strands of literature. In order to ground my analysis of blackness and indigeneity as they relate to Afrobolivians in social practice, I briefly introduce selected contributions from the anthropological study of ethnicity and processes of shaping collective identities. Subsequently, I summarize my approach to law as a decisive factor in re-shaping notions of identity, 'groupness' and boundaries, namely the notion of "legalizing identities" as developed by Jan Hoffmann French in her recent work on Brazil (French 2009). French's approach not only destabilizes common notions of blackness and indigeneity as separate modes of identification, but also fruitfully links debates on cultural change, legal recognition, political mobilization and the renegotiation of identities.

New perspectives on blackness and indigeneity in Latin America

In recent years, there has been an upsurge in publications dealing with indigenous people and Afrodescendants in Latin America within a single analytical framework. This has not always been the case. As Peter Wade (Wade 2010:24) has observed, the situation was marked by a fairly deep-seated divide between studies of black people and studies of indigenous peoples. Citing Colombia as an example, Wade contends that this divide in scholarship is at least in part a consequence of the fact that black and indigenous peoples have for the longest time occupied different spaces in Latin America's "structures of alterity": indigenous people as cultural others and black people – if not "invisible" (de Friedemann 1984) – as racial others. As a consequence of this divide, in Latin American Anthropology there are few examples of studies that treat indigenous people and Afrodescendants within a single framework and usually indigeneity and blackness are approached with fundamentally different theoretical tools. Indigenous people have been studied as ethnic groups, Afrodescendants as a racial group (Wade 2010). Studying indigenous people, anthropologists inquired into 'traditional forms' of social, political or religious life that have survived or have been modified by colonialism (de la Cadena and Starn 2007a). At least implicitly, notions of continuity and rootedness have played a part

in this, albeit that tendency is increasingly being questioned and debated (Canessa 2007; da Cuña and De Almeida 2000). In its most radical form, critics of indigeneity have questioned not only the analytical value of the concept but have also disavowed it politically due to its essentialism and exclusionary tendencies (Kuper 2003). Black people in Latin America have been approached either from a more sociological perspective, inquiring into Latin American ‘race relations’ or racism, or from an anthropological approach, in which black people have been linked to notions of cultural survivals from Africa (Herskovits 1990) and concepts like diaspora, creolization and hybridity. Rather than continuities, these concepts focus on transnationalism, cultural innovation and hybrid identities (Dixon and Burdick 2012; Greene 2007a; Rossbach de Olmos and Drotbohm 2009; Whitten and Torres 1998; Yelvington 2006; cf. Gilroy 1993; and Hall 1997). Although this depiction of the divide seems rather schematic, it has only been overcome in recent years and in many aspects still persists today.

Afro-indigenous multiculturalisms

However, in recent years, historically oriented works have demonstrated the relative flexibility of categories and ensuing negotiations of belonging within the Spanish colonial *casta* system (Albiez-Wieck 2017), and have occasionally even focused explicitly on the relationship between ‘native’/indigenous parts of the population and black slaves or former slaves (Gutiérrez Brockington 2006; O’Toole 2012; Restall 2005; Restall 2009). Those studies have decentered the notion of separate spaces of black and indigenous sociality and culture from colonial and early republican times until the present. From an anthropological perspective, an increasing number of scholars have targeted the ways Afrodescendant groups make sense of multicultural reforms and draw on indigeneity by tapping into transnational indigenism (Niezen 2003) and related politics of identity (Hooker 2005; Hooker 2008). In an article focusing on Peru, but with wider regional implications, Shane Greene has argued that we are increasingly confronted with situations where “states project a potential, if not in practice an actual, ethno-cultural and racial equivalence between Afro-descendent and indigenous populations in the region” (Greene 2007a:329). This situation he refers to as “Afro-Indigenous multiculturalisms.” For Colombia, Peter Wade has pointed out the tendency of indianizing or indigenizing blackness through engagement with the multicultural state (Wade 1995; Wade 2006a; Wade 2009c), an approach taken up by various scholars (Ng’weno 2007; Restrepo 2004) rendering it more precisely as an ethnicization of blackness and emphasizing its inherent tendencies to fix, homogenize and ruralize black identity in the Pacific Region of Colombia (see also Rossbach de Olmos 2009). Thinking along the same general lines, Shane Greene (Greene 2007a) has introduced the notion of the “holy trinity of multicultural peoplehood,” highlighting the influence

that the reforms' legal and political definition of a certain type of collective subject (*un pueblo*) have on the political subjectivities of indigenous and Afrodescendant people. In a very interesting case study from Honduras, Mark Anderson develops his concept of "black indigenism" in order to make sense of the cultural politics of Garifuna activism in multicultural Honduras (Anderson 2009). A similar focus on Latin American multiculturalism also informs recent analyses of black social movements in Latin America and blackness more generally (Rahier 2012a; Rahier 2014). At the same time, those studies have shown that beyond references to indigeneity filtered through multicultural regimes of recognition, Afrodescendants draw on notions of diasporic routes (Greene 2007a) and global notions of blackness and *Afrodescendencia* in processes of negotiating identities, constructing belonging and also political alliances (Rahier 2012b; Wade 2009c). The crucial point is that blackness and indigeneity – and associated tropes of diaspora vs. roots, race vs. ethnicity, 'Indians' vs. black people – should not be seen as two opposing and incompatible modes of identity formation and political contestation, but rather as complementary elements of a process by which concepts like "black indigeneity" or "indigenous blackness" can become avenues into "partially disrupt[ing] a conceptual-political grid that links indigeneity with Indians and Blacks with displacement" (Anderson 2009:22). I will directly address the possibilities and limitations of articulating Afrobolivianity as black indigeneity in my discussion of the changing patterns of Afrobolivian mobilization in chapters 8 and 9, and the basic assumptions of the approaches outlined above run through my entire argument.

Afrobolivians and indigenous people in a *mestizo* nation

Beyond the realm of the political, the relationships between black and indigenous peoples have been targeted in studies of *mestizaje* in Latin America, both historically, as well as through ethnographic inquiry in contemporary settings (De la Cadena 2005; Gruzinski 2002; Hale 2014; Hale 2015; Miller 2004; Rappaport 2014; Wade 2009b). For reasons of space, it is not possible to summarize the vast literature on *mestizaje* in its entirety. Suffice it to say here that there is a lively debate of the concept as "an elite-generated myth of national identity" (Hale 1996:2) in Latin America on the one hand and *mestizaje* as a lived experience on the other (for a recent contextualization see Wade 2005). As an ideological notion linked to nation-building processes, *mestizaje* has been widely criticized and famously dubbed an "all-inclusive ideology of exclusion" (Stutzman 1981) that although celebrating mixture and inclusion, privileges whiteness and denigrates and excludes blackness and indigeneity. As a lived experience, *mestizaje* has occasionally been celebrated as a "counterhegemonic claiming of intermediate identities that, by its very indeterminacy and flexibility, escapes the use of ethnic and racial categorizations for the purposes of social control" (Mallon 1996:171; see also De la Cadena 2000). Yet, as

Peter Wade has observed, *mestizaje* – albeit fundamentally about cultural and racial mixing – also plays a decisive part in reifying ethnic and racial categories such as black, white and indigenous as the original allegedly ‘pure’ ingredients of any mixture. This is all the more important since in recent years the rise of genomic research in Latin America has catapulted *mestizaje* yet again to the center of debates on the nation and its origin (Wade, Beltrán, et al. 2014; Wade 2017).

Mestizaje is important for the present study insofar as it is connected to “modern racial-colonial discourses [that] located the classic colonial triad (white, *mestizo*, Indian) at the center of debates about national identity and racial destiny” (Larson 2004:68). Within those debates in the Bolivian context, blackness often occupies a space at the margins of the “dynamic triad of racial hierarchy” (Larson 2004:68) and the nation. Consequently, most state-led initiatives of nation-building and parallel debates on national identity in academic circles have been simplified and reduced to the question “What to do with the Indians?” (“¿Qué hacer con los Indios?”) (Stefanoni 2010; see also Larson 2004) – leaving little space for debates on blackness.⁷ My discussion of different notions of blackness in relation to mixture and indigeneity in Bolivia in chapter 6 reflects the important discursive role of *mestizaje* as an ideology, but also leaves room for the discussion of racial mixture within families and communities, and how it relates to the Afrobolivian population more generally.

Emerging Afrobolivianity: articulations, performances and translations

If we conceive of indigeneity and blackness as fundamentally entangled, it is possible to draw on recent developments in theorizing indigeneity and fruitfully engage with blackness through this analytical lens. I propose studying blackness parallel to indigeneity as a matter of becoming, following James Clifford’s perspective on indigeneity as a matter of “becoming” in an age marked by globalization, decolonization and their entanglements (Clifford 2013). Similar proposals have been made from a variety of scholars from a variety of regional backgrounds (for an overview see Levi and Maybury-Lewis 2012; for Africa: Hodgson 2009; Hodgson 2011; Pelican 2009; for Latin America: Course 2011; Jackson 1991; Jackson 1995; French 2009; for Asia: Li 2000; Rycroft and Dasgupta 2011; Tyson 2010). Building on his earlier conceptualization of “indigenous diasporas” (Clifford 2007), Clifford proposes studying indigeneity as a matter of articulation, performance and translation (Clifford 2013:54f).

The notion of articulation provides us with a means to overcome the rather unfruitful divide between primordialist assumptions with regard to indigeneity on

7 The marginality of blackness in this regard – that seems to be even more pronounced in Bolivia than elsewhere in Latin America – has become an important aspect in Afrobolivian mobilization and has fueled the notions of ‘invisibility’ central to many activist narratives.

the one hand and the assertions that claims based on indigeneity can be comprehensively analyzed as a result of identity politics relying on “invented traditions” on the other (Clifford 2013:54). “Articulation offers,” Clifford argues, “a nonreductive way to think about cultural transformation and the apparent coming and going of ‘traditional’ forms” avoiding “[a]ll-or-nothing, fatal-impact notions of change” (Clifford 2013:60). Consequently,

“[i]n articulation theory, the whole question of authenticity is secondary, and the process of social and cultural persistence is political all the way back. It’s assumed that cultural forms will always be made, unmade, and remade. Communities can and must reconfigure themselves, drawing selectively on remembered pasts. *The relevant question is whether, and how, they convince and coerce insiders and outsiders, often in power charged, unequal situations, to accept the autonomy of a ‘we.’*” (Clifford 2013:61f emphasis added by the author)

Since articulation is concerned rather with possibilities than with prefigured patterns and certainties, the concept allows us to furthermore accommodate “cosmopolitan” (Goodale 2006) and “creole” (Halbmayer 2011) frames of reference for 21st century indigenous identities. Linked to emerging black indigeneities, this seems like a logical fit, as it accommodates not only the increasingly transnational dimensions of indigeneity but also allows for the integration in our analysis of Afrobolivianity of globally circulating discourses, images and practices associated with the African Diaspora and transnational notions of *‘lo Afro’* in Latin America (Anderson 2009; Wade 1999; Wade 2009c). Furthermore, it allows us to also consider (black) indigeneity in relation to the concept of autochthony that – albeit originating in an Africanist context (Ceuppens and Geschiere 2005; Geschiere 2009; Geschiere and Jackson 2006) – can be fruitfully employed in comparative studies of indigeneity (Canessa 2018; Hodgson 2002; Pelican 2009; Zenker 2011). I address the articulated nature of Afrobolivianity and the varying references to indigeneity, autochthony, and diaspora throughout the book as a whole, but most directly in my discussion of the emerging Afrobolivian movement and its consolidation in chapters 8 and 9. Moreover, such references play a role in state-led efforts at cataloging and normalizing Afrobolivian culture analyzed in chapter 7. What is more, although most of my interlocutors reject explicit references to being indigenous, local notions of Afrobolivian identity circle around autochthony, for example when representing Afrobolivians as the ‘original’ (i.e. non-migrant) inhabitants of the Yungas (see chapters 3 to 5).

Related to the basic understanding of indigeneity as articulation, Clifford suggests focusing on two additional aspects of “becoming indigenous”: heritage preservation and performance, as well as translation (Clifford 2013:252). This is all the more important in times and circumstances where “indigenous experiences [are] no longer exclusively rooted in village settings” (Clifford 2013:222) and these perfor-

mances enable “new identifications and more formally expressed notions of ‘culture’ or ‘tradition.’” In Bolivia, notions of Afrobolivian culture have been decidedly shaped by migration and the experiences of Afrobolivians in urban environments. What is more, Afrobolivianity has been formally introduced into the canon of Bolivia’s intangible cultural heritage and many representations of Afrobolivianity as heritage lie in constant tension with the lived experience of Afrobolivians all over the country. This is also where translation becomes so important. Afrobolivianity transcends conceptual spaces and cannot be considered to be rooted in a particular place or within a clearly defined unchanging collective. Thus, articulations, (re-)identifications and contingent performances of Afrobolivianity need to be translated between different contexts and people – for example between generations or regions, or between mediatized representations of Afrobolivian culture and local cultural practice (cf. Clifford 2013:224). In my discussion of *saya* in chapter 7, I will highlight the importance of performance and the dynamics of formalization as heritage, as well as the seminal role translation plays in bridging different conceptual spaces and sectors of Afrobolivian society.

Articulated Afrobolivianity and interethnic relations

There are limitations to articulation theory, however. Clifford himself recognizes that the concept (also due to its particular conceptual genealogy from Gramsci through Hall [1986]) tends to focus on discourse and speech (Clifford 2013:59). Moreover, if “pushed to extremes it can take you to a point where every cultural form, every structure or restructuration, every connection and disconnection, has a radical contingency as if, at any moment, anything were possible.” (Clifford 2013:63). This is of course not the case. The articulation of Afrobolivianity is – as much as that of any ethnic or ethnoracial category of identification – “circumscribed by the historically available materials” (Lentz 2006:5). Therefore, emerging “new modes of self-understanding must be anchored in existing social relations and ideas for them to be meaningful” (Lentz 2006:5). This aspect has been addressed in the study of ethnicity and indigenous groups in Bolivia for example by Xavier Albó, who pointed out “the ‘Long Memory’ of Ethnicity in Bolivia” (Albó 2008), i.e. the great historical depth of indigeneity and ethnicity in the country, and this history’s profound impact on society in the present. My aim is thus to “explore both the [...] ‘invention’ of ethnic categories, by multiple actors and with diverse interests, and the embeddedness of these new constructs in [...] [already established] modes of social positioning and belonging” (Lentz 2006:7). Throughout my discussion I will show that certain aspects of Afrobolivianity are more difficult to articulate than others and that processes of translation can also fail or be rejected. This is the case, for example, between Afrobolivian organizations and the state, as well as between different parts of the Afrobolivian population dispersed throughout the country.

In order to ground my study of Afrobolivianity in social practice and to make sense of how notions of being *Afro* become meaningful in contexts of face-to-face interactions and local processes of identification, I wish to add some input from other scholars to Clifford's proposition, as well as certain insights from anthropological theorizing on (ethnic) groups, identities, boundaries, social integration and conflicts (Eidson et al. 2017; Elwert 2002; Jenkins 2008; Schlee 1997; Schlee 2004). Engaging this literature grounds the study of Afrobolivian articulations in social practice and also helps us grasp the practical limits of articulation. There are multiple reasons for my engagement of theories of ethnicity: I understand Afrobolivianity and indigeneity as articulated and relational identities "without guarantees" (de la Cadena and Starn 2007b; see also Postero 2013) that become most relevant in day-to-day settings when negotiating social, economic and political relations with people that are considered 'others.' In contexts of concrete social interactions the question is often in what sense Afrobolivians can be considered a "we-group" sharing specific networks of communication, social norms (especially in terms of a moral economy and practical solidarity) and certain institutions of conflict resolution (Elwert 2002). Furthermore, engaging Afrobolivianity as a "we-group process" (as understood by Elwert), points our attention to the possibility of identity switching – both for individuals (situational switching) and collectively (for example in the realm of political positioning). Thus, the we-group and/or its boundaries may be widened, narrowed, re-drawn or re-conceptualized. However, Günther Schlee (Schlee 2004) warns us of the fact that though malleable, identities and boundaries, as well as belongings, affiliations and alliances, are not entirely flexible. They have to make sense within the conceptual spaces of the societies they are embedded in. Thus it is not possible to simply 'invent' them: "Social identities cannot be made up at will, because they have to be plausible to others" (Schlee 2004:137) and it requires "virtuosi in identity manipulation" (Schlee 2004:137) in order to succeed in plausibly widening or narrowing group memberships or inter-group alliances intentionally. In fact, the very existence of the group may be questioned and instead, as Rogers Brubaker has proposed, we can focus on processes of "group-making" and the creation of "groupness" (Brubaker 2002; Brubaker 2009). What is more, re-configurations of social identities can remain incomplete, contested and can be reshaped or undone. They may furthermore overlap, creating "cross-cutting ties" that in turn may serve to integrate society beyond ethnically or racially defined identities and collectives (Schlee 1997; Schlee 2004). Likewise Carola Lentz has suggested that since "ethnicity itself is not only fluid, but fluidly connected to [...] non-ethnic bases of identification and commonality" it is "necessary to broaden the perspective and explore much more than 'just' ethnicity" (Lentz 2006:3–4). In the case of Afrobolivians, this mainly concerns the identifications as *comunarios* and *cocaleros*, as well as regional identity as *Yungueños*.

I take up these issues in chapters 3 and 4 when discussing Cala Cala/Nogalani as marked fundamentally by two horizons of community (in emic terms “*Los Afros de Cala Cala*” vs. “*La comunidad cocalera*”) referring to different “dimensions of identification” (Schlee 2008) or “conceptual frame[s] of reference for purposes of identification” (Eidson et al. 2017). The two different we-groups produced through identification with one or the other frame are not mutually exclusive and my analysis of Cala Cala shows that switching between those horizons is possible – and indeed occurs quite frequently, both on the level of individuals, as well as in collective identifications and organizational contexts. Both horizons are options for summoning groupness in formalized representations of the community, as well as in practice.

What I have found to be of great importance in terms of the continuous interactions of different horizons of community in Cala Cala is the law, and more specifically the legal codification of the category “*Afroboliviano*” as one possible dimension or frame for collective identification. The legal codification, recognition and the ensuing political entitlements and economic possibilities associated with the category “*Afroboliviano*” provide a very powerful impetus to framing community, belonging and social boundaries in a specific way. I therefore engage a third strand of literature focusing on the proliferation of legal discourse and the law’s entanglements with identity in order to account for this shift.

Laws, rights and subjectivities

Since the passing of the New Bolivian Constitution of 2009, laws, legal language, procedures and rights have played a crucial role for many people in plurinational Bolivia. I understand the legal recognition and recurring references to rights, as well as the logics of formalization and bureaucratization this entails, as an important emerging site of the articulation of Afrobolivianity. The salience of law and legal discourses is by no means limited to Bolivia or Latin America, but has been identified as a global phenomenon (Benda-Beckmann, Benda-Beckmann, and Eckert 2009; Benda-Beckmann, Benda-Beckmann, and Griffiths 2005; Benda-Beckmann, Benda-Beckmann, and Griffiths 2009; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; de Sousa Santos 2002; Nader 2002). In a programmatic essay on their approach to an anthropology of law, governance and sovereignty, John and Jean Comaroff go as far as to assert that it “is impossible to approach the contemporary global order without close attention to law; to law especially in its polyvalent relation to governance” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009:31f).

This trend has been widely noted in Latin America. From a political science perspective (Nolte and Schilling-Vacaflor 2012) it has been labelled as Constitutionalism (or New Constitutionalism), while anthropologists have studied the process through ethnography (Postero 2017; Schavelzon 2012). In Bolivia, the constitutional

reform process has been interpreted as the culmination of a process of “natives making nation” (Canessa 2005) and celebrated as an important means of expanding citizenship to encompass more and more marginalized groups (Postero 2006). Legal recognition in the constitutional text has been interpreted as the end of ‘invisibility’ by AfroBolivians and has become an important point of departure for renegotiating notions of national belonging, further political mobilization and the claiming of rights. I will address the key features of Bolivia’s Plurinational Constitution and their perceived transformative potential from the perspective of AfroBolivians in chapter 9, but will also point out important limitations (cf. Albro 2010a; Crabtree and Whitehead 2008; Farthing and Kohl 2014; Goodale and Postero 2013; Postero 2017; Schilling-Vacaflo, Brand, and Radhuber 2012).

Legal recognition has in many cases fostered a growing importance of law way beyond constitutions. In Latin America and globally, there is a marked trend whereby the focus of conflict resolution moves from political contexts to the courts, subsumed under the umbrella term of judicialization of politics. Judicialization, following a recent conceptualization (Huneeus, Couso, and Sieder 2010), involves two distinct but closely related aspects. On the one hand, the term can refer to the observation that courts have taken on a new, more pronounced political role, positioning themselves as the defenders of constitutions and rights and occupying the role of arbiters in a variety of policy conflicts. On the other hand, speaking of judicialization signals the increasing use of laws and legal discourse by various political actors more generally – equally including individual politicians and social movements (Huneeus, Couso, and Sieder 2010:8). Importantly, the judicialization of politics can emerge from a variety of sources, including the state itself (“from above”), marginalized actors (“from below”) or transnational entities and organizations (“from abroad”) (Sieder, Schjolden, and Angell 2005a:4; on “legalism from below,” see also Eckert 2006; on the transnational dimension of “empires of law”: Goodale 2007). Law, the claiming of rights and the appeal to courts can become a strategy for advancing counterhegemonic political struggles (de Sousa Santos and Cesar A. Rodríguez-Garavito 2005:4; see also: Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Eckert 2006), a view differing significantly from more classic approaches in Marxist legal anthropology and sociology that saw law as fundamentally at the service of hegemony (for an overview see Spitzer 1983).

The “legal cultures” (Huneeus, Couso, and Sieder 2010:6) or “cultures of legality” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009:34) this engenders refer to the fact that “shifting repertoires of ideas and behaviours relating to law, legal justice, and legal systems” (Huneeus, Couso, and Sieder 2010:4–5) begin to shape social interactions that occur far beyond the formal legal system. Law permeates the social world “from constitutions to the capillaries of the everyday” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2006:24). “Humanity,” as Comaroff and Comaroff assert, “knows itself more than ever before by virtue of its rights.” In the cases I will discuss in this book with regard to Afrobo-

livians, it is the latter aspect of judicialization and the often elusive yet pervasive presence of legal discourse that are most important.⁸ Through as little as “rumours of rights” (Eckert 2012) law emerges as a “site of hope” for Afrobolivians parallel to collective political action and mobilizing. What is more, through judicialization, hopes and needs are shaped into claims, turning hope into expectation (Eckert 2012:157, 166).

The most striking example of this tendency is certainly the Afrobolivian campaign leading up to constitutional reform in 2009 (see chapter 9): “More than 500 years give us rights” (“*Más de 500 años también nos dan derechos*”) was the slogan Afrobolivian organizations used in their mobilizations, articulating the grievances of their constituency in terms of rights to be claimed from the state. In the aftermath of recognition, such discourses became even more important and in the most mundane settings of everyday life – for instance in the coca field – people nowadays speak of their rights and how claiming them might improve their situation.

Legalizing identity and plurinational ID-ology

Law, recognition and the invocation of rights not only exert influence on the way needs, grievances and hopes can be articulated, but they shape the ways people conceive of their collective identities, affiliations and belongings. Building on socio-legal studies that approach “law’s role in eliciting apparently natural identities” (Collier, Maurer, and Suarez-Navaz 1996:2) Jan Hoffman French has developed the concept of “legalizing identities” (French 2009). Studying a community of Afro-indigenous descent in northeastern Brazil, French analyzes processes by which one part of the community “became black” though asserting their (legal) status as the descendants of a fugitive slave community (*quilombo*), whereas another part of the community “became Indian” by claiming the (legal) status of an indigenous community. Her enormously fascinating study sheds light on processes by which two communities that share kin relations and a common regional history and identity as *sertanejo* (backlander) peasants and *vaqueiros* (cowboys) have come to identify and become legally recognized as ethnoracially distinct groups – although as she stresses, they “have always been deeply involved in each other’s lives” (French 2009:xiv).

The concept of “legalizing identities” builds on scholarship on the multifarious relations between law and social movement activism on behalf of collectives that share a certain ‘identity’ (as women, indigenous people, Afrodescendants) (see for example: Handler 1978; McCann 1994; Merry 2006; Rajagopal 2003; Scheingold 2004). These studies tend to focus on activists, strategies and movement messages

8 I am only aware of one case (the *Tundi* controversy briefly discussed in chapter 8) where the resolution of a conflict was pursued through legal means by an Afrobolivian organization or individual and this remained an isolated exception.

related to “rights talk.” However, as Sally Engle Merry (Merry 2003) has argued, the transformative potential of rights talk transcends the levels of organizations and activists as it is capable of engendering a “rights-defined identity” through “encounters with the new subjectivity defined within the discourses and practices of the law” (Merry 2003:346–347).⁹ On an even more general level, it has been argued that law plays a fundamental role in shaping notions of “Modern Personhood” (Collier, Maurer, and Suarez-Navaz 1996). “Bourgeois law,” (i.e. “the legal concepts and practices developed since the eighteenth century in Europe and its colonies that are presently spreading around the globe” [Collier, Maurer, and Suarez-Navaz 1996:1–2]), the authors argue, engenders “legal constructions of naturalized identities” (Collier, Maurer, and Suarez-Navaz 1996:3). They conclude that:

“[to] the degree that bourgeois law presupposes subjects with different interests capable of articulating and contesting their concerns, it encourages subjects to come together and assert their rights: to claim that their equal rights have been denied them based on difference, to assert that their difference – in cultural heritage, for instance – obliges them to demand special rights, or even to design their own system of rights based on their difference. [...] Law and bourgeois legality [encourage] people to be ‘free to find themselves’ and thus to ‘realize’ the ‘inner’ qualities that distinguish them from others. The kinds of ‘selves’ they are free to find are the basis of identity politics today. (Collier, Maurer, and Suarez-Navaz 1996:21)

In French’s conceptualization, the process of “legalizing identities” has different entangled dimensions that play out simultaneously (French 2009:13). Most importantly for the case at hand, she emphasizes how important it is that people are confronted with and experience “new or revised ethnoracial identities,” for instance when they “invoke rights based on newly codified legal identities” (French 2009:13). At the same time, local cultural practices are reconfigured, often in order to become vehicles for expressing particular identities in the course of the recognition process. This leads to situations where meaning and boundaries of community, as well as the terms of belonging are called into question and may be reconfigured. What is more, and although particular identities may have only recently been assumed and/or throughout the process of recognition “extrapolated from (or read into) the law,” they are nevertheless often regarded to have essentialized characteristics.¹⁰ As French emphasizes, these components of “legalizing identities” are neither meant

9 Her example is concerned with women who have been victims of violence and their interactions with the police, prosecutors, judges, shelter workers and feminist advocates, but her general points are easily translatable to a wide range of encounters.

10 Another important aspect in French’s example in Brazil has not been as important in Bolivia up to this moment. She argues that the meanings of the laws that are invoked through processes of recognition can also be reshaped when communities, legislators, and specialists – including anthropologists – negotiate the terms of recognition of “new identities.” So, for

to be regarded as describing a necessary sequence of events, nor as an exhaustive list of all the processes playing a role in the transformation of ethnoracial identities (French 2009:12–13). We also have to be cautious not to overstate the role of law on the one hand, and on the other the ‘novelty’ of the identities that emerge through engagement with legal categories. After all, ‘black’ and ‘Indian’/indigenous are very long-standing categorizations with deep histories in Latin America (Wade 2010). What “legalizing identities” thus helps elicit is the question of the salience of certain identities in certain contexts and moments – and what law has to do with it – but not their existence. In particular, my discussion of Cala Cala’s tourism project in chapter 10 owes a great deal to French’s approach. As will become clear, *Cala Caleños* built on a rather recent salience and importance of the legally recognized category “*Afroboliviano*” in pursuit of a specific project. Engaging the logics behind the category, however, has important consequences way beyond the specific project and entails a profound reconfiguration of identities, local histories and interethnic relations.

Although this book is mainly concerned with the processes that legal recognition of the specific category “*Afroboliviano*” has engendered in Bolivia, there is a more generalized corollary of the legal recognition and codification of categories of identity. Identity (Afrobolivian, indigenous or otherwise) has acquired an unprecedented force as both a strategic asset in political mobilization and as a means to secure attention and funding from the Bolivian state and international cooperation. I argue that the legal codification of categories of identity in general is the preliminary peak of a process that began almost half a decade ago, leading to the pervasive presence of “ID-ology” in contemporary Bolivia. With the term ID-ology, which I borrow from John and Jean Comaroff (Comaroff and Comaroff 2003; reprinted as part of Comaroff and Comaroff 2012), I refer to the tendency to represent social interaction (conflict as well as integration), politics and cultural practice mainly as matters of differing identities.¹¹ This process has its roots in the 1970s, when in-

example, the definition of what is now regarded a *Quilombo* in Brazil was significantly shaped by the recognition of specific communities under the *Quilombo* clause.

- 11 Writing about South Africa, the Comaroffs have mostly political contexts in mind in their discussion of the term ID-ology. They refer to a general characteristic of the postcolony that also applies to Bolivia, namely the fact that postcolonial states were not built on the basis of a culturally homogenous nation united through horizontal fraternity – as proposed by Benedict Anderson in his seminal work “Imagined Communities” (Anderson 2006 [1983]). Rather, postcolonial nations have been and are still marked by a “fractious heterogeneity” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2003:456) and “a terrain on which increasingly irreconcilable, fractal forms of political being [...] seek to open up possibilities for themselves” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2003:447). Studying how conflicts are resolved under such circumstances, they discern a “displacement from the struggle between political visions to struggles in the name of interest and affect.” “And interest and affect,” they continue to argue, “congeal in identity [...]” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009:41).

indigenous movements and intellectuals began questioning the promise of national integration through acculturation put forth by the Bolivian state after the National Revolution of 1952. They put culture, identity and indigeneity back on the political agenda and political discourse shifted from debating mainly ideological alternatives (Marxism, Trotskyism, Capitalism) to debating identities (Aymara, Quechua, white, *mestizo*, indigenous). Driven by internal and external influences (see chapter 2), the Bolivian state responded through multicultural reform, the propagation of indigenous rights, bilingual education and the acknowledgement of Bolivia's pluri-ethnic make-up. Beginning in the 1970s, indigenous politics came, by and large, to be reframed as identity politics. Social inequality, discrimination and exploitation were increasingly interpreted as matters of cultural difference, ethnic diversity and indigenous identity, overshadowing the class aspect of the conflicts in Bolivian society and making talk of identity a ubiquitous phenomenon. This logic is now laid down in written form in the Constitution and Bolivian-style plurinational ID-ology is marked by the fact that the question of identity is positioned at the forefront of debates on nationhood, citizenship, participation, entitlement and equality. ID-ology has been converted from an option in political discourse to the legally sanctioned backdrop of understanding political and social life in the country. This is not to say that ideological debates have been entirely silenced and alternative interpretations of social reality have vanished. What I want to point out is the fact that ID-ology, "the '-ology' of identity" (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009:41) now occupies a central position in the country, permeating not only political realms but also the "small spaces of [everyday] life" (Canessa 2012c).

The final question then is how – and to what extent – legally codified identities and the general framework of plurinational ID-ology inform everyday life and the dynamics of immediate, day-to-day interactions of individuals and small communities. In order to approach this issue I draw on Andrew Canessa's (Canessa 2012c) concept of "intimate indigeneities" to make sense of the intimate Afrobolivianities "in the small spaces of everyday life." Canessa urges us to

"focu[s] on the question of what it means to be indigenous to indigenous people themselves, not only when they are running for office or marching in protest but especially when they are in the small spaces of their lives, when they are lamenting their lot, cooing with their babies, cooking in their kitchens, or talking to their husbands who are far away." (Canessa 2012c:2)

This by no means contradicts concerns with (political) articulations of indigeneity or Afrobolivianity, but rather complements them: Canessa explicitly describes his project as being concerned with "those intimate social interactions to examine how identities are formed and articulated on a day-to-day level" (Canessa 2012c:35) without losing sight of the fact that even the most intimate sites of social practice (in

his example the kitchen) are not isolated from the “political and economic currents of the nation” (Canessa 2012c:2).

Overview of chapters

In Bolivia’s current plurinational moment, processes of collective identification, political articulation and law converge in the unprecedented efforts to ‘re-found’ the country and transform its society. I analyze Afrobolivianity as a collective identification articulated at the intersection of local communities, politics and the law. Studying Afrobolivian people’s often contradictory and highly contingent engagement with legally codified categories of identity offers a privileged vantage point from which to analyze the social and political dynamics shaping the country as a whole. Over 500 years of colonial and republican history, half a century of Bolivian (identity) politics, 30 years of Afrobolivian cultural revitalization and the emerging logics of Bolivia’s plurinational 21st century crystallize around such seemingly simple and intuitive acts as ‘invoking rights as Afrobolivians.’ My study of Afrobolivianity thus aims not only at filling an ethnographic lacuna by systematically addressing the experiences of Afrobolivians, but also contributes to a more thorough understanding of Bolivia’s current political conjuncture, its historical and conceptual roots, as well as its emerging social consequences. My aim is to shed light on the social dimensions of recent legal and political reforms in Bolivia and the consequences these have for people.

Beyond Bolivia, I contribute to anthropological debates on indigeneity and blackness in Latin America by pointing out their deep entanglements and continuous interactions. Analyzing local discourses on Afrobolivian autochthony, shared culture and ethnic ‘groupness’ through the lens of Afro-indigenous articulations contributes to decentering the all-too-common association of indigeneity with ‘autochthonous Indians’ in Latin America. It furthermore calls into question the equally widespread assumption that blackness in Latin America is best understood in a transnational, de-territorialized framework. Afrobolivianity, the term I use for the specific Afro-indigenous articulation I am dealing with in this book, is as much a matter of roots, territory and autochthony as it is a matter of displacement, diaspora and globalized black culture. My study also aims at enriching debates on politico-legal reform and social transformation more generally, pointing out how and under what circumstances collective identifications and intergroup relations stabilize and change.

In chapter 1, “*Encountering Afrobolivianity*,” I introduce the field sites of my study and discuss my methodology and the multiplicity of perspectives on Afrobolivianity that characterize this book. I furthermore address the dangers of reification

when studying categories of identification and briefly introduce some major organizational actors that will become important throughout the following chapters.

In chapter 2, entitled “*The Afrobolivian Presence in Bolivia, Then and Now*,” I shed light on relevant aspects of Afrobolivian history and situate it within the wider context of Bolivia’s political and social history. On the one hand, I summarize the available literature on Afrobolivians from a variety of scholarly perspectives, while on the other hand I situate this literature within debates on Bolivian national identity and strategies of political integration.

Opening the ethnographic part of this study, chapter 3, “*We are los Afros de Cala Cala*,” introduces Cala Cala, a small community in the province of *Nor Yungas* that was the main field site of this study. After briefly situating Cala Cala in the regional and historical context, I will shed light on the processes of articulating a collective identification based on ethnoracial affiliations in Cala Cala – in emic terms: “*los Afros de Cala Cala*” – and describe the practices through which belonging to this collective is enacted and becomes socially relevant. I will show how notions of community and collective identification as Afrobolivians are produced in a process of articulating kinship affiliations and networks, local history and translocal practices of sociality.

In chapter 4, entitled “*Cala Cala beyond ‘lo Afro’: Cumplir Función Social, Identidad Yungueña and the Comunidad Cocalera*,” I will introduce an alternative perspective on community and collective identification in Cala Cala. This perspective entails a notion of community that is on the one hand broader than “*los Afros de Cala Cala*” as it includes non-Afrobolivians, with whom “*los Afros de Cala Cala*” share economic, religious and political networks. On the other hand, it is also narrower, as it is limited to a territorially bounded community of social and economic practice, “*la comunidad cocalera*,” the community of coca farmers.

Chapter 5, “*The Changing Meanings of Ethnoracial Identifications in Cala Cala*,” builds on the preceding chapters and discusses how different categories of identification are employed in negotiating belonging and a sense of community. Although “*los Afros de Cala Cala*” and “*la comunidad cocalera*” are not mutually exclusive categories of identification and social practice, I argue that the growing salience of the legally codified category “*Afroboliviano*” has led to an emerging reconfiguration of intergroup relations, fostering ethnic stereotyping, as well as a reinterpretation of local history and relations in economic and political spheres.

At this point my study widens the scope of analysis and situates the discussion of Cala Cala’s local particularities within nationally circulating discourses on race, ethnicity and culture and how they relate to conceptualizations of Afrobolivianity.

In chapter 6, “*What It Means to Be Afro: Afrobolivianity, Indigeneity and the African Diaspora in Bolivia*,” I argue that what it means to be “*Afro*” in Bolivia is as much a matter of race (thought to be expressed through phenotype and ancestry), as it is a matter of ethnicity (expressed through ‘culture’ and customs). As such, Afrobo-

livianity is not only a matter of being black, but a concept deeply entangled with notions of indigeneity and debates on *mestizaje* (understood as racial and cultural mixture of particular individuals as well as in terms of referring to a general aspect of society). Consequently, debates on Afrobolivianity mirror engagement with the rooted politics of place characteristic of the otherwise global movement of indigenism, as well as with the transnationally circulating ideas of the diasporic black public sphere.

Chapter 7, “*We are Culture, not Color’: Musicians, Technocrats and the (Re-)Making of Afrobolivian Culture’*,” elaborates on some of the aspects discussed in the preceding chapter, highlighting the growing importance of conceptualizing Afrobolivianity beyond race and phenotype as a category of ‘culture.’ This ongoing shift is analyzed in the context of cultural performance and folklore, as well as with regard to recent efforts at cataloging Afrobolivian culture in the aftermath of legal recognition and political enfranchisement.

Chapter 8, “*El Movimiento Afroboliviano’: Cultural Revitalization, Citizenship and Development*,” summarizes the history of Afrobolivian activism from the 1980s until the early 21st century. Emerging as a movement of cultural revival linked to a specific dance – *la saya Afroboliviana* – “*el Movimiento Afro*” evolved from a local effort of a group of high school students to a nationally active conglomerate of individual and institutional actors navigating the realms of local politics, the national folklore and tourism industry, Bolivia’s state multiculturalism, and international development.

Chapter 9, “*Rights, Recognition, and New Forms of Organization – The Judicialization of Afrobolivian Activism and the Rise of CONAFRO*,” explores more recent and emerging political developments. I argue that in the context of constitutional reform and in the aftermath of legal recognition, Afrobolivian activism is increasingly inspired by legal discourse and now heavily centers on the notion of *el pueblo Afroboliviano* as a collective subject of rights.

Chapter 10, “*Plurinational Afrobolivianity on the Ground and Built Identity Politics: La Casa Cultural Afro Cala Cala and the Centro de Interpretación de la Cultura Afroboliviana*,” eventually leads us back to Cala Cala. In 2014, people from Cala Cala began developing a small community tourism project based on “Afrobolivian culture.” This project eventually culminated not only in the realization of the Afrobolivian cultural center envisioned by the community (*La Casa Cultural Afro Cala Cala*), but also in the construction of a large museum dedicated to “Afrobolivian culture” (*Centro de Interpretación de la Cultura Afroboliviana*). The exceptional developments surrounding this project help draw together the arguments made with regard to the local particularities of the community, as well as with regard to Afrobolivianity in plurinational Bolivia more generally.

