Scales of Resistance

Indigenous Women's Transborder Activism

Maylei Blackwell

Scales of Resistance

Scales of Resistance

Indigenous Women's Transborder Activism

Maylei Blackwell

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham and London 2023

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Designed by Courtney Leigh Richardson
Typeset in IBM Plex and Portrait by Typesetter, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Blackwell, Maylei, [date] author.
Title: Scales of resistance : indigenous women's transborder activism / Maylei Blackwell.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2022. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2022029792 (print) | LCCN 2022029793 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478017967 (paperback)
ISBN 9781478015352 (hardcover)
ISBN 9781478022602 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478092742 (ebook other)
Subjects: LCSH: Mexican American women—Political activity. | Indigenous women—Political activity—Mexico. | Women political activists—Mexico. | Women political activists—United States. | BISAC: SOCIAL SCIENCE / Ethnic Studies / American / Native American Studies | SOCIAL SCIENCE / Gender Studies
Classification: LCC E184.M5 B533 2022 (print) | LCC E184.M5 (ebook) | DDC 305.48/86872073—dc23/eng/20220622
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022029792
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022029793

Cover art: Indigenous women activists across Abiayala at the opening ceremony of the seventh Continental Network of Indigenous Women, Guatemala City, November 15, 2015. Photo by Maylei Blackwell.

This book is freely available in an open access edition thanks to TOME (Toward an Open Monograph Ecosystem)—a collaboration of the Association of American Universities, the Association of University Presses, and the Association of Research Libraries—and the generous support of Arcadia, a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin, and the UCLA Library. Learn more at the TOME website, available at: openmonographs.org.

Contents

Illustrations

Abbreviations

AMIO

Asamblea de Mujeres Indígenas de Oaxaca (Assembly of Indigenous Women of Oaxaca)

ANIPA

Asamblea Nacional Indígena Plural por la Autonomía (National Plural Indigenous Assembly for Autonomy)

APPO

Asamblea Popular de los Pueblos Oaxaca (Popular Assembly of Oaxacan People)

AZACHIS

Asamblea de Autoridades Zapotecas y Chinantecas de la Sierra (Assembly of Zapotec and Chinantec Authorities)

CAMI

Casa de Mujer Indígena (Indigenous Women's House)

CBDIO

Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueña (Binational Center for Oaxacan Indigenous Development)

CDI

Comisión Nacional para el Desarollo de los Pueblos Indígenas

CEDAW

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

CGMI

Coordinadora Guerrerense de Mujeres Indígenas (Guerreran Coordinator of Indigenous Women)

CHIRLA

Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles

CIELO

Comunidades Indígenas en Liderazgo (Indigenous Communities in Leadership)

CIG

Concejo Indigena de Gobierno (Indigenous Governing Council)

CMPIO

Coalición de Maestros y Promotores Indígenas de Oaxaca

CNI

Congreso Nacional Indígena (National Indigenous Congress)

COCOPA

Comisión de Concordia y Pacificación (Commission on Concordance and Pacification)

CODREMI

Comité de Defensa de los Recursos Humanos y Culturales Mixes (Committee in Defense of Mixe Human and Cultural Resources)

CONAIE

Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador)

CONAMI

Coordinadora Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de México (National Coordinator of Indigenous Women)

CONAMIE

Confederación Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas del Ecuador (National Confederation of Indigenous Women of Ecuador)

CONAYA

Comisión Nacional de Intermediación (National Intermediation Commission)

CRAC-PC

Coordinadora Regional de Autoridades Comunitarias—Policía Comunitaria (Regional Coordinator of Community Authorities—Communitarian Police)

ECMIA

Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de las Americas, formerly Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de Abya Yala (Continental Network of Indigenous Women of the Americas, formerly of Abya Yala)

EZLN

Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (Zapatista Army of National Liberation)

FIOB

Frente Indígena de Organizaciones Binacionales (Indigenous Front of Binational Organizations), formerly Frente Indígena Oaxaqueña Binacional (Binational Oaxacan Indigenous Front)

FIPI

Frente Independiente de Pueblos Indios (Independent Front of Indigenous Peoples)

HTA

hometown association

ILO

International Labor Organization

MIEL

Mujeres Indígenas en Liderazgo (Indigenous Women in Leadership)

NAFTA

North American Free Trade Agreement

NGO

Nongovernmental organization

ORO

Organización Regional de Oaxaca (Regional Organization of Oaxaca)

PAN

Partido Acción Nacional (National Action Party)

PRD

Partido de la Revolución Democrático (Party of the Democratic Revolution)

PRI

Partido Revolucionario Institucional (Institutional Revolutionary Party)

REDMMI

La Red de Mujeres Mixes (Network of Mixe Women)

SER

Servicios del Pueblo Mixe (Services of the Mixe Pueblo)

UCIZONI

Unión de Comunidades Indígenas de la Zona Norte del Istmo (Union of Indigenous Communities of the Northern Zone of the Isthmus)

UN

United Nations

UNDRIP

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People

Prelude

Walking Together: The Politics of Acompañamiento

I live in and teach on the unceded territory of the Tongva (Gabrielino) people and honor them as the traditional caretakers of Tovaangar, the land now known as Los Angeles and the South Channel Islands. As a two-spirit Thai Cherokee relative, I recognize and honor them as the stewards of the land and water and offer my gratitude to these ancestors past, present, and emerging. I dedicate this book to all those Indigenous women and their allies who fight colonial, feminicidal, structural, institutional, and political violence and work to heal themselves and their communities. *Scales of Resistance* is inspired by so many fellow travelers, luchadoras, and dreamers who are now ancestors, including Nellys, Marya, Tatiana, Horacio, Policarpo, Irma, and Martha. It is an offering in honor of the world we are building together and the future generations who will inherit it.

This book is a gift of the collective knowledge of Indigenous women activists in what is now Mexico and its diaspora in the United States. This knowledge was generated and shared with me while accompanying Indigenous women's organizing for over twenty years. It draws from seventy oral histories I conducted and more than eighty events I attended, including local, national, and transborder/transnational meetings, encuentros (gatherings), marches, workshops, and shared projects. This project's path has been guided by community-based, activist research and shaped by the deep collective conversations it engendered—a research process that changed as I traveled a shared path with others. Research undertaken in this way opens a journey created by rich connections, relationships, and commitments, all of which have taken me on unforeseen paths I could have never imagined when I set out. In this way, the research processes at the center of this book are rivers that flow through and have shaped much of my adult life.

I came to intellectual life and academia through politics and activism. On January 1, 1994, during the first year of my doctoral studies in the History of Consciousness program at the University of California (UC) Santa Cruz, an Indigenous rebellion led by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, or the

EZLN (the acronym formed from its Spanish name, Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional), sparked a global movement organized around the alternative to the ravages of the neoliberal economic order gripping the planet envisioned by the EZLN. A few years earlier, in 1992, I participated in the cross-border Indigenous networks formed throughout Turtle Island—what is known as the Americas—to refuse the five-hundred-year celebration of Christopher Columbus's so-called discovery of the Americas and to forge an Indigenous, Black, and popular front of resistance. In Mexico in the early 1990s, Indigenous people created a national movement, breaking out of the peasant and class-based organizing of prior generations to challenge anew, through mass mobilizations and uprisings, their own economic, political, and social marginalization. Indigenous women were at the center of these movements for Indigenous autonomy and continue to be. As the most marginal of the marginalized, they devised new strategies and discourses of political participation, equity and inclusion, and autonomy by weaving in and between household, community, municipal, regional, national, and international scales of power. Yet the promise and hope of the 1990s and Mexico's precarious transition to democracy aimed at transforming authoritarian populist nationalism forms of governance, undergirded by the coloniality of power, were undermined by the mass social inequality of neoliberal reforms and later, large-scale violence of an emerging narcostate and drug cartels.

I began working with Indigenous activists and organizers in Mexico in 1998, initially accompanying their organizing as an activist. Later, as we built trust and long-term relationships, we created activist research and collaborative research practices. These forms of accountability and knowledge production have begun to transform the historically uneven, and often exploitative, relations of power that university researchers have practiced in their research with Indigenous peoples. I have researched, written, and even published with the Indigenous women activists I write about. As a doctoral student in my twenties, I was called to Mexico to understand the role of difference in women's organizing in Mexico and the United States. I sought to study lesbian, Indigenous, and working-class organizing or questions of difference in women's organizing. Yet the urgency and vibrancy of Indigenous women's organizing eclipsed other aspects of my original project. Guided by ethics of Indigenous self-determination, autonomy, and my activist commitments, my conversations around decolonizing methodologies and collaborative and community-based research grounded in Indigenous protocols of knowledge production, permission, respect, and reciprocity evolved along with the work.

I started work with CONAMI (Coordinadora Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Mexico/National Coordinator of Indigenous Women) in the late 1990s in

Mexico City. As a relatively young scholar-activist the same age as the younger women in the founding cohort of CONAMI activists, including Martha Sánchez Nestor (Amuzgo from Guerrero) and Cándida Jimenez (Ayuujk [Mixe] from Oaxaca), who provided the backbone of early organizational labor, I fell in with them, hauling huge pots of beans, photocopying materials and making carpetas (folders) for national trainings for members that CONAMI hosted every other month in Mexico City, for which activists from all over the country came into the capital. I often met with activists in the apartment office the organization shared with K'inal Antesetik DF, under the leadership of Afro-Colombian socialist feminist Nellys Palomo, where CONAMI organizers would often stay. I fell into accompanying and working alongside organizers because I came from a working-class, activist background and political organizing came to me easier than the research I was conducting for my dissertation. That was how I began on the path of acompañando (accompanying) Indigenous women's organizing in Mexico, and I did not know where it would lead. We sometimes remembered to turn on a tape recorder or to sit down to conduct a formal oral history interview after long meetings or early in the mornings before activists would depart the capital on their long journeys back home to the mountains of Oaxaca, as was the case with Cándida Jimenez; to the rich P'urépecha homelands in Michoacán like Tomasa Sandoval of the Nación P'urépecha Zapatista; or to the states of Veracruz, Chiapas, and Guerrero, like other activists.

Over time, I realized that the process of accompanying Indigenous women's organizing and thus my research process followed the multiscalar nature of Indigenous women's resistance, weaving in and between local, national, international, continental, and transborder organizing. I lived in Mexico City in the late 1990s and met many Indigenous women activists who came into the capitol regularly for those national meetings. I conducted some early interviews during national meetings or the bimonthly national trainings CONAMI organized in its early years. Other times, I sat and waited for appointments with activists who were caught up in endless meetings, like the day I spent waiting in the Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD) offices in Mexico City for an interview with Margarita Gutiérrez, a Hñahñú activist who worked in the PRD's Secretariat of Indigenous Peoples and was one of two Indigenous women who worked on the women's sessions of the San Andrés Peace Accords. On other occassions, I rode the bus for days to attend meetings or conduct oral histories, like the one I conducted with Zapotec/Ayuujk (Mixe) leader Sofía Robles at the offices of Servicios del Pueblo Mixe (SER) in Santa Maria Tlahuitoltepec, the Southern Mixe region in the southwest of the state of Oaxaca.

In those heady days of the Indigenous movement, much activity and organizing occurred. After I moved back to California, I returned often to Mexico and was honored and inspired to attend the Second National Encuentro of Indigenous Women in Chilpancingo, Guerrero, in 2000. Hundreds of Indigenous women gathered to demand justice for women who suffered under the increased militarization of their communities, due to increased political repression of their movements. Together they analyzed the gendered racialized violence against Indigenous women forging the early movement against feminicide and the heightened violence enacted by the state and narcotraffickers in the War on Drugs—which all too often looked like a war on Indigenous communities. I had been in women of color feminist organizing circles that initiated INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence and as an early member in the Bay Area and Los Angeles chapters, I saw the interconnection between colonial and state violence and intimate partner violence and the challenges of seeking solutions that did not rely on and reinforce structures of policing founded on racial violence, settler colonial occupation, and class oppression. I immediately recognized these connections in Indigenous women's fight against gendered and state violence in Mexico.

CONAMI's second encuentro represented the growth of a multigenerational struggle of Indigenous women. In Chilpancingo, Guerrero, I continued interviewing founding members of CONAMI who were of an older generation, including María de Jesús Patricio, a Nahuatl healer known as Marichuey who became the spokesperson for the Indigenous Govering Council of the National Indigenous Congress that, as a collective, ran to become a presidential candidate in the 2018 elections. I met Doña Rufina Villa from Masehual Siuamej Mosenyolchicauani (Women Who Support Each Other), one of the oldest Indigenous women's organizations in the country, formed in 1985 in Cuetzalan, Puebla. Tomasa Sandoval, a powerful leader from the Nación P'urépecha Zapatista of Michoacán, spoke on one of the plenary panels delivering a persuasive analysis that debunked the dichotomy between individual and collective rights that pits women's rights against Indigenous rights in Western legal thought. These leaders comprised a different generation in CONAMI whose leadership and social authority was grounded in their experience as mothers and as leaders and organizers of their families, communities, and local organizations. The second encuentro also included a dynamic generation of younger activists who were forged in the fire of Indigenous autonomous struggles, including Hermalinda Turbicio, a Mixtec leader from Guerrero who had stepped into leadership when the men of her community were arrested because of state repression in response to the community declaring themselves autonomous, and "Lorena," a

leader from a weavers collective in Chiapas whose empowerment and consciousness shifted along with the EZLN's women's revolutionary law and the historic community deliberation of women during the San Andrés Peace Accords following the 1994 Zapatista uprising.

Some of the oral histories and collaborative research were conducted at multiple "local" and regional scales, such as hometowns and organizations' offices in municipal centers. For example, the first oral history I conducted with Zapotec/Ayuujk (Mixe) leader Sofía Robles at the offices of Servicios del Pueblo Mixe (SER) in Santa Maria Tlahuitoltepec, the Southern Mixe region in the southwest of the state of Oaxaca. I rode the bus for a day to meet Sofía for that first interview in Tlahuitoltepec. Over the years I conducted return interviews with her in the SER offices in the state capital of Oaxaca City, where she coordinated women's rights work in the Mixe region, across the state and internationally. I continued to meet and interview her as she traveled to Los Angeles as part of the rich connections of the Indigenous diaspora from Oaxaca in California. I conducted other research at the continental scale across solidarity networks of Indigenous people that span Abiayala, a scale of solidarity anchored in land epistemologies of the Guna people of Panama and Colombia. Invoked by Indigenous organizers across the continent that is now called the Americas, Indigenous women conjure this scale of organizing based on Indigenous relationships and commitments to land in ways that disrupt settler colonial nation-state borders of what scholars call "transnational" organizing. By organizing across multiple borders, Indigenous women foreground their Indigenous nations and territories based on their cosmovisions, notions of place, and responsibilities, weaving them into the scales that are conjured, traversed, interwoven, and trans-ed through this organizing. This research included accompanying activists from Mexico who helped to form the Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de Abya Yala (Continental Network of Indigenous Women, ECMIA); the group later changed *Abya Yala* to *the Americas* as activists learned which Indigenous epistemologies translated across scales and which were not effectively scalable.

In this way, I accompanied activists at continental and international meetings and transnational scales of activism that organizers use to cross colonial scales created by and between nation-states as well as scales conjured by Indigenous epistemologies and advocacy networks for Indigenous and women's rights activists globally. For example, although I missed Margarita Gutiérrez that afternoon in the PRD offices when I lived in Mexico City, I eventually sat down with her in 2001 in Durban, South Africa, at the NGO Forum of the World Conference against Racism, where we conducted our first of many oral histo-

ries. In chapter 2, I document how the scale of Abiayala was conjured, to use Anna Tsing's word (2012), and map Indigenous women's multiscalar activism within diverse transnational sites such as the Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encuentros, ECMIA gatherings, hemispheric Indigenous gatherings, and UN meetings.

My role as researcher and participant in these spaces was richly layered and complex, and it often shifted. It was informed by my own identities and political commitments as an urban native, mixed-race, two-spirit/queer, feminist researcher formed in women of color feminist and anti-imperialist politics. I was a researcher accompanying Mexican Indigenous women and ECMIA activists and a member of women's native rights networks and two-spirit communities from the North. Unlike other researchers who were positioned as observers or guests, I sometimes was invited as a guest or observer, and other times was positioned as an activist/member of the organizations and networks I was accompanying and documenting. For example, Indigenous activists from Mexico invited me to speak as a native feminist activist at a session they organized at one of the Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encuentros and invited mestiza feminist researchers to participate as allies. At other times Northern native women's organizers and friends positioned me as part of our regional formation, particularly when I attended Northern meetings as a participant rather than as an observer accompanying women to the Mexico and Central America meetings. I attended the World Conference of Indigenous Women in Lima, Peru, to catch up with friends and activists from all over Latin America, all members of ECMIA. During each meal, elders and knowledge holders from Northern Indigenous women's organizations in the United States would sit next to me and regale me with their powerful histories and stories of organizing. After a time, they told me that some of the founding members had shared their histories because they wanted to collaborate with me to document the origins of one of the older networks of Indigenous women's organizing, which I thought was a beautiful project I am honored to do. I may have been in that space to do return interviews with organizers from the South, but native women from the North had plans, too, and they positioned me within their own agendas—and of course, I was a willing coconspirator.

I kept in touch with activists over the years by traveling to Mexico and international meetings and, between meetings, by connecting through social media, email, and WhatsApp. After I returned to California and finished my PhD, I moved to Oakland to undertake a UC President's Postdoctoral Fellowship under the mentorship of Norma Alarcon at UC Berkeley. There I organized forums and tours to bring activists like Nellys Palomo from K'inal Antsetik

and Martha Sánchez of CONAMI to the United States to give talks (for example, at an event called "Rebellion at the Roots," which I organized at the San Francisco Women's Building) or to attend meetings with other Indigenous women to build the Northern Network of Continental Network of Indigenous Women. Cherríe Moraga and Celia Herrera hosted these visitors at their home in Oakland to bring them together with members of the Red Xicana Indígenas. Martha Sánchez and I later traveled to Chicago to attend the INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence Conference and to meet up with other Northern native women to build the northern region of ECMIA. This was before Mexico broke off to become a separate region, thereby illustrating how activists not just weave in and between existing scales, but conjure new ones. Despite the fact that they are geopolitically located in North America within hegemonic geographies, Mexico created their own region within the network by arguing that, even though they are only one country, they are so large and diverse and yet, too linguistically and culturally different from the United States and Canada, that organizationally Mexico should operate as one of the regions within the network, which not only expanded the North, Central, South regional scalar organization of the network but exemplified the flexibility in conjuring new scales of resistance. After that tour, Martha and I finished our second and longest, oral history interview at the San Francisco International Airport. I have met up with her many times over the years at Indigenous gatherings and meetings. I have continued to interview her, even when our time was short because we had meetings, were drafting declarations, or were just catching up on life. This is why it was devastating to learn that Martha died of COVID-19 complications in 2021 (Burgete Cal y Mayor 2021), as had many other Indigenous activists, including Los Angeles-based Maya K'iche, spiritual leader, interpreter, and founder of Mayavision Policarpo Chaj (Solis 2021). Other times I was able to invite ECMIA members such as Tarcila Rivera Zea, Margarita Gutiérrrez, and Sonia Henríquez to visit UCLA. While Tarcila's schedule did not permit her to come, both Margarita and Sonia joined me in 2014.

Over the years, I continued to return to Mexico to attend events with CONAMI. In 1999, I traveled with Nellys Palomo, an advisor to the CONAMI who also tragically died in an accidental fall in 2009, to the mountains of Guerrero to do a training workshop on Indigenous autonomy and women's rights. Riding in the back of a camioneta (a pickup truck) with people headed home from the market with their turkeys and crops, we became ensnared at a checkpoint the Mexican state used to repress Indigenous social movements by using the War on Drugs as a pretext. This is part of what Aida Hernández Castillo (2018) calls the continuum of violence where the Dirty War of state repression

against organized resistance movements between the 1960s and 1980s merged with the repression of Indigenous autonomy movements in the 1990s and later connected the use of the Mexican military to occupy Indigenous communities in resistance under the guise of the Drug War in the 2000s. We were detained and had to wait hours before we were allowed to move on; by then it was too late to make it to the community. I have vivid memories of this trip because I started smoking again after quitting six months after I finished my dissertation—one of seven attempts to quit before it finally stuck.

There were other negotiations to consider while doing fieldwork. In those years that I lived and traveled back and forth to Mexico frequently I had short hair and presented as less feminine so I had to navigate different gender, sexual, and racial conventions as a queer, mixed-race urban native feminist who stood out as wearing "men's" shoes. Over time my presentation became more femme, and some negotiations became easier, whereas others became differently complex—as when I was propositioned at political meetings and conferences or had to turn down marriage proposals with some grace and humor. My being queer/two spirit meant becoming a parent relatively late in life, so I was often regarded as a perpetual señorita—a young, unmarried woman—even when I was the same age as the grown women we addressed with the respectful *Doña*. Class and racial differences have always been indexed by how I am addressed. I noticed the rigidity of the class structure in Mexico and that I had little in common with other academics and researchers I met due to differences in our class backgrounds. They were referred to by their academic titles (with the forms of social distance that implies), whereas I was not. Nor did I need to be. These negotiations became even more intense as the "field" became more integrated with daily life and activism as I began organizing and working with migrant Indigenous women in California.

Other scales of accompaniment and research include the translocalities or transregions created by the Indigenous migrant routes that link, through dense diasporic ties, the Sierra Norte, the Central Valleys, and the Mixteca regions of Oaxaca to Mexico City, Baja California, and the California cities of Oceanside, Los Angeles, Fresno, and Santa Maria—so much so that these locations form a transborder scale. In 2005, Odilia Romero was elected as the Binational Coordinator of Women's Affairs. She invited me to become an advisor to FIOB. Later, as FIOB members wrote a research proposal to study ways to diversify FIOB's binational leadership, they invited Laura Velasco, of the Colegio de la Frontera Norte, and me to join the team. The proposal won the group the Latin American Studies Association's Otros Saberes Grant, which funds Indigenous and Afro-descendant knowledge producers. For many years,

I worked in solidarity with the FIOB and supported its members as they built leadership development programs for women. I met with the team of facilitators and supported them with documentation and resources as we built the Mujeres Indígenas en Liderazgo (MIEL) workshops held in Oaxaca and California. I met Janet Martinez, Odilia's daughter, when she was fifteen in their small studio apartment jammed with shelves of books, in the Pico Union district of Los Angeles. During that meeting, we made food as they shared their plan to reinitiate *El Tequio*, FIOB's magazine, by modeling it on the feminist magazine *Bitch*. After Janet went to college at UC Berkeley, Poncho joined Odilia as her life partner, and I have fond memories of bringing their son his favorite Cookie Monster cake for one of his first birthdays. A highlight of working in collaboration with Odilia and Janet are the many working sessions over Oaxacan, Thai, and Korean food.

Another long-term relationship that has informed this work is with Dr. Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, Mixtec scholar and founding member of the FIOB, who I met in graduate school in Santa Cruz. We have shared many political and research collaborations as fellow travelers journeying, for example, to the Mixteca for research and staying at his family's home or to the fields of San Quintin to bring mutual aid and solidarity to striking Oaxacan Indigenous agricultural workers. Accompanying the base building and leadership development of Indigenous migrant women has been a great honor. I've witnessed the joys and sorrows of these strong women, including Monserrat, who learned to fight for herself as a young girl in the Central Valleys of Oaxaca and who uses this strength and resilience as an organizer of tenants and domestic workers. As we sat in the park to do our interview, she told me about getting up at 3 or 4 a.m. to do all the "women's work," which fell on her shoulders when her mother passed away, and then walking miles to school—all to show her dad that her dream of going to school would not interfere with the labor she was charged with completing. As she shared the struggle and exhaustion of those years trying to access education, the waves of memories swept over us, and we wept together on the park bench. Reflecting on her fight to go to school, she shook her head and shared how challenging it was to animate her kids to want to pursue their educations, as they were often consumed by video games and did not understand her arduous struggle for what they take for granted.

Yet, another courageous woman I met was Doña Mari, who told me how she crossed the border while carrying an infant to join her husband working in the United States. Before she would let me interview her, she thanked me for mentoring her son—that same baby who had been my student at UCLA: the talented Zapotec historian Luis Sánchez-López, who went on to earn a PhD in

History and become a professor at the University of California, Irvine. Many of these collaborations grew into friendships and other shared projects of Indigenous women's empowerment, Indigenous survivance across colonial borders, and digital storytelling that spanned years of meetings, marches, fundraisers, ceremonies, solidarity tours, and parties in the Los Angeles neighborhoods of Korea Town, Pico Union, Westlake, and the city of Long Beach. These relationships crossed Oaxacan migrant geographies including the communities of Oceanside, Santa Maria, Fresno, Ventura, and San Diego in California; San Quintin and Tijuana in Baja California; and Oaxaca City, Huajuapan de León, Santiago Juxtlahuaca, Tlacolula de Matamoros, Zantatepec, or the Isthmus of Juchitán in Oaxaca; and in Mexico City.

While working on this project, I lived in many Indigenous homelands, including Awaswas Ohlone, Chumash, Tewa, and Tongva territories. I've also visited many other Indigenous territories where Indigenous women are weaving their scales of activism, including Hñähñú (Otomí), Zapotec, Ñu Savi (Mixtec), Triqui, Ayuujk (Mixe), Amuzgo, Mexica, Maya, Nahuatl, and Guna in Fresno, Oceanside, and Los Angeles, California; Morelos in the State of Mexico; Michoacán, Guerrero, Oaxaca, Chiapas, Tijuana, and the San Quintin Valley of Baja California; and other nation-states including Peru, Guatemala, Mexico, the United States, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Canada, and South Africa.

In 2011, I received the Lillian Robles (Juaneno/Acjachemen) Award for Leadership and Action from the Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Department at California State University Long Beach (CSULB) for community-engaged research. I received this great honor with Georgiana Sanchez, a Chumash storyteller and scholar and one of my beloved college teachers. As the Robles family sang honoring songs during the award ceremony, I was struck by the convergence of an American Indian scholar-activist who works with Mexican Indigenous movements and their diasporas on Native California Indian territory, holding the stories of displaced Indigenous peoples on the lands of those who have been dispossessed of their lands and are struggling to survive. I had been working with students and with Dalit transmedia storyteller Thenmozhi Songdaragan, one of the original creators of digital storytelling, to create digital storytelling projects with organizers of the FIOB women's leadership program called Mujeres Indígenas en Liderazgo (MIEL). We began to write grants to build a storytelling platform for this multiple and layered Indigenous Los Angeles. After the evening at the Robles Awards, with the multiple layers of Indigenous LA present together in one space but often kept from knowing each other's histories, I was even more inspired to create this digital storytelling

platform we called Mapping Indigenous LA. I applied for an initial seed grant and invited UCLA professors Mishuana Goeman, Wendy Teeter, and Keith Camacho to serve as co-principal investigators for a story-mapping project that uncovers the histories of sedimented layers of Indigenous LA, including the original inhabitants of the Los Angeles basin and islands, the Tongva/Gabrielino, relocated American Indians, Pacific Islanders, and the Latin American Indigenous diaspora. Although Keith did not stay on with us as we built the Mapping Indigenous LA platform (mila.ss.ucla.edu), throughout the autumn of 2012 we met weekly to design the project based on digital story maps and the digital platform in collaboration with Tongva community members and cultural educators. We each continued to build, and in the summer of 2016 I worked intensively with six community researchers from the Zapotec, Mixtec, and Mayan communities of Los Angeles to design the Latin American Indigenous Diaspora map, which informs my thinking in chapter 5 of this book. I conceptualized the original proposal, wrote the language used on the platform, and managed grants and staff on multiple projects for our collaborative project, including the Crossroads and Currents, Pacific Islander, and Two-Spirit Maps. Many other colleagues and friends went on to build storymaps and this hub for Indigenous stories of place and teaching resources, as when Tongva cultural educators came together to build resources and train schoolteachers in the LA Unified School District. Even more important, many communities, tribes, collaborators, and organizations went on to build their own storymaps that show the transformative histories they are weaving.

I thank all the Indigenous women activists who generously shared their insights, dreams, knowledge, and visions with me. I appreciate the longtime friends and collaborators who made this work possible, including Margarita Gutiérrez, Tomasa Sandoval, Paty Sandoval, Martha Sánchez, Fabiola Jurado, Norma Don Juan, Odilia Romero, Janet Martinez, Dr. Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, the late Rufino Dominguez, Centolia Maldonado, and many, many others. I thank Angela Davis, who served as my PhD advisor and mentor as I began this project as a first-generation doctoral student. She taught me how to walk the activist-scholar path. Pat Zavella modeled the best of critical feminist ethnography, humor, and decades of mentorship and ultimately friendship. Sonia Alvarez and Jonathan Fox guided my work as I completed my intial fieldwork and doctoral thesis. Many others generously read iterations of chapters and versions of the manuscript as it worked its way through the writing and publication process including Lynn Stephen, Shannon Speed, Josie Saldaña, Pat Zavella, Nadine Naber, Tony Lucero, Grace Hong, Horacio Roque Ramirez, Gloria Chacon, Gaye Theresa Johnson, Leisy Ábrego, Juan Herrera, Mauricio

Magaña, Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, Holly Worthen, Sherene Razack, Monisha Das Gupta, and Judy Wu. I thank Lise Nelson for our early conversations, which directed me to theorizations of scale by feminist geographers. I learned early on to survive the academy to break its solitude and competitiveness by building community. For many years I have written in community, in writing groups and with many writing friends. I am especially grateful for the writing accountability group that has supported me with their wisdom and humor during the past six years while writing this book: Tiffany Willoughby-Herard, Michelle Habell-Pallan, Julia Fogg, and Lynn Fujiwara. What a gift to be in community with these talented, powerful women. I wrote with another "get the book done club" that included Pat Zavella and Nadine Naber and thank them for their grit and insight. I have had the privilege to build writing communities and have writing dates with many friends along the way, including Tiffany Willoughby-Herard, Lilith Mahmud, Alicia Carroll, Mauricio Magaña, Juan Herrera, Floridalma Boj Lopez, Josh Guzmán, Micaela Diaz, Audrey Silvestre, Rafael Solorzano, Nadia Zepeda, Brenda Nicolás and Eddie Alvarez.

I workshopped an early draft of the book and thank the UCLA Center for the Study of Women for the early protoype of the Research Excellence Award. I thank Grace Hong for her advocacy to create spaces such as these on campus; Tony Lucero for reading an early version of the manuscript; and those UCLA colleagues who read chapters, including Grace Hong, Shannon Speed, Flori Boj Lopez, Leisy Ábrego, Gaye Theresa Johnson, Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, and Brenda Nicolás. I was generously invited to workshop the manuscript for chapter 4 at the University of Connecticut and later at the Institute for Research on Women and Gender at the University of Michigan as part of the Rethinking Transnational Feminisms Working Group and as a fellow at the School for Advanced Research in Santa Fe, New Mexico. I also workshopped the chapter 2 manuscript as part of that same group's UCI Humanities Center Faculty-in-Residence Seminar and the chapter 5 manuscript as part of the Critical Latinx Indigeneities LA Writing Group. I thank members of the LOUD collective, the Critical Latinx Indigeneities Working Group, most especially Floridalma Boj Lopez, Luis Urrieta, Gloria Chacon, Bianet Castellanos, and Lulu Alberto. When I lived in New Mexico, I was lucky to write and discuss work with Corinne Sanchez, Laura Harjo, Susan McKinnon, Karin Fredric, and Brian Burke. I have been blessed to work with the next generation of Indigenous scholars who are emerging as an emphatic force that will reshape multiple conversations. It has been a pleasure to work in community and conversation with Flori Boj Lopez, Brenda Nicolás, Luis Sánchez, Daina Sánchez,

and Michelle Vasquez Ruiz in our critical Indigenous studies reading group. I have worked at the intersection of Indigenous, Chicano/a/x, and Latinx studies for many decades, founding and helping to build spaces of convergence, such as the Women's Indigenous/Native Caucus of Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social (MALCS), attending the founding meeting of the Native American Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA), and helping to build the Abya Yala Working Group in subsequent meetings, Otros Saberes within the Latin American Studies Association, and finding spaces of affiliation and collaboration in the American Studies Association (ASA). Ines Hernandez-Ávila and Ines Talamontes are forerunners who opened the space for multiple indigeneities across these fields.

For accompanying me in the last stages of this project and for their research assistance, I thank Audrey Silvestre for her clarity, strength, grace, and friendship; Rafael Ramirez Solorzano for his insights, perpetually positive outlook, and merging of movement work and scholarship; Rose Simons for her work translating, annotating, and reflecting on the work with me; and Chantiri Resendiz Ramirez for her critical engagement and timely assistance. Finally, my deepest gratitude to Michelle Vasquez Ruiz for her steadfast research, intrepid spirit, and commitment to community-engaged Indigenous digital humanities. Over the years, I have benefitted from many sources of support over the multiple stages of research for this project, including the UC Institute for Mexico and the United States, a UC President's Postdoctoral Fellowship, a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship, the School for Advanced Research, and the Latin American Studies Association Otros Saberes Initiative. At UCLA I thank the Institute for American Cultures, especially Chon Noriega and the Chicano Studies Research Center for years of unwavering support. Many other research centers have been important community hubs, including the American Indian Studies Center, thanks to the powerful leadership of Angela R. Riley and Shannon Speed; the Latin American Institute, under the leadership of Kevin Terriciano; and the Center for Mexican Studies, under the leadership of Ruben Hernández. I have received critical support from two key colegas in the UCLA Department of Chicana/o and Central American Studies. I thank Leisy Ábrego and Gaye Theresa Johnson. The UC Academic Senate's Committee on Research and the dean of social sciences have supported my research in key phases.

This project manifested alongside many political struggles, en camino to building family and community, and during life transitions that span accompanying my mom through end-stage lung cancer to the birth of my daughter, and the rise of authoritarianism in the United States and renewed uprisings

to end white supremacy—all while surviving a global pandemic (it's not our first as Indigenous people). Friends have surrounded me with love and solidity. Thank you Dre, Joan, Josie, Alice, Deb, Erica, Lilith, Juliet, Raja, Queen, Dean, Iyatunde, and especially my family: Gary, Alphonce, Rubi, Jose, Cosme, and Luna. Mostly, I am ever grateful for the light that is Juniper Nayeli.

Introduction

The third National Indigenous Congress, held in 2001 in Nurio, Michoacán, took place in the lead-up to a historic debate in the Mexican Congress. Many in attendance were traveling with the Zapatista caravan to Mexico City, including Comandante Esther, who would make history by being the first Indigenous woman to speak on the floor of the Mexican Senate. Numerous leaders had called for a women's session during the gathering and so, at the designated time, hundreds of us sat and stood in concentric circles, waiting for the session to begin. When, or even if, the women's session "began" is not really clear. At first, the discussion centered on whether a women's session should be held at a gathering of the national Indigenous movement in Mexico at all. Two hundred women stood at the ready while a couple of male activists moved to the center of the circle to argue against the idea of a separate women's session. As I sat in the circle, I was initially annoyed that the right to have a women's session was being debated yet again, but as I looked around me, I saw hundreds of women leaders and members of Indigenous organizations throughout Mexico, like Tomasa Sandoval of la Nación Purépecha Zapatista of Michoacán and Martha Sánchez of 500 Años de Resistencia of Guerrero (see figure I.1). Among the leaders from Indigenous regions throughout Mexico, I saw Zapatista women from Chiapas, including several comandantas who were attending as part of the 2001 Zapatista caravan. Leaders of other international Indigenous movements were there, too, such as Blanca Chancoso, one of the founders of la Confederación de los Pueblos de Nacionalidad Kichua del Ecuador, former president of the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE), one of the organizations that hosted one of the first gatherings of the Continental Indigenous Women's Network in 1995. Blanca stood, spread out the rainbow-colored flag of the Indigenous movement of Ecuador, and spoke in solidarity with and in support of women having their own space for deliberation. About an hour into the debate, I realized that the women's session was actually happening despite being denied a formal space. Women spoke in between the decreasing arguments that a women's session divides the movement or is unnecessary because Indigenous cosmovisions are already complementary in terms of gender. Between the counterarguments, I realized that a power-

Figure I.1. CONAMI activist Tomasa Sandoval speaking to the women gathered at the Congreso Nacional Indígena (National Indigenous Congress), Nurio, Michoacán, 2001. Photo by author.

ful discussion was continuing regardless of the opposition being voiced against it. As that opposition slowly dissipated, the interstitial conversation began to gain momentum. I was witnessing the way in which Indigenous women, organized at multiple levels and scales, could weave together the power and momentum of "in-between." The threads of their organizing linked remote, rural communities to networks that spanned Mexico, came together to form the national Indigenous women's movement, and connected across the continent to the global stage. That day, I got to see how Indigenous women used the threads, networks, and knowledge from multiple scales to work around resistance to their organizing at the national level.

The 1990s witnessed the emergence of mass Indigenous rights movements in Mexico—indeed throughout Latin America. The roots of Indigenous struggles, many of which had been organizing below the surface at the community or the regional level, surfaced into the public eye after the Zapatista rebellion in 1994 in Mexico, and then out across the world. As these local struggles for dignity and social justice began to grow into national networks, Indigenous women who had been active locally in community radio, in Indigenous assemblies, or within weaver's collectives began to meet with other women activists—first in their own regions and then nationally and internationally. In 1997, they

came together to form a national network of Indigenous women activists, the Coordinadora Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Mexico (CONAMI), the first national Indigenous women's organization in Mexico's history. Some were established leaders in their own communities, some had been participating in Indigenous assemblies with their fathers since they were children, whereas others were young women thrown into leadership when the male leaders in their community were imprisoned. Some were already members of Indigenous women's organizations in the community, whereas others still were brand new to social activism. But all felt the shift in the winds and were called to commit their lives to organizing themselves and their communities to stand up for the rights of Indigenous peoples and, together, to revitalize Indigenous cultures.

In the late 1990s, I had the great privilege of accompanying CONAMI members during the early years of the organization. I returned to interview them ten years later. I start with the vignette at the beginning of this chapter to illustrate just one instance of how, despite blockages, Indigenous women organizers built a vibrant national network that spanned Mexico. Many think of the Zapatista rebellion as isolated to the state of Chiapas, but this view ignores the extent to which the uprising only brought to the surface local Indigenous rights movements that were operating just out of view of dominant society but within Indigenous communities throughout Mexico. Once these efforts coalesced, they quickly formed into a broader national movement after 1994, and women were pivotal in building this momentum at each step. Women met at numerous local and regional meetings to debate Indigenous autonomy and discuss which parts of Indigenous communal practices they liked and, just as important, which they did not—all vital conversations about women's rights in what would form the basis of Indigenous normative systems (known as usos y costumbres). As the Indigenous rights movement and other sectors of civil society mobilized as the EZLN negotiated with the Mexican government culminating in the 1996 San Andrés Peace Accords, these workshops and meetings focused on Indigenous autonomy flourished all over the country—so much so that organizers began to leverage these conversations to gain access to greater women's participation in local mixed-gender organizations or collective Indigenous governance structures. They were able to point, for example, to other communities where women did participate in community decision-making or argue that their organization was out of step with the national Indigenous movement. The early 1990s were also critical in the coalescence of a hemispheric solidarity among Indigenous peoples in the Americas as they rose up with Black and popular sectors to protest the five-hundred-year celebration of the arrival of Christopher Columbus to the Americas. As this grounded transborder activism

spread across Abiayala, Indigenous migrants also began to organize as political subjects who crossed colonial borders, such as the 1992 formation of the Zapotec/Mixtec Front, whose organizing raised questions about indigeneity in diaspora, challenging the ways it is often fixed by settler colonial strategies of containment while often being displaced and dispossessed as part of the settler colonial logic of elimination (Speed 2019).

What I share in this book is the result of my participation and research accompanying Indigenous women's organizing efforts for more than twenty years across local, national, continental, transnational, international, and transborder scales of activism. *Scales of Resistance* includes Indigenous women's organizing in Mexico and their work building advocacy networks across Abiayala,[1] a concept of the Kuna people of Panama and Colombia used by activists to name an Indigenous scale of interconnection and responsibility to land. The book also explores the ways they (re)grounded this activism and localized it into their own pueblos, municipalities, and territories. It then joins the organizing within the migrant stream that is building (trans)local ways of being and belonging that form Indigenous transborder scales of cultural continuity and political mobilization among Zapotecs and Mixtecs from Oaxaca and among members of the Latin American Indigenous diaspora who spatialize geographies of indigeneity on the unceded territories of the Tongva/Gabrileño peoples, which include the Los Angeles basin and southern Channel Islands. The insights I share are part of collective knowledge forged through the experience of many Indigenous women activists and several generations of organizers across different communities and multiple scales.

Scales of Resistance: Transborder Indigenous Women's Organizing shows how Indigenous women activists developed a strategy of weaving in and between multiple scales of power to create new spaces of participation and new forms of consciousness and discourse and how their organizing conjures, reimagines, and rethinks scale. The Chiapas uprising opened new political spaces for Indigenous women and increased social movement networking, not only between various regions within Mexico but also across different kinds of sectors and movements, or scales of organizing across the globe. Indigenous women, one of the most marginalized sectors of Mexican society, effectively learned to move within the limited social and political spaces allowed them, thereby creating new forms of identity and social meaning in the crevices of discourses that excluded them, and building new forms of political subjectivity and new spaces of political engagement. Out of the most restrictive locations, activists developed this political skill of moving in and between different scales of political representaion and negotiating, in turn, the distinct configurations of power at

each level. And with this skill came a new form of political consciousness, one that facilitated new kinds of conversations and led to new kinds of practices, analyses, hopes, and commitments. Importantly, these developments helped sustain the work of the Indigenous women's movement in times of attempted neoliberal incorporation or co-option, subsequent demobilization, and political repression, and during an unprecedented wave of state and narco violence in the decades that followed. This book tells the story of how organized Indigenous women were able to revitalize and, in some cases, redefine women's role in community decision-making and create discourses that addressed women's rights within Indigenous rights frameworks. Indigenous women activists began conversations about their own cosmovisions and the gendered nature of social organization in their own communities, leading some to decolonize gender hierarchies and identities, and others to argue that Indigenous women are the heart of family and community structures and therefore are at the heart of Indigenous resistance and autonomy.

The book highlights the creativity and agency central to Indigenous women's organizing strategies in what is now Mexico and its diaspora in what is now the United States. It demonstrates, through extensive multisited, multiyear, and multiscalar ethnography, how Indigenous women activists have navigated exclusions of and blockages to their participation at one level by moving to another, and then leveraging the skills, knowledge, experience, and discourses gained in one political space to effect change in the other. Such strategies have multiplied the places in which Indigenous women's demands are engaged and have helped them to create new organizational spaces and visions of inclusion for themselves and their communities. I map how the linkages between these scales of power shape the way in which Indigenous women articulate themselves as political subjects and influence the discursive strategies they employ. By using their own interstitial positioning to create new sites for participation, new visions for (other) world making, modalities of organizing, and discursive strategies, Indigenous women have transformed various scales of power—instances of governance and authority in which they are ignored—into scales of resistance.

Analysis of multiscalar movements is hardly new, of course, and a number of scholars have shown the benefits of being able to scale *up*, from feminist to human rights movements to the struggle to pass the UN Declaration of Indigenous Peoples to the Zapatistas becoming a global force against neoliberalism (Brysk 1993; Escárcega 2013; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Olesen 2005). Others have called attention to how activists have successfully localized, vernacularized, or retrofitted political projects and imaginaries from transnational, national,

and translocal scales to their lived realities (Blackwell 2014; Hernández Castillo 2016; Levitt and Merry 2009; Thayer 2001). Building and expanding on earlier work (Blackwell 2006), I analyze a strategy of interweaving scales by which organized Indigenous women in Mexico have used the momentum of local movements to build a women's network within the national Indigenous movement and even to demand women's formal leadership in national organizations. *Scales of Resistance*, however, also reveals the importance and efficacy of being able to scale not only *up or down* but also *across* different *types* of scale—connecting formal political arenas with specifically gendered bodies, for example, and contrasting colonial divisions of scale itself with Indigenous conceptions of scale, space, solidarity, and connection. In chapter 1, for example, I examine how Indigenous women scaled the concept of Indigenous autonomy down from the formal claim for legal rights afforded by the state to demand women's autonomy over their own bodies and within their own homes in their local communities. This scaling down translated rights discourse into a practice of autonomy that, along with their organizing work with other Indigenous women horizontally across other translocalities and vertically to other scales, became an important strategy of resistance to neoliberal state incorporation and the shortcomings of state-based forms of recognition (Coulthard 2014). Organized Indigenous women weave scales of power not only horizontally but vertically to influence and organize other (trans)localities on the same scale.

Furthermore, rather than exploring a fixed set of demands, strategies, or identities that are scaled in one direction or another, this book examines how Indigenous women activists and social movements traverse and negotiate vastly different terrains of power at each scale, what I have been calling *geographies of difference*.[2] Transnational social movement scholars Keck and Sikkink (1998) theorize the importance of scaling up with their concept of the "boomerang effect," whereby movements blocked at the national level can take their work to international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) or other international solidarity organizations that then exert pressure back on the national scale. What many fail to acknowledge, however, is that marginalized actors have to navigate relationships of power that disenfranchise them in order to scale up. Indeed, most theories of transnational organizing do not account for how intersectional entrapments of power are configured and exerted differently at each scale and across scales. Political actors who are marginalized, often in multiple ways, at one scale have to navigate those different configurations of race, class, gender, indigeneity, and citizenship at each level (Blackwell 2000, 2014, 2015). The analytic I call "geographies of difference" is attentive to how even within differential relations and flows of power that con-

stitute networked scales of activism, not only is power configured differently between each scale, but social movement actors are differentially situated by these power configurations within each scale. Geographies of difference names how the political landscape of each region, not to mention each country or scale, at which Indigenous women organize in is quite distinct, so that activists at each scale navigate the different terrains of social, political, and economic power as they move. Further, based on decades of work accompanying transnational and transborder organizers, the concept of geographies of difference accounts for the way different transborder political actors are situated by intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and citizenship status differently as they cross borders. It centers the complex and creative ways differently situated transborder actors navigate power in and between scales.

What I have called geographies of difference bridges central tenets of women of color feminist praxis, including an intersectional understanding of power and the practice of building solidarity and power from difference, with feminist and critical geographers and Critical Indigenous Studies. In his 1996 book *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*, David Harvey called for a theory of justice that not only accounts for social and ecological issues at local and global scales but one that attends to questions of difference and commonality. In light of the challenge decolonization movements across the globe lodged against the ways European rationalities of enlightenment thinking had become universal and the demands of radical social movements of people of color, feminists, and queers in the US and Europe to dismantle the white supremacist, capitalist and patriarchal logic underpinning those universalisms, many theorists on the left challenged, avoided, or just outright ignored these challenges by conflating them with poststructuralist preoccupations with difference. Harvey argued that only through a "critical re-engagement with political-economy, with our situatedness in relation to capital accumulation, can we hope to re-establish a conception of social justice as something to be fought for as a key value within an ethics of political solidarity built across different places" (360). In his thinking about "differentiated construction embedded in processes operating at quite different spatio-temporal scales," he asserts that "the task of progressive politics is to find an equally powerful, dynamic, and persuasive way to relating the universal and particular at different scales in the drive to define social justice from the standpoint of the oppressed" (362). Women of color theory and praxis does not rely on universals that imagine the oppression of women, for example, based on sameness, but builds an understanding of power and solidarity based on difference (Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Alexander and Mohanty 1997; Cohen 1997; Hong and Ferguson 2011; and Hong 2006, 2015).

Doreen Massey's (1993) early work foregrounded this "complex social differentiation" (62) in what she called the "power-geometry of time-space compression," which illustrated how globalization, not only a set of processes driven by capital but as a set of social relations, can produce uneven geographies. (68) She argued that "different social groups have distinct relationships" to time and space and as a result also have a "differentiated mobility" for different social groups and different individuals are placed in very distinct ways in relation to these flows and interconnections. The point concerns not merely the issue of who moves and who doesn't, although that is an important element of it; it is also about power in relation *to* the flows and the movement" (61). As Massey built on this (1994, 1999) argument that places are constituted through 'power geometry,' she theorized the interconnections between local, regional, national, and global processes by refusing "to see this differing scaling of time-space as a simple hierarchy," which complicates the view of "the 'global' being something above, or determinate of, the local" (Latham 2002, 124). If these power geometries are configured differently not only in different locales but at differing scales, then we can see more clearly the ways these power geometries shape how social movement actors negotiate those specific configurations of power.

What I call geographies of difference marks not only these differentiated terrains of power that social movement actors navigate but how actors within those terrains are also complexly and differentially situated in relation to the intersectional ways power operates through categories such as class, gender, race, sexuality, and indigeneity. Indeed, others have taken Massey's power geometries to analyze the way social location and geographic scale play into transnational migration in what Pessar and Mahler (2003) call "gendered geographies of power." Building on an intersectional analysis, they consider what the multiple scales of those power hierarchies might mean or how "hierarchies are not built just at the national or supra-national level. Rather, hierarchies of class, race, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality and, of course, gender operate at various levels that affect an individual or group's social location" (816). This framing is useful in understanding that gender, race, class, and sexuality, for example, operate simultaneously on different scales and how to account for social location or how a person is located within a gendered, racialized, classed, and colonial hierarchies. While theorists of transnational feminism discussed the notion of scattered hegemonies (Grewal and Kaplan 1994) to name how systems of power at one level may operates at different scales to collude and compound gendered oppression, in chapter 4 I examine how these systems collide and hybridize. Before turning to the specific historical, regional, and political context of Indigenous women's organizing in Mexico, it is important to

elaborate on and clarify my use of the term *scale*. In Chicana literary theorist Mary Pat Brady's brilliant work *Scales of Captivity* (2022), she defines scale as "a fundamental grid structuring the Western imaginary, one of the operative, taken-for-granted principles of the coloniality of power (3)." Brady argues that what she calls a "scalar imaginary" is a tool that maps and secures empires as well as the nation-state and its borders. Simultaneously, scalar logics justify carceral and other forms of state sanctioned captivity, including enslavement, incarceration, internment, detention, family separation, and constrained lives. Precisely because it has been so historically imbricated with colonial logics and projects, we must unpack the conventional concept of "scale" to reveal the assumptions that underlie it and that it serves to naturalize. I triangulate notions of scale with Marxist, feminist, and Indigenous understandings that highlight the mutual constitution of space and social relations.

Decolonizing Scale, Weaving Scale

Western ideas of scale are rooted in colonial governance and epistemological structures, with a long history of colonial spatial projects being imposed over Indigenous ceremonial, political, and economic spatial structures such as market spaces or trade routes (Vicenti Carpio 2011). This imposition is dramatically illustrated throughout Mexico, where colonial churches and government buildings are built directly on top of precolonial temples and Indigenous civic, political, spiritual, and cultural centers, often using the same stones. Pre-Hispanic and early colonial Indigenous mapping sought to represent social and spatial relationships to the landscape. Elizabeth Boone's (2000) study of Aztec cartographic histories and Mixtec screen folds, lienzos (sheets), and tiras (rolls), documents how pictorial codices "held explanatory keys to the Mexican social order . . . [showing] how the present and previous worlds were created and organized. Like community charters, they explained how the people came to occupy and control the lands they did and how their government was established. The books [maps] explained the relationships between peoples, their neighbors, and their enemies. These painted histories of the past held the evidence that supported the rights of the governing families to rule, and they kept true the stories of the heroic deeds of the ancestors" (27).

Indigenous notions of scale can be illustrated by how Nahuatl speakers in the Valley of Mexico organized themselves into a political and communal unit called an altepetl, which Charles Gibson (1964, 9) identifies as an Indigenous city-state. In *The Mapping of New Spain: Indigenous Cartography and the Maps of the Relaciones Geográficas* (1996), Barbara E. Mundy writes: "Politically, altepetl

were somewhat like Russian nesting dolls, holding within them smaller and smaller subunits; most comprised numerous calpolli (house[s]), each with its own leader, which in turn comprised family-centered households" (105). Yet, we can imagine the ways these scales were not linear but were often a form of mediation between precolonial Indigenous land and water epistemologies and graphic traditions and the emerging colonial reality. Pictorial histories of the Aztecs and Mixtecs recorded events through the lens of the local scale (local polity/stories), through their coverage of altepetls/community kingdoms, rather than recording regional histories/polities. These Indigenous archives stressed "supernatural origins, others focusing on long migrations and others detailing events that affected the polity after it was established" (Boone 2000, 2). Using postconquest accounts of "Indigenous forms of sociopolitical and economic organization" between 1550 and 1650, Rebecca Horn (1989), unlike previous authors writing about cartographic maps, draws on primary sources such as Indigenous landholdings, descriptive accounts, and colonial litigation records written in Spanish in the sixteenth century to argue that any regional study concerning Indigenous communities in the Valley of Mexico "must take into account the nature of Indigenous forms of sociopolitical organization" (9). The altepetl (*alt*: water; *tepetl*: mountain) referred to both a people and a territory, and they were ruled by a dynastic lineage (18). Horn explains that the altepetl was "subdivided into smaller units called *calpulli* or *tlaxilacali*, and these units were often organized into groups within the altepetl, group which in most cases were not recognized by the Spaniards or explicitly described in Spanish sources" (10). She notes that their organization "was cellular rather than hierarchical, each subunit being equal . . . each with its own sense of separate origins, each a microcosm of the whole [altepetl]" (18).

In the Mixtec region, these political and social units were called ñuu and, after the arrival of the Spanish, colonists referred to such communities as cacicazgos to describe the lands they perceived an Indigenous leader or cacique to rule over. Even notions of territory and governance were shaped by colonists' interpretations of Indigenous precolonial spatial and political categories. In fact, *cacique* comes from the Taíno word *kassiquan*, meaning to "to keep house" (Dove 2004, 136), and was thought to be earned by a democratic process; whereas *cacicazgo* is the Spanish transliteration of the Taíno word for lands ruled over by a cacique, which the Spanish apparently understood as mini-kingdoms. The lienzos grounded historicity to tiras to map territory in order to record how territory is linked to a sacred past, a specific history, and a genealogy of rule. "This union of place, history, and rule thus formed a kind of community charter, such that many towns in Oaxaca and southern Puebla relied

on their lienzos to function as community land titles throughout the colonial period and into the nineteenth century, some even into the twentieth century" (Boone 2000, 128). Hidalgo's (2019) cartographic study of the region that is now the state of Oaxaca between 1573 and 1778 reveals the function of maps in the multilayered, complex, and even contradictory relations between Indigenous communities and Spanish colonialists (judges, magistrates, hacendados). Maps were the cultural collision of meaning making in relation to spatial, geographic, and cartographic knowledges where Indigenous map makers wove in their own epistemes and representational strategies with colonial ones to create a double consciuousness (2). The work of historian Stephanie Wood (1997) actually shows the presence of women in Mixtec codices and other maps, marking the importance of women in Mixtec genealogies. Haudenosaunee literary scholar Mishuana Goeman (2013), however, cautions that although women participated in the exchange and production of native mapping and spatial knowledge, "Native women . . . were doubly excluded from the realm of a seemingly objective and masculine world of science and cartography. These erasures have had an enormous impact on the archives of colonial maps" (24).

Scale was a colonial project of conquest. The logics embedded in scale, according to Brady (2022), facilitated the colonial endeavor through epistemic and spatial violence, enforced, of course, through military violence and Christianity.

> Francisco López de Gómara, Hernán Cortés's confessor and apologist, sought to shift away from a plurivocal multiverse to gain a sense of perspectival possession that could enact the terms and architecture for empire and form a monovocal, monofocal universe. He turned to the idea of scale to produce the possibility of empire; scale enables rationalized abstraction (the world is one), transforming and authorizing indistinction and defining possessions claimed and carved and narrated from the ejido to the rancho, from the local to the regional to the hemispheric to the global, the planetary, and beyond. The many belong to the one (a king, a pope), articulated as his, as mappable and mapped, as for sale, a source of tribute and point of pride, articulated within a nested hierarchy, a new geoimaginary. (18)

Given the ways in which the discipline of geography was constituted through colonial surveys, descriptions, representations, and Western understandings of space designed to eradicate, displace, or contain Indigenous peoples, Kwagu'ł (Kwakwaka'wakw Nation) geographer Sarah Hunt (2014) asks, "How might Indigenous geographic knowledge, or knowledge rooted in Indigenous worldviews, be situated in relation to the discipline and its hegemonic ontologies?" (30). On the basis of her analysis of the interconnection between colonial and

interpersonal violence, Hunt (2015) reminds us of the settler colonial function of scale: "Just as reconciliation discourse requires us to create a temporal divide between past wrongs and current colonial realities, this framing creates a scalar division which positions everyday legal and state violence out of view. Because in order to buy into the notion that state violence 'no longer constitutes the regulative norm of settler colonialism,' we have to view gendered violence, police brutality, carcerality of everyday life, death of kids in care and willful negligence of our communities as not politically significant" (4).

Yet, Maya K'iche theorist and public intellectual Gladys Tzul Tzul (2015) conceptualizes Indigenous resistance through Indigenous communal systems of government in ways that engage gender and scale in important ways. "Strength and power lies in the ability to disrupt and sabotage domination projects, but this capacity draws from a communal network of men, women, girls and boys who produce government and defend a territory, which I will call in this text: indigenous communal system of government" (128). Her analysis is scalar as she goes on to locate the locust of resistance at the communal within the scale of Indigenous territory and at the scale of the household, or what she calls the unit of reproduction of daily life. "When I say the concrete means for the reproduction of life, I mean the territory and everything that contains it, namely: Water, roads, forests, cemeteries, schools, sacred places, rituals, feasts; in sum the concrete and symbolic richness that communities produce and govern through a series of strategies developed from a specific space and time that are structured from each reproduction unit. To make what I say more intelligible, I clarify that the reproduction unit is the space where everyday life takes place; that is, houses inhabited by nuclear and/or extended families that enjoy water service, that make use of the road, that feed on the mushrooms that occur in the forests, among several more" (129). While Tzul Tzul has discussed forms of Indigenous self-governance through what she calls "tramas comunales" (communal plots or weaves) and "tramas de perentesco" (plots or weaves of kinship), each of these plots or weaves is a scale of communal belonging or building relations. Tzul Tzul further elaborates that the struggle for Indigenous communal governance is structured through three strategies: kinship alliances, k'ax k'ol (communal labor), and the assembly as the political form of collective decision making. Finally, she argues theses scalar forms of Indigenous self-determination meet the force of colonial scales of exploitation: "Thus, from indigenous communal government systems, emerges a series of practices and strategies that organize and dynamize ways to limit and/or disrupt capitalist state domination in their local forms, municipalities and other local ways of state power. Indigenous communal government systems have known how to

read that the exploitative, colonial paradigm that continues to operate; specifically the strategies of meaning making in indigenous community politics and the local composition of statehood (or state formation)" (131).

Chicana scholar María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo (2016) examines how contemporary racialized geographies of the US-Mexico borderlands are products of differing British and Spanish colonial logics and legacies—what we could call the coloniality of spatial organization. After independence, governance in Mexico not only identified regions according to colonial logics but also, as Zapotec historian Luis Sánchez-López (2018) argues, established its own hegemony by recognizing Indigenous regions and limited forms of Indigenous territorial and spatial autonomy as a way to establish a settler state. Indeed, Chickasaw anthropologist Shannon Speed (2017, 2019) argues that settler colonialism in Mexico and Guatemala is a structure established during the independence era. The contemporary organization of power into scale includes colonial and Indigenous notions of scale. In Latin America, the colonial imprint on structures and relations of power has been termed the *coloniality of power* (Quijano 2000). But whereas the coloniality literature has been challenged in relation to gender and intersectionality, the spatial arrangements of the coloniality of power and the gendered nature of those colonial imprints has yet to be fully examined (Pérez 2010; Pratt 2008; Rivera Cusicanqui 2012). In Sarah Radcliffe's work thinking about decoloniality and geography (2020), she reflects on the coloniality of power in relation to knowledge production and policy. Her earlier work accompanying Kichwa and Tsáchila women as theorists of development (2015) examines how they disrupt academic and policy analysis and shift the geopolitics of knowledge production. Despite the deep flaws of Andean state policies meant to align with Indigenous concepts of *sumac kawsay* or *Buen Vivir*, she notes that these policies represented a "decolonizing political possibility, combining collective and individual rights, Indigenous epistemologies, [and] challenges to (intersectional) patriarchy" (2020, 585). Hernández Castillo (2019) examines how these colonialites of power shape racialized geographies of the war on drugs produced by an onslaught of violence and dispossession where "women's bodies have become territories to be invaded, violated, and incarcerated" (2). Indigenous women activists navigate these local, national, transnational, and transborder colonialities of spatial power but they also move in bodies, homes, families, pueblos, and municipalities guided by Indigenous cosmovisions that overlay Indigenous regions and territories which can be life affirming spaces of dignity as well as oppression.[3] In dominant representations throughout Latin America, Indigenous women are often symbolically bound to the local, seen as rural, uneducated, and low class, on the one hand, and as bearers of culture and embodiments of

the authentic (dress, foodways, etc.), on the other. Yet, as Indigenous women activists have collectively worked across Abiayala, they have forged their own Indigenous political imaginary that has created alternative forms of transnational, transboder and hemispheric solidarity, connection, and responsibility in their continental network, which I explore further in chapter 2.

In following these organizers in and between sites of power, I turn to the way geographers understand scale in the social construction of space. In naming these levels of political representation and new sites of struggle, the rich literature on scale elaborated by Marxist and feminist geographers is useful (Braman 1996; Marston 2000; N. Smith 1992; Staheli 1994). Scale is "the embodiment of social relations of empowerment and disempowerment and the arena through which they operate" (Swyngedouw 1997, 169). Scale, at its most basic level, is a scale of representation (Gregory 2009; Marston 2000). In this project, *scale* means the levels through which power is organized and how activities enacted and political interests articulated, contested, and negotiated produce those levels. Rather than fixed platforms for social activity and economic and political processes that "connect up or down to other hierarchical levels, "scales" are instead outcomes of those activities and processes, to which they in turn contribute through a spatially uneven and temporally unfolding dynamic" (Gregory 2009, 665; see also Swyngedouw 1997). Or, as Neil Brenner concisely puts it, scales are "the temporarily stabilized *effects* of diverse socio-spatial processes" (2011, 31).[4]

Scholars have used scale to analyze the effects of capitalism, gender relations of re/production, and social movement resource mobilizations. For example, they have theorized the multiplicity of scale in the socio-spatial organization of capitalism, identifying possibilities of resistance and opportunities to create linkages across scale (N. Smith 1992). Others have importantly critiqued the literature on the social construction scale for its overreliance on modes of production in the public sphere, with the goal of calling attention to the scales of gender and social reproduction (Marston 2000). This work richly illustrates other systems of domination besides capitalism and its effects on the social construction of scale in the organizing of political parties, unions, and AIDS politics. Others have used scale to understand social movements. For example, Lynn Staheli argues, "To the extent that oppositional movements can move across scales—that is, the extent that they can take advantage of the resources at one scale to overcome the constraints encountered at different scales (in the way that more powerful actors do)—they may have greater potential for processing their claims" (1994, 388).

But as I emphasize, the processes and networks of Indigenous women's activism, in which scales are established and collapse, depend on differing configurations of power, movement flows, and Indigenous visions of scale, relation, connectivity, solidarity, and responsibility, such as Abiayala. In addition, not all networked scales stay equally connected—some tear away from each other, and others re-form around alternate visions of region or around various spatial logics of political urgency or strategy. While some scholars think of networks as "the overlapping and contested material, cultural and political flows and circuits that bind different places together though differentiated relations of power" (Featherston, Phillips, and Waters 2007, 386), others theorize them as meshworks to capture not only a vertical organization but a horizontal one: The concept of meshwork is meant to suggest that place-based groups "engage in dynamic vertical and horizontal networking, connecting among themselves and with others in places far and near, across cultural, political, racial, and ethnic divides" (Harcourt and Escobar 2005, 14). Meshworks, Escobar, and Harcourt (2005) argue, involve parallel strategies of localization and interweaving. Localization requires reading the geographies of difference or the different ways power is configured for differentially situated actors at each scale. *Interweaving* names the strategy that activist Indigenous women I have accompanied use to weave scales by reading power differential across scales and geographies of difference.

Although my work was not originally part of the spatial turn, because the Indigenous women organizers I work with weave in and between local, national, transnational, transborder, and land-based scales of power to create new spaces of participation, I decolonize social geography's concept of scale to describe how they used these nodes of power. The scope of *Scales of Resistance* includes those scales created by Indigenous women's organizing at the local, pueblo (town or village/people), or municipal level, or across Indigenous regions—territory that might include several pueblos, municipalities, and settler colonial juridical borders. It analyzes how their organizing creates scales of resistance across various conceptualizations of scale, such as settler nations, states, and geopolitical regions (across Latin America and Caribbean); across hemispheric, transnational, and international scales; and across trans-Indigenous scales like Abiayala. Finally, the project includes transborder scales produced by the way Indigenous migrants build translocal, transborder lives and politics with such density that some scholars have called them "transregions" (Jonas and Rodríguez 2015; Stephen 2007, 2012). Sofía Robles, a Zapotec/Mixe activist whose long history of organizing forms part of this book, described

to me the levels or scales of organizing that situate her political work. When I asked her about the relationships between the levels or scales of activism, Sofia said,

> The levels, there are a lot of levels [of activism]. For example, in Mexico, speaking just in Mexico, the local level is the community. Then comes the regional that includes various communities. Then the state level that already includes different regional places, or different regions of the state. Later, at the national level . . . there might be two or three from each state represent[ing] us [within national organizing]. Now at the continental [level], which is all of Latin America, Canada, the United States, all of Central America and South America. The network includes super regions like South America that is the southern region [of the Continent], Central America is the central region and there is Mexico, United States, and Canada, right? We are the northern region . . . language is difficult but those are the levels [of activism]. Then at the international level we organize with others, but we relate mostly to the continental level. The worldwide level is more difficult, more complex. (Sofía Robles, interview with Maylei Blackwell, August 31, 1999)

Moving in and between scales is a form of weaving. Weaving knowledges, weaving spaces, strategies, and discourses. This mode of organizing is specific to Indigenous women, who weave worlds to produce modes of social change relationally. In her 2010 book, which topples racialized geopolitical hierarchies of knowledges and colonial circuits of theory, Aymara scholar-activist Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui examines Indigenous proposals for engaging in mestizo modernity and citizenship. In subsequent work, she critiques the masculinized notion of identity as territory as "still marked by the colonial seal of the exclusion of women" (2012, 106). She continues:

> The notion of the identity of women, however, is similar to a fabric. Far from establishing the property and the jurisdiction of the authority of the nation—or the people, the autonomous indigenous—the feminine practice weaves the fabric of the intercultural through women's practices as producers, merchants, weavers, ritualists, and creators of languages and symbols capable of seducing the "other" and establishing pacts of reciprocity and coexistence among different groups. This seductive labor, acculturated and surrounding women, allows for the complementing of the territorial homeland with a dynamic cultural fabric that reproduces itself and spreads until it reaches the mixed and frontier areas—the *ch'ixi*

areas—and there contributes its vision of personal responsibility, privacy, and individual rights associated with citizenship. (107)

This act of weaving from the inside to meet the outside, creating a third space in the middle, is also used to create the Cherokee doubleweave basket woven with rivercane. Two spirit Cherokee scholar Qwo-Li Driskill (2010, 2016) theorizes how this form of weaving creates bridges between multiple knowledges, practices, and epistemologies. Whereas from the outside the basket appears one way or has one face, on the inside there is another weave, held by various splints, which serves as a metaphor of how, for example, the queer and the Indigenous knowledges in Driskill's Asegi theory, when doublewoven, create a new, interwoven epistemology. Driskill argues that "by looking to doubleweave as a Cherokee theory and practice, we can theorize a third space that materializes through the process of doubling. Doubleweaving privileges the voices and stories that colonial projects have attempted to destroy but that, hidden in the third space forgotten about by colonial cultures, survive" (Driskill 2016, 24). This inter- or doubleweaving describes how Indigenous women's organizing moves in and between both colonial and Indigenous scales, as well as conjures new ones to produce interstitial or third space knowledges, practices, and scales of resistance.

Even the translocal ways Indigenous migrants are weaving localities and scales when they are deterritorialized calls attention to how those weavings become an embodied mobile Indigenous archive that has the possibility of resisting settler colonial logics. Maya K'iche scholar Floridalma Boj Lopez argues that Mayan clothing worn in the diaspora functions as an embodied Indigenous geography that marks the body with spiritual epistemologies and spatial cartographies that preceded, and now exceed, the nation of Guatemala. Boj Lopez theorizes wearing Mayan weaving as a form of continuity and rupture across the generations and spaces within the diaspora has the possibility of contesting settler colonialism. Those weavings "embody difference" representing Maya cosmovision, localized histories, and landscapes on the body. "Whether it is the sacred numerical values that are present in the technique of weaving, which correspond to numbers of key significance in the sacred calendars of the Mayas, or the actual figures and designs that speak to important landmarks in the area (lakes, mountain ranges, or volcanoes)" (Boj Lopez 2017b, 196). Indeed, weavings are just one of many cultural and political formations that are embodied mobile archives of indigeneity, according to Boj Lopez (2017a).

Scales of Resistance moves along these interwoven, networked activist scales to show how Indigenous cosmovision, knowledges, discourses, identities, and

epistemologies are woven into and with those forms found in and across scales. Building from Cusicanqui's woven fabric of Indigenous women's land epistemologies and world building, Driskill's theorization of doubleweave, and Boj Lopez's mobile archives of indigeneity, I examine how Indigenous women's organizing interweaves scales to create third spaces and what Chicana feminist theorist Chela Sandoval (1991, 1998) calls "differential consciousness" to describe the tactical shifts in consciousness produced by reading and responding to multiple contexts, and I would add scales, of power, or *geographies of difference*. Differential consciousness describes the ways in which Indigenous women in Mexico and its diaspora move within and between forms of consciousness, epistemologies, and discourses as they travel the circuits and scales that structure power and meaning in their lives.[5]

Driskill theorizes the ways in which "Cherokee Two-spirit and queer people are reimagining our pasts and futures through a practice of re-storying in the present" (2016, 3). This project examines how the spaces of connection between interwoven scales creates third spaces from which to envision and create new worlds and, as Driskill invites us, to weave the past and future. Indigenous women activists struggle to create a new world where many worlds fit by weaving together ancestral knowledge, dreams, and instructions with visions for future generations. This re-storying is at the heart of the innovation and embodiment Mayan youth enact in their use of ancestral weaving in Los Angeles that can "blur the boundaries between settler, Native, and migrant in ways that may challenge what it means to be an indigenous migrant in a settler society" (Boj Lopez 2017b, 200) creating what Boj Lopez calls, with a nod to Audra Simpson, Indigenous geographies of refusal. Indeed, the National Movement of Maya Weavers of Guatemala refuses the appropriation of their territories and their bodies by insisting that their weavings have been, for millennium, protected in a communitarian and collective manner in their book, *Our Weaving Are Books the Colony Could Not Burn* (2020).

Yet weaving scales also produces frictions. Anna Tsing (2005, 2012) calls our attention to the important ways scales are produced by global capital, how they produce frictions, and how they can fail. These conceptual tools help map how Indigenous women activists in Mexico and its diaspora create, use, and weave scales of resistance and how they also learn to tie threads off when their projects, visions, or epistemologies are revealed to be "unscalable" (Tsing 2012, 523). Tsing argues that "scalability, again, is this ability to expand without distorting the framework. But it takes hard work to make knowledge, landscapes, and projects scalable. What I have tried to show is how that work, by its design, covers up and attempts to block the transformative diversity of social relations. From

this perspective, the history of scalability must be considered in relation to both its moments of success and its sometimes-happy failures" (2012, 523). In the project of weaving scales, strategies, epistemologies, and movement discourses, new scales are conjured, as Tsing suggests, but, critically, some elements of Indigenous knowledges and practices are unscalable and must be valued for their inability to be deterritorialized, universalized, and scaled (which, ironically, is why they are often dismissed as backward, unmodern, quaint, local, specific, etc.). Brady (2022) calls for the refusal of the seduction of scale and the scaffold imaginary "as the vision of the world as understandable through a set of nested hierarchies that privilege a vertical plane. Most clearly articulated as the stretch from body to home to city to region to nation to hemisphere, scale names mass and relation, while insisting on the fundamental logic of abstraction, containment, categorization, and comparison folded into a vertical, hierarchical orientation" (19). The Indigenous women activists I have accompanied scale down and across to create new communities of resistance and practices of autonomy, conjure new scales, navigate the unscalable, bypass colonial scale with Indigenous epistemologies that reground scale into the Earth, challenge the scaffold imaginary by centering and connecting their own locales and territories, disrupt scalar confinement, and rescale Indigenous belonging through diaspora. They engage in Brady's alternatives to scale—queer horizontality and density—to "shirk the violence of the scaffold imaginary that scalar thought enforces" (3). Throughout the book, I describe these densities of connection, solidarity, and relation making as well as the multidirectional reorganization of scales from hierarchal and vertical to horizontal, translocal, transregional and transborder. For example, in chapter 1 Indigenous women activists in Mexico practice Indigenous autonomy through what could be called a density of autonomous practices and communal connections located not in the State, but in the embodied and community scales of autonomy. Practicing another of Brady's alternatives to scale, queer horizontality, I illustrate how Indigenous women's continental activism conjured the scale of Abyiayla, a horizontal scale of connection to each other and to land, that shifts the geopolitics of international diplomacy and transnational activism that had erased them and their epistemologies. In chapter 3, I explore how Indigenous women's multilocal organizing interrupts the verticality of scale through meshworks that not only interweave the vertical and horizontal notions of scale but create new relations across horizontal planes by weaving Indigenous epistemologies and communalities. These strategies of density and connection are manifest through Indigenous transborder organizing and transborder community that rescale Oaxacan Indigenous belonging in chapters 4 and 5. Drawing on more

than twenty years of ethnographic research and seventy oral histories, *Scales of Resistance* examines how Indigenous women activists are navigating, rejecting, localizing, interweaving, and remaking ideas of scale.

Contesting Gender as a Discourse of Governmentality

Mexico has the largest population of Indigenous peoples in the Americas, representing 15.1 percent of the population (IWGIA 2021). About 6.2 percent of the total population of Mexico speaks an Indigenous language (INEGI 2020) and Mexico has the largest number of native languages spoken: 68 languages with 364 recognized dialects of those languages (Jacquelin-Andersen 2018, 77). The seventy-year single-party rule of the PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional, or Institutional Revolutionary Party) began to be increasingly challenged by forces of democratization and ended in 2000. In the early 1990s, Indigenous movements across the continent united to protest the 1992 quincentennial celebration of Columbus's so-called discovery of the Americas. Mexico surprised many by adopting policy measures that addressed Indigenous peoples and recognized the nation's pluricultural nature. In 1990, it became the second country in the world and the first in Latin America to ratify Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the UN International Labor Organization (ILO), a critical tool for Indigenous social movements around the world that recognizes the collective economic, cultural, social, and political rights of Indigenous people. Mexico adopted the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007.

While purportedly positive in nature, the signing of Convention 169 and Mexico's subsequent passage in 1992 of Article 4 of its constitution, which recognized the pluricultural nature of Mexico as a nation as well as Indigenous peoples' cultural rights, were regarded warily by many skeptics. It seemed all too possible that such moves were yet another strategy to address mounting international pressure without meaningful reform during a critical juncture in Mexico's alignment with a hemispheric neoliberal agenda carried out through free trade, deregulation, and privatization. Such suspicions were confirmed, for example, in 1992 when, in preparation for the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), then President Salinas de Gotarri dismantled the Ejido system, a collective land tenure system that was one of the remaining victories of the Mexican Revolution affecting some 61 percent of the land within Indigenous communities, effectively undercutting rural and Indigenous farmers' ability to survive (Hernández Navarro and Carlsen 2004). Ultimately, neoliberal reforms have had a profound and detrimental impact on Indigenous com-

munities throughout Mexico, leading to displacement, migration, and greater marginalization.

Such effects, however, are obscured by celebratory accounts of arguably superficial symbolic gestures. On the one hand, for the first time in Mexico's history, the constitutional reform to Article 4 (which is now Article 2 after being renumbered) acknowledged the pluricultural nature of Mexico as a nation recognizing Afro Mexicans and Indigenous peoples' cultural rights surrounding the protection of their own languages, cultures, customs and traditional practices, and forms of social organization. On the other hand, the article lacked enforcement mechanisms and failed to recognize the collective rights of Indigenous peoples, thereby bounding Indigenous rights within a cultural rights frame whose meaning and parameters are determined by the state, rather than recognizing collective rights to self-determination codified in international law. Critics pointed out how the underlying minimalist, neoliberal notion of state responsibilities defanged any effort to redistribute wealth or power, watering the article's implications down to become virtually meaningless (Hindley 1996). Neil Harvey noted that the state's limited interpretation of Convention 169 "had the effect of not only ignoring the social and economic factors that prevented Indigenous peoples from truly exercising their rights, but also reproduced the authority of the state (and specifically the executive branch) over the acceptable practices of Indigenous peoples" (1998, 201–2).

The Chiapas uprising on January 1, 1994, the day NAFTA went into effect, brought many of these tensions to public light, disrupting the myth of progress and exposing the devastating poverty, racism, and neglect that Mexico's sixty-eight Indigenous pueblos continue to experience. In November 1996, the Commission on Concordance and Pacification (COCOPA) proposed their initiative for constitutional reform based on the San Andrés Peace Accords on Indigenous Rights and Culture, which the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) and government representatives signed in February of that year. Despite being designed by government representatives and receiving mass approval after widespread deliberation convened by the EZLN and the National Indigenous Congress, then President Ernesto Zedillo rejected the plan. A stalemate ensued until the next presidential sexenio (six-year term), when the PAN (National Action Party) candidate, Vicente Fox, promised to introduce the COCOPA initiative to congress and resolve the problem in Chiapas in twenty minutes. In 2001, the EZLN traveled by caravan through twelve states to the Mexican capital for a historic appearance on the floor of the lower house of the Mexican Congress. But despite broad support for the COCOPA proposal, both

houses of the legislature chose instead to pass the Law on Indigenous Rights and Culture, a counterreform that fails to meet the basic agreements of the San Andrés Peace Accords (Mora 2017b).

Those analyzing state responses to the rise of Indigenous and women's mobilization in Latin America have observed that states, instead of denying or repressing social movement demands, use a strategy of selective co-option, whereby minimal recognition of rights leads to an increased role for the state in constituting and regulating identities through its administrative and technocratic power (Hale 2002; Schild 1997). Charles Hale (2005) argues that state recognition of cultural rights and limited Indigenous autonomy as states rolled back their social welfare policies became a cultural logic of neoliberalism or what he called "neoliberal multiculturalism." Addressing the ways in which the discourse of gender equity has been co-opted by successive elected governments in Latin America, Verónica Schild states that "increasingly, the advancement of women's rights—a political goal—is being transformed into a technical task that leaves unchallenged the exploitative capitalist relations that enable the successful global economic integration of countries in the region, and may even deepen the problem of the feminization of poverty" (2000a, 25). Instead of being seen as contradictory to neoliberalism, gender and Indigenous cultural rights were increasingly seen as part of neoliberal governmentality (Hale 2002, 2005; Postero 2007).[6] Indeed, Sarah Radcliffe examined how Ecuador established administrative and discoursive biopolitical power to form both governmentalities of race and gender in her analysis of the State's reproductive and sexual health policy and the use of gender rights and intercultural multiculturalism (2008).

While some analysts examine how demands for Indigenous autonomy fit into the cultural logic of neoliberalism and feminist scholars critique the selective co-optation of some of the most liberal elements of the feminist movement (Schild 2015), I have called attention to the ways in which Indigenous claims are engaged and managed by the neoliberal state *through* the discourse of gender (Blackwell 2012). Bridging the ways scholars have looked at both the co-optation of gender and Indigenous rights through neoliberal governance in Latin America, I examine how gender has been used by the state as a discourse of governmentality to regulate Indigenous subjects. When we examine closely how the Mexican state has understood and denied Indigenous claims, we see that much of its opposition to claims for Indigenous autonomy ultimately revolves around questions of gender and hegemonic constructions of Indigenous culture (Blackwell 2004). This response stems from the gendered logic of racism that the government has deployed in response to women's rights and

Indigenous communities. The Mexican government first claimed that the Zapatista uprising was not truly Indigenous (and was led by outside agitators and feminist infiltrators) because, among other reasons the movement was too well organized and executed or started too early in the morning as the uprising started in the dawn hours of January 1, 1994. Further evidence of this supposed outside influence was that women comprised some 30 percent of the EZLN and the rights of women to equality, a life free of violence, equal pay, and the right to choose their partner and when and whether to bear children were codified in the Women's Revolutionary Law. In direct contradiction, when the Indigenous movement did make a claim for Indigenous peoples' autonomy, the government justified its denial of the right of autonomy to Indigenous people on the claim that women's rights are not protected within Indigenous customs and practices (I unpack this assertion in chapters 1 and 3).

A gendered logic of racism has often served as the lynchpin of the debate in the sense that much of the government's argument against Indigenous self-governance has hinged on the question of gender. In fact, this governmental tactic has been deployed so often that we might consider how gender has become a discourse of governmentality that is used to define what counts as "authentically indigenous" and to regulate indigenous subjects. Foucault (1991) turned toward governmentality as a way to understand how neoliberal governance acts on populations through the logic of the market so that subjects become self-regulating individuals in a context where power is decentered and where regulation and control are not limited to state institutions but include a wide range of civil society (NGOs, for example) (Alvarez 2010).[7] This is linked to the political rationality that shifts responsibility for services formally provided by the state in social welfare, education, and social services onto the individual. Neoliberal withdrawal of the state is tied to personal responsibility and new technologies of the self whereby subjects must become self-managing (Gil-García 2015).[8] As a new relation of rule between the state and Indigenous communities was consolidated through a watered-down multiculturalism, the Mexican state used a gendered logic of racism to define and regulate Indigenous subjectivity and rights (Speed 2008). Whereas Hale (2004) warns against forms of selective governmental co-optation that define which activists are appropriate Indigenous subjects (or the Indio Permitido), I have argued that gender has become a discourse of governmentality used to regulate and define "good" and "bad" Indigenous subjects, those worthy of rights and autonomy as peoples and those not (Blackwell 2012).

This gendered governmentality came into play in the debates leading up to the 2001 constitutional reform of articles 1, 2, 4, 18, and 115. Legislators called

into question the right to Indigenous self-determination on the basis of the (disingenuous) premise that Indigenous normative systems (usos y costumbres) do not protect the rights of women. This premise, of course, ignores the patriarchal norms of the Mexican state and the widespread work of Indigenous women to transform Indigenous laws and cultures in order to recognize gender diversity, create equity, and stop violence. The law that was implemented instead of the San Andrés Accords, negotiated between the government and the EZLN in 1996, are better understood as "counterreforms" because they fail to implement the collective right of Indigenous people to self-governance (Mora 2015; Stavenhagen 2001). Starting in 2003, the members of the EZLN and the Congreso Nacional Indígena (CNI) began to implement the San Andrés Accords, starting in their own autonomous communities outside of the state's purview. Indigenous movements have navigated the perils of selective co-optation and the ways in which the state restricts Indigenous demands for autonomy to cultural rights by largely bypassing state forms of recognition. Although several states have gone on to pass provisions recognizing Indigenous peoples in state constitutions, Indigenous jurisprudence and governance have yet to be fully recognized. In the context of Oaxaca where three-fourths of all municipalities hold elections through Indigenous law, Worthen has found that women's rights are often constructed as a colonial "rescue narrative" where the state is positioned as the savior, especially in relation to recent legislation on gender equity in election law in Oaxaca. Increasingly, in a context of Mexico's democratic tradition and the war on drugs, Indigenous peoples' political and legal frameworks of self-governance were portrayed as not only as nondemocratic but illegal. Worthen (2021) argues "By creating new hegemonic ways of conceptualizing indigeneity within a legal/illegal binary, it helped promote an agenda of state securitization that portrayed Indigenous people as a threat to national security (Hernández et al. 2013)" (2).

It is important to note, however, that Indigenous women activists have played a critical role in contesting the government's use of gender to deny collective Indigenous rights. Chapter 1, for example, explores how their grassroots practices of construction and consultation have sustained the movement beyond the claim for rights in the face of military repression and governmental recalcitrance. At the same time, Indigenous women activists face a significant challenge in the form of the state's gendered logic of racism. Yet by creating a strategy of scaling down rights discourse into a decolonial practice of autonomy, Indigenous women activists have devised, implemented, and sustained a long-term movement for self-determination. Along with scaling down the

right to Indigenous autonomy to the practice of autonomy embedded in multiple scales of the home, the body, and the community, the work of interweaving in and between scales became more strategic with the passage of the Law on Indigenous Culture and Rights, which undermined the basic guarantee for Indigenous self-determination in Mexico at the national scale. The strategies Indigenous women have developed in response are instructive to other social movements given the neoliberal state strategy of co-opting selected rights discourses without implementing real change (Schild 2000a).

While activists and critics decried the conjunction of neoliberalism and a watered-down multiculturalism, what Mariana Mora and Jaime García Leyva (2020) call attention to is the simultaneous growth of the state security apparatus, specifically during the undeclared war on drug trafficking by the administration of President Felipe Calderon (2006–12), and carried on by the subsequent Peña Nieto administration. For example, Mora and García Leyva underscore that while historically the state divested resources dedicated to education and health with the rise of neoliberal regimes, it made a corresponding biopolitical investment in the state security apparatus. From 2000 to 2012, for example, while spending on education increased only 54 percent, the Mexican state's investment in the security apparatus increased 334 percent. The increased militarization of Mexico has been justified by the war on drugs, and linked to increased repression, but Mora and García Leyva highlight the racialized nature of who came to occupy the category "criminal" in these processes. They argue that the state security apparatus and the increased militarization of social spaces led to the criminalization of social actors who were racialized, such as political activists, many of whom were environmental and anti-extractivist organizers, teachers, and students, throughout Indigenous and Afro-descendent communities in Mexico (Mora and García Levya 2020, 219). In fact, Aída Hernández Castillo had already analyzed the ways increased state violence and criminalization of social movements had begun to specifically repress activist women through gendered forms of violence. She wrote widely on what happened in Atenco in 2006 when the community was protesting their dispossession by a megadevelopment project and police forces violently entered the community, detaining 207 people—including children, women, and elders—by extralegal means; 2 people died; 20 people were injured and 26 women were sexually assaulted while detained (Hernández Castillo 2013b).

The power of her 2016 book, *Multiple InJustices: Indigenous Women, Law, and Political Struggle in Latin America*, is that it brings together an analysis of the latest phase of capitalist extraction and Indigenous dispossession with an

understanding of gender and sexual violence, specifically how these forms of violence are being used against Indigenous women and organized Indigenous communities. Specifically, Hernández Castillo condemns sexual torture by governmental agencies, which she argues is part of the "patriarchal semantics of violence and impunity" (2016, 22) across Indigenous regions of Latin America that are undergoing a process of accumulation by dispossession (see Harvey 2003). Critically, Hernández Castillo finds that "we are before a new onslaught of capital that appropriates the territories and resources of native peoples through neocolonial strategies that criminalize social movements and use sexual violence as a repressive strategy in the processes of dispossession" (2016, 22–23). This new onslaught of capital, then, produces continuities and layers onto the gendered forms of racism in the earlier neoliberal moment I previously described, creating devastating effects.

Shannon Speed's book *Incarcerated Stories* (2019) critically analyzes this shifting context. She argues: "In the span of a little more than a decade, we have seen a significant shift in the state itself and its forms of governance. Since the 1990s, Mexico and Central America quickly expanded and grew out of the control of legal regimes. Meanwhile, the nascent democratic tendencies and fledgling rights regimes, however limited, were quickly sucked into the vortex of the mass-scale illegal economies . . . fed by the wide-scale corruption of the government and military and the deregulated flows of capital" (4). Her analysis of Indigenous women refugees from Central America centers on what she calls "neoliberal multicriminalism" created by the structural forms of neoliberalism, drug cartels that found a reserve army in those impoverished by neoliberal reforms, and the emergence of the national security state as both state and nonstate actors carried out obscene levels of bloodshed with impunity (5). Speed examines how these forms of violence extend the genocidal and patriarchal logics of settler colonialism within Latin America, and how these logics create overlapping and interrelated dynamics that exponentially increase the forms of violence that Indigenous women experience. In the introduction to their 2021 edited volume, she and her colleague Lynn Stephen write: "The racial and gender logics that underpinned native dispossession, slavery, and successive waves of labor exploitation are structuring logics, inherent to those systems. Today these structuring logics—and the forms of intersectional violence inherent to them—are driving processes of criminalization and victimization of Indigenous men and women, leading to escalating levels of murder, incarceration, or transnational displacement of Indigenous people, and particularly affecting Indigenous women" (2021, 4).

Collaborative Methods and Other Knowledges

Scales of Resistance is the result of nearly twenty-five years of collaborative research conducted while accompanying Indigenous women activists in Mexico, into their continental networks, and throughout the Mexican Indigenous diaspora in the United States. Collaborative work and collective conversations have not only guided the methodological design of this study, but these forms of collaboratively produced and shared knowledge guide the book's arguments. The methodology includes ethnography, seventy oral histories, and community-based digital storytelling projects and story maps. The project follows the multiple scales of Indigenous women's organizing and sees them as interconnected rather than divided by national contexts or easily divided by the policy or political arena in which they make their claims. That is, the collaborative research and ethnographic strategy center the activists themselves as the point of connection linking their lives, scales of organizing, and multiple sites of increasingly networked activism. This approach addresses the challenge of bringing together different levels or scales of analysis—in other words, how to analyze changes in international and state institutions while paying due attention to actors' agency in everyday spaces and their organizational and political dynamics. I devised this methodological strategy by following the network logics of activist organizing and being attentive to how globalization produces tensions within and across the multiple "sites" of activism. Following Juris and Khasnabish (2013) and "against overly romanticized views of transnational activism" (4), I use ethnography to highlight that "inevitable, yet productive, 'friction' (Tsing 2005) that ensues in the encounter between activists from diverse movements, political contexts, and cultural backgrounds" (4).

Whereas ethnographers of globalization, transmigration, and transnational social movements call for multisited ethnography, this project moves along scales of political organizing to illuminate the complex, cross-border, and transnational dialogues that are reshaping local ideals of justice as well as national and international policies. Although I might traditionally describe this project as multisited ethnography, that depiction does not accurately reflect how the field "sites" are not just bounded spaces of "here" but places constituted by other scales of power and the simultaneity of how "here" exists with usually one but often more "theres." These sites are not discrete spaces easily separated from each other; they are scales of power and place. Understanding this requires seeing how Indigenous women activists use their "peripheral vision" (Zavella 2009) to understand how changes they advocate for at the National Indigenous Congress, for example, might play at home in their community

assemblies; how continental women's politics might leverage more influence for them at the national level; or how, when they organize in local "sites" such as Los Angeles, Fresno, or Huajuapan de Leon, Oaxaca, they are also organizing—usually quite explicitly—with other points on the migrant route and the transborder communities that span those spaces. As Juris and Khasnabish (2013) have argued, "Grasping such dynamics requires not so much an ethnographic strategy that is multisited (although that can be a critical component) as one that is networked: attuned to the complex place-based meanings, flows, and sensibilities that interact within momentary spaces of encounter" (5). Each site within these networked and scaled organizing strategies happen, like globalization, "in place," as Escobar (2008) has argued. As much as these struggles are products of globalized flows of people, capital, and movement discourses, they are also in defense of collective Indigenous places, worlds, and projects: "Place-based struggles more generally link body, environment, culture, and economy in all their diversity" (7).

I began my earlier research, focused on Indigenous women's movements in Mexico, during a year of fieldwork in Mexico City in 1998; I initially sought to examine questions of difference within women's organizing. Yet, as with much engaged research, working with movements and communities shifts research agendas, subjects, and approaches, and forces the ethnographer to ask how the research is both accountable to those communities and useful to them. At that time, I began documenting the formative years of the CONAMI, attending meetings, conducting interviews, and assisting with organizational tasks such as getting materials photocopied and picking up food for the meeting. I continued to attend national gatherings of CONAMI and continental meetings of the Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de las Américas (ECMIA), and to meet up with Indigenous organizers at several Latin American and Caribbean feminist encuentros. In 2009, I began returning to Mexico to reinterview several of the founding members of CONAMI; during the next ten years, I met subsequent generations of leaders who shared their reflections on the Indigenous women's movement and their organization over the past two decades.

In 2005, during my research with CONAMI and ECMIA, I was approached by Odilia Romero Hernández, then the newly elected binational coordinator of women's affairs and a member of the Los Angeles office of the Frente Indígena de Organizaciones Binacionales (FIOB), who invited me to serve as an advisor to the organization. We had a series of meetings, and our conversations eventually led us to begin designing a set of workshops designed to empower women in the community and develop their leadership skills in FIOB. We developed a curriculum that was part consciousness-raising, part skills-building,

and we applied for an initial collaborative grant. A few months later, the FIOB applied to the Otros Saberes Initiative of the Latin American Studies Association, which funded Indigenous and Afro-descendant organizations and communities to partner with academics to design and carry out a collaborative research project. They were awarded the grant for a project entitled "Developing Binational Indigenous Leadership: Gender, Generation and Ethnic Diversity within the FIOB." The research team included Rufino Domínguez-Santos, then the General Coordinator; Centolia Maldonado, the coordinator of the Juxtlahuaca region of Oaxaca at the time; Odilia Romero Hernández; Laura Velasco, a sociologist from the Colegio de la Frontera Norte; and myself. Over the next year and a half, we designed and implemented statewide workshops on gender, generation, and ethnic diversity with leaders of the FIOB across three states in the United States and Mexico.

Sixty-three activists participated in the workshops in Tijuana, Baja California; Los Angeles, California; and Huajuapan de León, Oaxaca. Among the participants, 59.5 percent were men and 40.5 percent were women. Participants' mean age was 32.2 years. They spoke any of seven languages: Mixtec, Zapotec, Triqui, P'urépecha, Mixe, Spanish, and English; 56.8 percent spoke an Indigenous language (Romero Hernández et al. 2013). Interestingly, the Los Angeles workshop had the most linguistic diversity among Indigenous-language speakers, and though many people spoke some Spanish, English fluency was most prominent among migrant youth of the 1.5 and second generations. In addition to this initial work, chapters 4 and 5 draw on the many years of collaborative research and over twenty oral histories I conducted while accompanying women in the FIOB as they organized leadership programs and worked to be heard at all levels of FIOB. I served as a binational advisor to the organization for six years. After that project, I spent another ten years attending more events and forging relationships with FIOB members in Oaxaca City, Zanatapec, Juxtlahuaca, Fresno, Los Angeles, and Oceanside. That research included participant observation, oral history, and digital storytelling.

In 2013, I began a large-scale public humanities project creating digital story maps with Indigenous communities in Los Angeles. Honoring Indigenous protocol, we consulted with Tongva communities to build the project and create a prototype of a story map; we worked with community educators to build the first story map. Mapping Indigenous LA has been a platform for collaboration, communication, and dialogue between the Tongva and Tatavium, relocated native communities, Pacific Islanders, and the Latin American Indigenous diaspora and the spring board for many other community-led story mapping projects. In 2018, I started the archivo móvil de las comunidades indígenas

(Mobile Indigenous Community Archive, MICA) as an Indigenous memory project that works to rematriate Indigenous women activists' knowledge and stories of resistance back into Indigenous communities and movements. Conceptualized as a seed bank, the mobile digital archive is a community controlled platform where rich histories of Indigenous organizing in Mexico and the Latin American Indigenous diaspora are gathered, preserved, and shared, often with younger organizers. Centering on Indigenous women who are often left out of the documenting and archiving process, guided by community designed protocols and a commitment to replant the knowledges that are gathered, MICA provides training and labor for Indigenous organizations and community members to collect and digitize their documents, videos, photos, and ephemera as well as to create exhibitions and popular education modules guided by the movement's needs and desires.

Theoretical Inspirations and Conversations

Scales of Resistance builds on rich political and intellectual traditions of Indigenous activists and scholars throughout the hemisphere, along with literatures in Indigenous feminisms, Critical Indigenous Studies, Indigenous migration, and Critical Latinx Indigeneities. It is inspired by intellectual, epistemological, and political conversations with many Indigenous activists, social thinkers, and Indigenous scholars whose work dismantles the legitimacy of settler colonial borders and empire such as Inés Hernández-Ávila, Inés Talamontez, Gloria Chacon, Margo Tamez, Jodi Byrd, Hokulani Aikau, Audra Simpson, and Shannon Speed; those whose work emerges from and centers Abiayala including Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui and Emil Keme; those whose thinking transforms colonial systems of gender and sexuality like Gladys Tzul Tzul, Aura Cumes, Emma Chirix, Cristina Cucurí, Joanne Barker, Irma Velásquez Nimatuj, J. Kehaulani Kauanui, Dian Million, Deborah Miranda, Renya Ramirez, Jennifer Denetdale, Maile Arvin, Qwo-Li Driskill, to name a few; and the numerous collaborators building Critical Latinx Indigeneities including Indigenous scholars Floridalma Boj Lopez, Luis Urrieta, Lourdes Alberto, Brenda Nicolás, and Luis Sánchez. This works builds on prior conversations on comparative and hemispheric Indigeneities including those who contributed to and edited the groundbreaking collection *Comparative Indigeneities of the Amerícas*.

Feminist journalists, activists, and anthropologists have engaged the transformative role of women in the Zapatista rebellion (Eber and Kovic 2003; Klein 2015; Lovera and Palomo 1997; Ortiz 2001; Rovira 2000; Speed, Hernández Castillo, and Stephen 2006). Other scholars have focused on forging new

forms of Indigenous gendered political claims on autonomy (Millán 1996, 2014a; Speed, Hernández Castillo, and Stephen 2006), human rights and community organization (Speed 2008), healing (Forbis 2003), violence (Hernández Castillo 1998b, 2014), building the Zapatista caracoles, epistemologies, and pedagogies (Klein 2015; Mora 2017a), and the role of women in the Consejo Indígena de Gobierno (Indigenous Governing Council; CIG) (Muñoz Ramírez 2018). There is a rich tradition of scholarship on Indigenous women's activism in Mexico (Bonfil Sánchez and del Pont Lalli 1999; Espinosa Damien 2009a, 2009b). Bonfil et al. (2008) highlight how Indigenous women's participation and leadership engages in two parallel systems in which they have faced gender, racism, generational, and other forms of discrimination (116): the national political system and Indigenous normative systems. Aída Hernández Castillo (2001, 2016) called attention to how Indigenous women's gendered demands were triangulated between feminist ethnocentrism and Indigenous ethnonationalism, concerns that have been echoed widely by Indigenous feminist scholars in the United States and Canada. Indigenous women's organizing has been critical in scaling down political claims to Indigenous autonomy into daily lived realities (Blackwell 2000, 2006; Forbis 2003; Speed 2008). Indigenous women activists and thinkers have envisioned shared frames of resistance based on Indigenous cosmovisions, asserting their role in the balance, responsibilities and right relationships embedded in their millennial cultures in a wide arrange of struggles from land and water defense in the fight against extractivism, to those resisting state and narco violence, to those who have fought for Indigenous autonomy, territory and communal decision making in ways that challenge sexual and gender violence, discrimination and exclusion (Cumes 2014; Cunningham 2006; Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas 2010; Sánchez 2005; Tzul Tzul 2015) Other social thinkers have formed a powerful gendered critique from an Indigenous perspective, which has led some to begin questioning the basis of feminism predicated on individual western rationality (Cumes 2021; Gargallo Celentani 2012; Marcos 2005; Millán 2014b). Analyzing how "organized Indigenous women are developing diverse forms of cultural politics from within organizations where women's rights are central to their political agenda, and also from those where local demands are the priority," Hernández Castillo maps the complex project of Indigenous women's organizing in Mexico and beyond (2016, 8). Indigenous women's political agenda "decenters not only the discourse of power about law and custom but also hegemonic discourses on indigeneity gender, modernity and tradition" (8). Over decades, Lynn Stephen's work on Indigenous women (1991, 2005, 2011), social movements (1997, 2002, 2009), migration (2007, 2012, 2014a), and testimonio (2013) has reshaped the

way the field has been understood. In just one instructive example, her work on the 2006 Oaxacan uprising examines how Oaxacan Indigenous women gendered human rights discourse to challenge the ways they are stigmatized as "short, fat, and brown" insisting on the right to speak and be heard as the face of Oaxaca (Stephen 2011). Others have sought to understand Indigenous women's rights within legal pluralities and struggles for justice (Picq 2012; Sieder 2008, 2017; Sierra 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2012; Sierra and Speed 2005; Terven Salinas 2005). Finally, Berrio Palomo (2006) offers a rich comparison of Mexico and Colombia and Rousseau and Rosales Hudson (2016, 2018) offer a unique comparative perspective on Indigenous movements in Mexico, Peru, and Bolivia. The latter argue that "the fact that most Indigenous women leaders have first mobilized within mixed-gender organizations sets the frame for understanding autonomy as relationally constructed in the context of the broader dynamics of Indigenous movements" (Rousseau and Rosales Hudson 2016, 59).

Scales of Resistance combines and contributes to the scholarship on transnational social movements, transnational migration, and translocality—phenomena that are often studied as distinct but that are, in fact, often interrelated. Indigenous migrants navigate the complexity of what earlier transmigration scholars called transnational community, families, and identities to describe the ways sending and receiving communities influenced each other in a circular nature (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Black-Szanton 1994). Glick Schiller (2005) argues that migrants produce transnational social fields that cross the boundaries of various nation-states. As a political stance, the late Mixtec organizer Rufino Dominguez, one of the founders and leaders of FIOB, refused the term *transnational*, saying on numerous occasions that "we [Indigenous migrants] are not goods capitalism imports and exports for profit." In seeking to understand Indigenous migration, I complicate transnationalism, arguing that it must be approached from a perspective that denaturalizes the colonial borders of the nation-state and recognizes Indigenous peoples and nations as transnational actors. This perspective insists that migration scholarship cease replicating the settler colonial logic of terra nullius and understand that the territories being transited are not empty spaces but are Indigenous territories and homelands (Blackwell, Boj Lopez, Urrieta 2017). This move unmasks the "settler move toward innocence" (Tuck and Yang 2012) embedded within the notion that the US is a "country of immigrants" as a settler colonial narrative (Dunbar-Ortiz 2021). This approach to migration studies forges a more complex interplay of multiple colonialities, Indigenous transnationalisms, transregions, and translocalilties, thereby opening up a conversation about transindigeneity for Indigenous migrants (Blackwell 2017a).

Indeed, scholars of Indigenous transnational migration call attention to the complexities of social, cultural, and political spatial relations within deterritorialized indigeneity and to efforts to retain Indigenous social, economic, cultural and political norms in transborder communities. Early scholarship on Indigenous cross-border politics called attention to the presence of binational (Indigenous) civil societies (Fox 2005; Rivera-Salgado 2006). Velasco Ortiz and París Pombo argue that Indigenous migration articulates "the duality of origin and destination and of modernity and tradition in a new field of multiterritorial integration and differentiation" (2014, 10). Similarly, Lynn Stephen notes that within transborder lives, the "ability to construct space, time and social relation in more than one place simultaneously is part of the daily framing of life in . . . extended families" (2007, 5). Much work on Indigenous migration from Mexico draws on the groundbreaking work of anthropologist Michael Kearney (1995), who coined the term *Oaxacalifornia* to explain the migratory patterns, cultural, social, and political identities of thousands of Oaxacans in California. In the words of Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, from his essay on "The Right to Stay Home," "'Oaxacalifornia' is a transnationalized space in which migrants bring together their lives in California with their communities of origin" (2014b, 99). This "space" has enabled Oaxacan migrants in California to engage in collective action and cultural enrichment while away from their communities of origin. Oaxacalifornia is a way in which Indigenous migrants maintain their connection to their Oaxacan origin. As they work in California to raise money for their families back home, these largely Zapotec, Mixtec, and Triqui migrants find it important to retain their Oaxacan identity. To maintain ties with their communities of origin, some migrants have formed hometown associations to fundraise and carry out community rituals, like holding feast days, transborder communal care, and teaching and continuing Indigenous cultural forms. There is also a rich tradition of mutual aid and civic organizing where coalition projects that focus on "translocal" ties enable migrants to "bring people together from a broader, regional, ethno-geographic sphere," according to Rivera-Salgado (2014b, 98). Some examples of these types of coalitions are FIOB and the Organizacion Regional de Oaxaca (ORO) discussed in chapters four and five.

Although conceptions like Oaxacalifornia signal the notion of transregional social, cultural, and political worlds and projects of community belonging, we still must attend to the fact that the lands upon which transregional Indigenous belonging are constructed belong to other Indigenous nations. Ideas like Oaxacalifornia make space and home for Oaxacan Indigenous migrants in California, which already is structured by Spanish and Mexican colonial arrangements overlaid by US settler colonial ones (Blackwell, Boj Lopez, and

Urrieta 2017; Blackwell 2017a). Crafting a place of belonging amid structural violence and hostility is part of what scholars have called Latino cultural citizenship (Flores and Benmayor 1998), yet these forms of belonging being created on the homelands and territories of native California communities. Zapotec scholar Brenda Nicolás (2020) critiques the concept of Oaxacalifornia for the ways it aligns Oaxaca to the Spanish colonial frame of California, erasing Indigenous peoples whose homelands are settled on thereby creating a new settler project.

Some notes toward the use of terms may be necessary, as this project crosses disciplines and fields (political science, anthropology, and ethnic, gender, and Latin American studies) as well as academic and activist borders and Indigenous and non-Indigenous worlds. *Transnationalism* has been used to talk about the movement of cultures, peoples, and capital across borders under neoliberal capitalism. Scholars of social movements often use *international* to describe formal state-to-state relationships to distinguish transnational actors and processes that occur across nation-state borders but do not necessarily involve state actors. For example, Francesca Miller (1990), in her study of early transnational women's organizing in the Americas (the Pan-American Scientific Congresses of the 1890s and the First International Feminist Congress in 1910 in Argentina) distinguishes between internationalism as "formal intergovernmental activities carried on at the international level" and the transnational arena where women organize not as representatives of their governments but as those who are marginalized by them (225). Add to this complexity an Indigenous perspective that sees relationships between Indigenous people and states as nation-to-nation relationships, especially in the North American context. For example, Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd (2011) has argued that the homogenization of more than five hundred Indigenous nations through US settler colonialism is a process of minoritization that makes racial what is truly international. Whereas the state has attempted to manage indigeneity via racial/ethnic categories (Barker 2006), others have argued that Indigenous people have radically different goals than a civil rights agenda or pluralist discourses of inclusion that misconstrue Indigenous claims as being race based (Kauanui 2008). Yet not all Indigenous groups who recognize themselves as a distinct people refer to themselves as nations; for example, in Mexico, many Indigenous peoples refer themselves in relation to their pueblos (people/places) even though in official discourse they are referred to as ethnicities.

Federico Besserer's (2004) work mapping transnational topographies of the Mixtec diaspora in terms of culture, politics, economics, and labor shows the multiple borders that migrants cross. For me, Stephen's (2007) notion of

transborder is an important tool in this toolbox or analytic repertoire, and her work on transborder lives (2007, 2012) introduced the theoretical complexity of borders, border crossing, and borderlands (Anzaldúa 1987; Segura and Zavella 2007) to cross-border migration and the complex social, cultural, political, and economic ties Indigenous migrants forge. In this formulation Stephen argues that migrants cross nation-state borders and the national racial hierarchies that others have called "coloniality of power" (Quijano 2000), which means Indigenous and Afro-descendent migrants face discrimination for being not only part of a national group but also part of a racially subjugated group within that nation. For me, the concept of transborder is also useful to call attention to the multiple colonial, racial, class, and gendered borders that transborder migrants and organizers navigate.

I build on transborder as a tool to disrupt and open up what *transnational* means—to include transindigenous or Indigenous nation-to-nation relationships and to account for the multiple configurations of power within nations. For example, I use the term *transborder* rather than *transnational* to denaturalize multiple colonial borders, colonialities of power (systems that have colonial arrangements of meaning and power at their center), and settler colonial structures (designed to eliminate the native). Immigration scholars overlook the idea that the US-Mexico border is not only a colonial border that migrants—and their translocal cultures and binational civil societies—cross, but also a border that is mapped over other Indigenous nations' territories, which are also crossed, divided, and traversed, though far less frequently acknowledged (Tamez 2013). I have contributed these perspectives to building a framework called Critical Latinx Indigeneities that I argue later in chapter five is part of understanding how Indigenous migrants navigate Indigenous geographies of difference. This perspective allows us to (1) rethink and unsettle colonial borders; (2) grapple with the role of migration in settler colonial projects, and (3) challenge state-generated racial projects of Indigenous erasure, as do mestizaje and notions of indigenismo.

One of the challenges of Indigenous migration is the often-obscured fact that multiple colonialities may be at play in any given space, and that those colonial projects are not isolated from one another but have historically colluded to create the power relationships, indeed the geographies of difference, that Indigenous women navigate, especially in migration. These multiple and divergent colonialities have produced conflicting notions of indigeneity. Indigenismo was part of a mestizo intellectual and cultural movement in Latin America in which national elites imagined and constructed national unity by recognizing the grandeur of the Indigenous civilizations on which Latin American societies have by and large been built, and which they have surpassed.

The way indigenismo was deployed in the nation-building project of post-revolutionary Mexico celebrated the grandeur of an Aztec past while denying the present and future of the sixty-eight Indigenous groups of Mexico, which comprise the largest Indigenous population in the hemisphere. In *Blood Lines* (2008), Contreras defines *indigenismo* as "the stylistic appropriation of Indigenous cultural forms and traditions by non-Indigenous artists and intellectuals" (24). Although recognizing the power of Mesoamerican Indigenous civilizations may seem like a positive development, it was tied to cultural projects of modernism and state projects of modernity. In the hands of state institutions, indigenismo as an ideology and set of policies allowed mestizo elites to regulate not only the meaning of indigeneity but which cultures were worth preserving and under which terms. Portraying Indigenous people only in the past is part of a genocidal logic that locks Indigenous people in a temporal frame of extinction or disappearance.

Mestizaje has been understood as the mixture of Indigenous, African, and European roots. Yet its historical origins are not so innocent; they buttress racial projects of whitening in the region including in countries such as Brazil and Mexico. In 1920s Mexico, then Minister of Education José Vasconcelos wrote that the country was populated by a cosmic race, by which he imagined indigeneity and Africanness to be eradicated via whiteness (Saldaña-Portillo 2003). Uncritical deployments of mestizaje and indigenismo in the Chicano movement and by Chicana feminisms have recycled the Mexican state project of eugenics based on whitening and on Indigenous/African erasure (Blackwell 2017a, 2017b; Contreras 2008, Guidotti Hernandez 2011). Following Gloria Anzaldúa's retheorization of mestiza consciousness (1987) as a facultad to break down dichotomies between first and third world, Mexican and American, straight and queer, many critical theorists took up the liberatory possibilities of hybridity in her writings. Scholars were disturbed by the way her work seemed to embrace the hybridity of mestizaje while overlooking how it had historically been deployed to erase, eliminate, and ultimately whiten Black and Indigenous communities in Mexico. Others argued that she, along with other Chicana scholars, "appropriated this concept to construct a new mestiza cultural identity that resists racial, sexual, and other forms of structural oppression" (Gutiérrez Najera, Castellanos, Aldama, 2012, 7). Sandy Grande (2000) cautions critical theorists who take up the mantle of mestizaje "as the basis of a new cultural democracy [because it] does not fully consider Indigenous struggles to sustain the cultural and political integrity of American Indian communities" (469). She asks if mestizaje can be reconciled with Indigenous imperatives of self-determination and sovereignty (474).

In terms of Indigenous migration and transborder organizing, I have argued that multiple colonialities have produced different state-managed boundaries of indigeneity, which, under conditions of neoliberal globalization, have collided and hybridized. This process is what I call elsewhere "hybrid hegemonies" to describe how one racial system migrates and gets mapped onto US white supremacist and settler state projects through the process of migration. I have argued that Indigenous migrants are learning to navigate not only multiple racial hegemonies but also the intersection of local, national, and transnational systems of power that shift, overlap, and hybridize during the process of migration (Blackwell 2010). These migrating meanings of race in relation to indigeneity are both historic and new and signal the ways in which racial power is signified and utilized to create structures of disempowerment. For example, the anti-Indian prejudice in which Mexican racial hierarchies are embedded facilitates labor segmentation and the hyperexploitation of Indigenous migrants in the increasingly global economy. These historical racial hegemonies from Mexico that have marginalized Indigenous peoples are not just imported; they are hybridized and get mapped on American race, class, gender, and sexual relations. Further, these hybrid hegemonies create conflicting boundaries of who is considered Indigenous by the US and Mexican states and dominant societies, thereby creating the erasures, invisibilities, and, ironically, new possibilities for Indigenous identity and consciousness. Thinking through how racial logics are marshaled by the coloniality of power and settler colonialism, and the ways they hybridize, pushes us to consider the ways meanings of US Latinidad and indigeneity are shifting because of Latin American Indigenous diasporas.

Overview of the Book

Each chapter of *Scales of Resistance* focuses on a different set of scalar relationships. Chapter 1 examines how women activists in the national Indigenous movement in Mexico scaled the concept of autonomy down into the multiple scales of their daily lives, such as their homes, bodies, and communities. It highlights the lessons gleaned from how Mexico's Indigenous autonomy movement navigated the selective co-optation of neoliberal multiculturalism in Latin America. The chapter analyzes how Indigenous women activists have, through their participation in the Indigenous rights movement since the 1994 Zapatista uprising, and before, refigured the right of Indigenous autonomy as a lived practice that is embedded in multiple spaces of their lives. As Indigenous women began to enunciate themselves as autonomous political subjects in Mexico in the 1990s, they not only looked to the state to demand

their rights as citizens/subjects but also turned their attention to *where* those rights are practiced. By scaling autonomy down into their homes, communities, and communal Indigenous social customs and governance practices, they have essentially created a *practice* of autonomy as a vital strategy that moves beyond rights discourse and the ways in which neoliberal states have selectively co-opted social movement demands (Blackwell 2004; Forbis 2003).

Chapter 2 is based on oral histories with the founders and subsequent leaders of the Continental Network of Indigenous Women of Abya Yala (later the Continental Network of Indigenous Women of the Americas, ECMIA), a hemispheric network that formed to protest the ways Indigenous women were excluded from the Latin American NGO forums held in preparation for the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995. It examines how Indigenous epistemology was used shift the conversation, decolonize "transnational" consciousness, and create solidarity among Indigenous rights organizers to name the interconnected struggles of Indigenous peoples on the land of what is now called the Americas. The research on ECMIA involves documenting not just the articulation of collective identities and spaces of resistance but also the critical strategy of weaving in and between scales of power—even creating new scales when existing ones do not reflect Indigenous women's political needs and cosmovisions. The chapter follows activists from Mexico who helped to found the organization and who hosted the second continental encuentro in 1997, as well as other activists from the United States, Bolivia, Canada, Panama, Brazil, and Guatemala who have participated in the leadership of the network. My thinking is shaped by my observations at three of the continental encuentros in 2004, 2007, and 2011—the latter in Hueyapan, Mexico—and by seeing members participate in other transnational regional formations such as the Latin American Feminist Encuentros and the First International Encuentro of Politics, Art, Sport, and Culture for Women Who Struggle, organized and hosted by the Zapatista in 2018.

Critically, the place-based struggles that Escobar has called "multi-scale, network oriented subaltern strategies of localization" (2001, 139) are at the heart of many of these transnational networks, regional movements, and transborder organizations. With this in mind, in chapter 3 I explore how work at other scales both emerges *from* and is localized *to* Indigenous pueblos, municipalities, and regions—the local scales where Indigenous women organize for communal defense or against their own exclusion from community decisions. Within the scales created by Indigenous regions/territories and states within Mexico, Indigenous women have created networks of women's organizing, linking multiple movements, congresses, marches, caravans, and workshops across

hundreds of communities and municipalities in order to better their lives and those of the people in their communities. Thus, chapter 3 returns to Mexico and the local politics in the states of Jalisco and, more deeply, Guerrero and Oaxaca in order to understand the impact and interrelationships of the other scales of organizing on local realities. These locales and the forms of organizing across them became even more important as activists scaled down coordinating efforts at the state and local levels after the Mexican government betrayed earlier commitments to Indigenous rights at the national level. On the basis of initial interviews with many activists I met in the 1990s who have since returned to build local organizations, and subsequent interviews with them conducted more than a decade later, I trace the ways in which political mobilization at the national level draws from and nourishes the local as well as the way migration has shaped local/global dynamics.

Although many Indigenous migrants originate from the Sierra Norte, the Central Valleys, and the Mixtec regions of Oaxaca, one of the poorest states in Mexico, they are settling and working across the migrant stream that runs from Oaxaca through Mexico (Mexico City and Baja California) to California and north through the Pacific Northwest. Thus, chapter 4 examines women's roles in shaping transborder politics within Indigenous communities, in this case largely Mixtec and Zapotec women. It is based on collaborative research with the Women's Commission of FIOB and on the work of activist Indigenous women as they organize along the Oaxacan Indigenous diaspora in Juxtlahuaca, Huajuapan de León, and Zanatepec (Oaxaca); Tijuana (Baja California); and Los Angeles and Fresno (California). It examines the transregional scale created by the dense networks of Oaxacan Indigenous migrant organizing and communal life—much of which relies on the labor, imagination, and dreams of Indigenous migrant women who create transboder Indigenous life worlds for themselves, their families and their communities. The chapter analyzes how these organizers learn to articulate their demands, identities, and campaigns (trans)locally while creating resonance binationally within this transregional Indigenous scale and beyond.

Finally, chapter 5 focuses on Los Angeles as a "transnational hub" (Ramirez 2007) for many Indigenous cultures and migrant streams, specifically examining how Indigenous groups from Mexico and Guatemala interact with multiracial Los Angeles creating multilayered geographies of indigeneity within the traditional, unceded territories of the Tongva/Gabrielino people. The chapter responds to the estimated 250,000 Oaxacan Indigenous immigrants settling and working in Los Angeles, whose presence, along with the diaspora of Mayans (largely Kanjobal and K'iche) from Guatemala, challenges us to

see immigration from Mexico and Central America as a multiracial process (Fox 2006; Vankin 2017), shaking loose some of our received notions of who is "Latina/o," "Mexican," and "Indian." Although Los Angeles has a rich Latino immigrant history and the largest urban Native American population—thanks to the "relocation days" of the 1950s when the US government enacted its specific policy of termination and "detribalization" by relocating reservation-based populations to urban centers and large Indigenous diasporas from Oceania and Latin America—social services fail this growing population because these migrants and refugees are often non-Spanish-speaking monolingual speakers of their own Indigenous languages. Chapter 5 examines Indigenous mobility, translocal community formation, and political organizing among the Latin American Indigenous diaspora in Los Angeles. It explores how community organizing, labor circuits, sacred geographies, and the spatial projects created by the Oaxacan Indigenous culinary and musical soundscapes are forms of Indigenous place-making that are reorganizing socio-spatial relations in Los Angeles. By proposing a Critical Latinx Indigeneities framework by which to understand Latin American Indigenous migration, this chapter explores how Indigenous migration and place making come into complex play with the region's multiple colonialities and considers the conflicts, responsibilities, and opportunities to build solidarity with the native communities upon whose land these translocal Indigenous social worlds and transregional ways of being are being forged.

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1 In 2010 the Congreso Guna General (Guna General Congress) and Congreso de la Cultura (Congress of Guna Culture) voted to officially change the spelling of Abya Yala to Abiayala. They worked for more than ten years to build a dictionary and subsequently published the gayamar sabga: diccionario escolar gunagaya—español (Gayamar Sagba: Gunagaya—Spanish Scholastic Dictionary). The dictionary, released in 2013, was part of a larger Congreso Guna General initiative called Proyecto de Educación Bilingue Intercultural de Gunayala (Guna Intercultural Bilingual Education Project). I thank Dule scholar Sue Hagland for drawing my attention to this change in spelling and the important political work of cultural autonomy and language.

2 I developed this concept to describe a set of conditions I witnessed as I conducted interviews with Indigenous women in the 1990s (Blackwell 2000). In accompanying an array of women's social movement since then, I continue to see its relevance as an analytic to describe other organizing (Blackwell 2014).

3 Following Lynn Stephen (2007), I do not translate the word *pueblo* to leave intact the simultaneous meaning of a people and a town or place, revealing the socio-spatial relationship between place and peoplehood.

4 Brenner (2011) further argues: "We are dealing not with a nested political economy of fixed, discrete, singular and nested scales, but rather with a multiplicity of scaled political economies that are implicated in, and are in turn productive of, diverse, tangled patterns of scale-differentiation and scale-redifferentiation" (12).

5 In deploying differential consciousness, I retrofit Sandoval's model (in homegirl homage). In her original formulation, she fought against the erasure of US third world women in typologies of US feminism by describing the ways women of color feminists move in between modes of consciousness like a differential on the gears of a car. Rather than getting stuck in narrow forms of consciousness (liberal, radical, cultural, separatist), her fifth gear, or mode of consciousness, overrides and reconstructs the other modes it moves between. She acknowledged how differential consciousness would be transformed by multiply situated actors in diverse contexts, arguing that it was not bound but "a theory and method of oppositional consciousness that rose out a specific deployment, that is, out of a particular tacti-

cal expression of US third world feminist politics that more and more became its overriding strategy" (Sandoval 1998, 368; italics in the original).

6 Feminist scholar Sonia Alvarez (2000, 2010) has explored this key challenge of Latin American social movements, theorizing the selective co-optation of women's rights discourse and two distinct logics of organizing that have emerged in the context of neoliberal governance, increased "ngo-ization," and the transnationalization of social movements.

7 See also Inda (2006) and Ong (2006).

8 Lemke (2001) argues that this is a technique of power that harmonizes collective and individual bodies, corporations, states, universities to be "lean," "flexible," and "autonomous" as well as an "integral link between micro- and marco-political levels of analysis (e.g., globalization or competition for 'attractive' sites for companies and personal imperatives as regards beauty or a regimented diet)" (203). Critically, what he doesn't mention is how both these processes are gendered and are seen upon recruitment of transnational capital to maquiladoras (export processing zones) in Mexico, and the forms of beauty pageants and gendered surveillance and regulation that are widespread in such industries.

CHAPTER 1. THE PRACTICE OF AUTONOMY

1 Unless otherwise noted, all translations by author.

2 For a history of the way autonomy developed as a shared framework of meaning, see Carlsen (1999, 45–70) and Stephen (2003).

3 Melissa Forbis (2003) found a similar pattern in which Indigenous women collectively engage in autonomy as part of Zapatista base communities and at the individual level of their daily lives.

4 Whereas many Indigenous communities in Chiapas, Oaxaca, Guerrero, and Michoacán have declared themselves autonomous, many other communities that are not specifically Indigenous have also adopted the Zapatista philosophy of autonomy to protest the lack of social services under neoliberalism. See, for example, Tellez (2005, 2021).

5 The "right to have rights" was invoked in 1994 both by Dagnino (1994) and by the Zapatistas. See also N. Harvey (1998), and for an earlier formulation of the right to have rights, see Arendt (2000).

6 IUP Cultural Studies Working Group (1987); Rosaldo (1994); Flores and Benmayor (1997).

7 Ong (1996, 737) sees citizenship as "a cultural process of 'subject-ification'" in the Foucaldian sense of self-making and being-made by power relations that produce consent through schemes of surveillance, discipline, control, and administration (Foucault 1989, 1991).

8 Because research is a relational activity, it is important to note that I met most of these activists when I was in my twenties, and at that time, I was generally the same age as the younger generation. Our proximity in age, class, and indigeneity brought us closer as we built our shared sense of collaborative and activist research. I hung out with organizers while we created photocopies, put together folders, picked up food, and performed other tasks for the national meetings CONAMI hosted.