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The present study analyses the institutional discourse of the National Indigenist Institute (INI) in the context of the instauración of neoliberalism in Mexico. Considering that the multicultural model was established during the neoliberal transition, this thesis tries to identify in the first place, the way in which the “indigenous other” is discursively portrayed in this transition; and in second place it tries to distinguish neoliberal ideology in the institution’s discourse.

The texts analysed comprehended 10 documents produced by representatives of the institution with an approximate of 150 pages, and the methodological and theoretical framework used was Critical Discourse Analysis with focus on Teun A. Van Dijk. The texts were divided in three periods of time during the decades of 1970, 1980 and 1990, from which a subsequent selection of three documents representing each period was made. The analysis was performed applying three categories obtained from the texts: *el indígena*, culture and state.

It was observed that INI’s discourse develops in the multicultural paradigm towards a vision of the “indigenous other” as owner of “capacities”, at the same time that it prioritizes the preservation of cultural identity; nevertheless, an essentialist and pejorative perception remained. Moreover, the neoliberal ideology was discursively represented in the centrality of the culture trope more than in the mention of social rights; the diminishing of the State’s intervention and the decentralization of the INI, as well as in the diversification of actors in the indigenist action.

### Keywords
INI, *indigenismo*, neoliberalism, multiculturalism, ideology, discrimination, indigenous peoples, state policy
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **INTRODUCTION** .................................................................................................................. 4

2. **CONTEXT** ............................................................................................................................ 8
   2.1 The Indigenous Population in Mexico ................................................................................. 8
   2.2 From Indigenismo to Multiculturalism ............................................................................... 11
   2.3 Transitions in the INI ........................................................................................................ 13
   2.4 The Instauration of the Neoliberal Project during the Decade of 1980 ......................... 15

3. **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY** ..................................................... 17
   3.1 Discourse, Power and Ideology ...................................................................................... 18
   3.2 Neoliberal Multiculturalism ........................................................................................... 20
   3.3 Critical Discourse Analysis .............................................................................................. 21

4. **ANALYSIS** .......................................................................................................................... 25
   4.1 Discursive Transitions in three Institutional Texts ............................................................ 27
      4.1.1 The ideals of the indigenist action. Alfonso Caso Andrade. 1962. ......................... 29
      4.1.2 Programatic bases of the indigenist policy, a participative schema. Ignacio Ovalle Fernández, 1978................................................................. 41

5. **CONCLUSIONS** ................................................................................................................ 57

**REFERENCES** ......................................................................................................................... 61

**ENDNOTES** ........................................................................................................................... 65
1. INTRODUCTION

In Mexico, the indigenous policy performed by the state better known as *indigenismo* has had a long tradition, being an important component of the political and ideological composition of the national reality since the first half of the twentieth century. One of the main tasks of the governments after the end of the Mexican Revolution (1920) was to integrate the diverse composition of indigenous peoples to the mainstream society, in order to form a homogenous Nation-State. In order to achieve this aim, and also as consequence of several continental conventions treating the indigenous issue, the National Indigenist Institute (INI, *Instituto Nacional Indigenista*) was created in 1948 as the only institution dealing with what was better known as “the indigenous problem”. Its integrationist (assimilative) perspective remained approximately until the decade of 1970, when the multicultural model that still prevails was implemented. During the adoption of this novel institutional paradigm, a reshaping of the social and political life was taking place with the positioning of neoliberalism as axis of the national economic model, officially established in 1982.

Neoliberalism and its multifaceted consequences is maybe one of the most widely discussed topics in the local academic field during the last decade. Undoubtedly it has been capable of reshaping the political and institutional spheres besides a wide range of social phenomena in the region, with its ideological character being probably one of the most influential aspects it has had. It is true that the transformations the neoliberal project has promoted are part of an uneven and multidimensional process were the limits of its influence may seem difficult to discern; but at the same time, its identifiable ideological core may lead to a clarification of its reach in a defined case. From this arises the interest to find in discourse, the influence that neoliberalism as an ideology had in the discursive frame of the indigenist policy.

The research topic of this thesis deals with the construction of the indigenous “other” in the institutional discursive frame of the Mexican state during the shift to the multicultural paradigm in the INI; at the same time that it tries to take into account the influences of the
neoliberal ideological model over the multicultural indigenist discourse. Firstly it focuses on how the “indígena” (indigenous person) is portrayed during the discursive transformation, if it changes and how; and secondly the focus is on the ideological aspects of discourse in relation to neoliberalism. To approach these aspects, three categories (obtained from the analyzed texts) are to be considered: el indígena, culture and state.

The objectives of the current research are then: to identify the way in which the "indigenous other" is discursively portrayed in the institute during the transition to neoliberalism in Mexico (just before and after the implementation of the multicultural model); as well as to distinguish the neoliberal ideology in the incipient multicultural paradigm adopted by the institute.

As implied, one of the main inquiries that appear as background and support for the current study is the tentative relation that may be implicated between the multicultural paradigm and the neoliberal model, specifically referring to the Mexican case. Authors like Charles R. Hale (2005) and Will Kymlicka (2011) have already discussed this relation, and have referred to it with the concept of “neoliberal multiculturality”, although from quite different perspectives. This relationship takes special emphasis when situated in the Latin American context, where intense neoliberal reforms were performed at the same moment that multicultural ones in the indigenist politics during the decade of 1970 and 1980, as was the case of Mexico.

As part of a wider academic motivation, I am interested in how “the other indigenous” is perceived as different, or is constructed in order to legitimate a generally unequal social reality ad hoc with the economic paradigm in turn; and on how these unequal relations are reaffirmed in different ways through discursive transformations on hand with the diverse contexts in which such discourses make sense. Even the actual democratic multicultural rhetoric exposed by the Nation-States may paradoxically bear conceptions about others that reproduce or reaffirm such relations; there are indeed several approaches which rest under these arguments\(^1\). Hence, the role of elites in the forging of influential discourses under certain ideological paradigm has a relevant influence not only over the public perceptions of that “other”, but on important material repercussions, as lack of welfare and justice.
Furthermore, the focus on Mexican indigenismo permits on one hand, to look at the role of political elite’s (INI) ways of forging discourses of otherness in a context of a strong statist policy tradition on ethnicity; and on the other hand it permits to highlight the influence, relation and accommodation of new discourses to the ideological political and economic context. Besides, the instauration of the neoliberal project at the same time that the restructuration of the indigenist paradigm, permits to focus on the relation between discourse and context. Consequently, the discursive changes of the INI’s paradigm in a context of strong remodeling of politics and economy, is the main frame of the analysis.

Research within this approach is not especially central in the Mexican academic context, even though the wide study of indigenismo as such. The work of Overmyer Velázquez (2010) dealing with the concept of “neoliberal multiculturalism” focused on an indigenous movement in Guerrero (Mexico), is one reference in the present. The focus in INI’s discourse, concerning the image of the indígena is maybe more extensive. However, one the particularities of the present work is that besides the image of the “indigenous other” in the multicultural model, it includes the influences of the neoliberal ideology in the context of its implementation. Besides, Critical Discourse Analysis’ (CDA) approach focused mainly on Teun A.Van Dijk not limits itself to the linguistic indigenous representations, but highlights the contextual and ideological conditions of discourse. It has indeed an historical character, but at the same time it is capable to indirectly deal with some aspects of the current indigenist reality.

In this sense, the research questions are: How “el indígena” is constructed in the discourse of the INI just before and during the shift to the multicultural paradigm? And as the new paradigm chronologically coincides with the instauration of the neoliberal project (1982-) as a new national economic and political model, How the neoliberal ideology is embedded in the new multicultural paradigm of the institution?

The material analyzed comprehends a selection of different kinds of written texts produced by the institute during the transitional period, mainly from its directors. It includes 10 documents with an approximate of 150 pages. The methodology used, CDA, is a pertinent approach for the kind of inquiries to deal with, mainly because it permits a close relationship between language and context at the same time that it allows a certain critical
standpoint when dealing with political situations, this way going beyond a descriptive reach of analysis. At the same time, it deals with “ideology” in “discourse” as well as considers the relevance of language in the constitution of “power” relations.

This work will bring some light to the multicultural paradigm in Mexico in relation to the discursive construction of el indígena, and will show how the ideology of the still current political and economic model influenced this construction. In this way, the study brings more understanding not only of the current and future indigenist paradigm of the Mexican social reality, but of the way in which neoliberal ideologies remodel institutional discourses dealing with the relation of indigenous peoples and the state.

As a form of brief introduction to the content, the second chapter describes the context in which the main questions are embedded. There is a brief description of the contemporary indigenous population in Mexico which provides basic figures and information as well as it includes relevant remarks concerning what is indigenismo and which are the main transitions it has had. Subsequently, there are explained the main traits of the institute (INI) as well as some aspects about the instauration of the neoliberal model. This part will be constantly referred along the analysis since the contextual aspects are especially relevant in this approach.

The third chapter includes the main concepts in which the research rests: discourse, power and ideology. Moreover, there is a brief discussion about one of the main assumptions of the current study, which is the existing relationship between multiculturalism and neoliberalism, relation expressed in Hale’s concept “neoliberal multiculturalism”. This chapter exposes also the main theoretical considerations of the analysis and it deals with the methodology to approach the texts. It extends an explanation of the use and main characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis, including the approach of Van Dijk and some references to Ruth Wodak. The third chapter also holds a brief description of the main conceptual tools to approach texts, the ideological structures of discourse, as well as some comments regarding the analysis that seemed relevant to expose, including more specifications of the data. The actual analysis and discussion is covered in the fourth chapter. In here appears a detailed analysis mainly of three texts, and during the analysis of
each, there are also comparative observations that later on will be more closely clarified in the concluding remarks of chapter five.

2. CONTEXT

The ILO (International Labor Organization) Convention celebrated in June 1989 (No.169) announced the adoption of “new international standards with a view to removing the assimilationist orientation of the earlier ones” (ILO 2014) concerning indigenous rights within a national frame. This new vision recognized the indigenous cultural rights that had been negated in previous perspectives. The Convention inscribed itself in a wider tendency of indigenous recognition that was taking place since decades with the organization of multiple indigenous movements around the planet, as well in an uneven and complex reshaping of the political and economic constitution of multiple nation-sates. Mexico is one of the countries embedded in these global developments, which acquired specific characteristics concerning its local indigenous composition on hand with an intense reshaping of economy and politics at the same time. In this case, the adoption of neoliberalism as the new economic model occurred together with the reshaping of these new tendencies of indigenous official recognition. Some of the most relevant particularities in this respect are to be mentioned in this brief contextualization.

2.1 The Indigenous Population in Mexico

The indigenous population in Mexico represents 14.9% of the total population of the country, composed by a great variety of ethnic groups encompassing more than 60 languages officially recognized. According to the last national demographic census
performed in 2010 (INEGI 2011), a total of 15.7 million people are considered indigenous using language and self-definition\(^2\) as parameter. The indigenous communities have remained through time as the most excluded and marginalized when compared with the rest of the population. Their indexes of poverty and analphabetism are still the highest, being a typical case (at least in the Latin-American context) in which public policies have not had relevant efficacy to change the situation.

It is of common knowledge that indigenous peoples’ access to public services is more limited than for the not indigenous population. To mention some figures regarding education, one third of the indigenous children do not assist to school and half of the total indigenous population reaches the primary education as the highest grade; the average schooling on indigenous persons who speak an indigenous language is 5.1 years, meanwhile for the mestizo population it is 9 years (CESOP 2011). Concerning illiteracy, the percentages vary from 26% of the former category and 5.1% of the latter one, according to the same source. Respect health, just one fifth of the indigenous population has formal labor health insurance; and in relation to labor conditions, 69% of the population that speaks an indigenous language, receives less than two minimum salaries or is not paid at all (2011). As can be seen, these indicators show an evident indigenous disadvantage when compared with the figures of not indigenous population.

The reasons for this exclusion have been widely explained and discussed in the intellectual, academic and political sphere for decades, especially during the consolidation of the modern national state in the beginning of the twentieth century. In general, it has been perceived as a consequence of centuries of colonization, situation that permitted a specific class formation that tended to exclude and marginalize the indigenous peoples until the present. For decades the formerly called “problema indígena” (indigenous problem) has been part of the public agenda and has represented a challenge for the Nation-State. Despite the poor tangible results that the indigenous population has had until now in its relation with the state (in a comprehensive sense), the multiplicity of indigenous movements of the present show their active role of resistance and persistence in claims for social justice that remain tangible in a complex process of political transformations and reconstruction of identities and alternatives for the future.
The multilateral changes of relatively new cultural and social diversification and of economic restructuration at a global scale, among other reasons, have contributed to open the spectrum for opportunities of political action in defense of their rights through new forms of resistance. The rising and permanence of the EZLN\(^3\) (Zapatista Army of National Liberation) in the state of Chiapas since 1994 is a common example, but there is a diverse range of indigenous organizations\(^4\). Indeed, “the end of the twentieth century was notable for the cultural and political florescence of indigenous peoples in Mexico” (Overmyer-Velázquez 2010:4). Moreover, the population defined as indigenous is growing. According to the official national population census performed from 1930 until 2010, the population speaking an indigenous language was in the former year 2.3 million, while it was 6.6 million in the latter (CESOP 2011); these figures could represent a situation of cultural “conservation” and resistance. Nevertheless, there are current discussions about a process of exhaustion taking place in the indigenous movements, which after decades of struggle are starting to lose direction and strength.

Furthermore, one of the relevant historical events that strongly contributed to the recent indigenous political revitalization was the instauration of the multicultural project in the national agenda during the decade of 1970. With its particular characteristics, the new model opened political and social spaces for indigenous participation. The economic conditions in which it was established, as well as its intrinsic ontological core interrelated with such conditions, not only shaped the indigenous movements’ character, but also “their ability to face the changes their sought” (Overmyer-Velázquez 2010:4).

In this regard, the actual constitution of the indigenous political participation is influenced on one hand by the state policy towards the indigenous population, particularly during the instauration of multiculturalism; and on the other, by the economic and ideological conditions of the multicultural transition, practically parallel to the instauration of the neoliberal project in the decade of 1980.
2.2 From Indigenismo to Multiculturalism

The phenomena called “indigenismo” in Mexico was defined by one of the main indigenists, Aguirre Beltrán (1967), as a state policy to procure the integration of indigenous peoples to the national culture; and one of the institute first ideologist (Antonio Caso) stated that the objectives and main characteristics of the indigenismo were comprised in the phrase “planned acculturation by the Mexican government” (Sánchez 1999:42). In this work the term indigenismo is maintained in Spanish because it encompasses not only the reach of a direct translation (indigenism), as the governmental policy towards indigenous peoples, but it also refers to the Mexican (and Latin American) indigenous policy of the State as an historical passage with specific characteristics. It has for example, a direct correlation with what was known as “applied anthropology”, which represented one of its main ideological influences; and it is also linked to a strong nationalist construction of identity, product of the Mexican Revolution, as well as it is embedded in a heavy presidentialist and populist tradition.

Indigenismo in Mexico has faced important transformations since it was well established in the political scene more than six decades ago. As it has been intensively interrelated with the political and economic context through a direct relation with the governmental agenda, the changes it has faced correspond to the implementation of specific social policies and to different economic and ideological backgrounds. The once legitimated representation of the indigenous population as people who need to be assimilated to the mainstream culture, is not a “valid” claim anymore in the current rhetorically “multicultural” context. The recently called “neo-indigenismo” by some academics who have traced these changes, is now characterized by a rhetorical shift to the multicultural nation, the rising of cultural diversity as a national value, a retreatment of the state in policies aiming to assimilation, and others. However, tracing its roots, authors like Luis Villoro (1996) argue that indigenismo’s first stages began before the constitution of the nation.

Actually, the long history that comprehends the relationship between the indigenous population and the State can be traced back to the Spanish conquest in the sixteenth
century. From this time onwards until the Independence revolution in 1810, the so called *Nueva España* (New Spain) apparently did not have major difficulties dealing with the “ethnic issue”, in part because it managed to take advantage of some of the organizational forms that indigenous peoples practiced. Indeed, the called *Leyes de Indias* (Indian Laws) gave juridical recognition to the multicultural character of the territory, aspect that was left aside in the pro-independence future conceptions (León Portilla 2003:261). Besides, the hierarchical *castas* system in society was well established, and this social composition kept indigenous with a strict and apparently unproblematic distance from creoles and Spaniards (León Portilla 2003). Even though the existence of the semi-feudal “hacienda” system, the “indians” still had the right of land property, aspect that could sustain a relative “peace” in this context.

The Independence and then the Mexican Revolution in 1910 changed the landscape. The post-revolutionary context posed the constitution of the Nation-State as the main task, with the classical fundamentals based on the ideals of a homogeneous State in a unified nation walking towards progress, development and modernization in a climate of social justice and equality; all characteristics of almost any national formation at that time. Consequently, one of the implications of the national constitution process in the first decades of the twentieth century, was the “incorporation” of “indians” into the “rest of the national population” by all means necessary, acknowledging the state of “backwardness” and segregation of which they were object of (a discourse evidently evolutionist, in correspondence to the epoch). Later on, as will be seen with more details in the transitions of the INI, entity responsible for the indigenist integrative policies, the *indigenismo* would take a radical shift from the integrationist to the multicultural paradigm.

The multicultural project in this case, took singular characteristics when inscribed in a more or less sudden way in a strongly nationalist traditional rhetoric characteristic of the integrative *indigenismo*. A combination of traditional with new discursive elements was propitious to the legitimation of the new model, aspect that is considered in the present study. A remarkable aspect of this is the absence of the term “multiculturalism” as such, which nevertheless is represented through different conceptual references as cultural diversity, participation, ethno- development, and others.
In this respect, the decade of 1970, just after the diversified movements of the year 1968, was a context that permitted to open spaces for the adoption of a new discursive frame impelled from highly diverse fronts: from the social and indigenous movements claiming for their rights, to the adoption of the multicultural project as the official governmental policy which embraced (at least discursively) such rights. Moreover, the strong criticism towards the traditional assimilative schema, accused of ethnocide, permitted to shape the new ground for the incipient transformation. The changes were mainly materialized through discourses of the main indigenist tool: the INI.

2.3 Transitions in the INI.

In a context of building strong institutions during the national consolidation, was recognized the relevance of the so called “problema indígena” (indigenous problem), and soon in 1948 the “National Indigenist Institute” (INI, Instituto Nacional Indigenista) was formed to attend the “problem” in practice, as well as an effort from the state to assimilate the indigenous cultures into the mainstream mestizo\(^6\) society. According to the government, the aim was to include “indians” to progress and modernization in which the nation as a whole was already committed to. The INI since its foundation was supported by a solid theoretical tradition of anthropology and research was one of its main tasks. “Initially it states as its main objective, the ethnographic research of the indian peoples (pueblos) of the country, and of their economic, political and social problems, in order to be consultant of the government in the topic of development and integration” (Aguirre Beltrán 1988:17). The Primer Congreso Indigenista Interamericano (First Inter- American Indigenist Congress) celebrated in Mexico in 1940 in which ethnologists, anthropologists and sociologists joined to discuss the “indian question” in a continental scale, was an important precedent for the creation of the institute (Barre 1982:44).
For decades, the institution occupied a central role in the political and social domain on dealing with the indigenous concern until its replacement in 2003, by the “Commission for the Development of the Indigenous People”, CDI (Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas). The creation of the INI crystallized part of the important political and academic debate during the post-revolutionary times in relation to the ethnic-national question, as the institute was the official indigenist representative. The integrationist perspective triumphed in the official discursive domain, and the modern institutional indigenismo began its long tradition.

The institute since its creation had emphasis on “action” through the practical implementation of different projects focused mainly on ethnological research, education, and development. Formerly, it was centered in the “region” as the main unity of analysis and operation, a way to tackle the complexity and unequal relations among the indigenous communities and the mestizo ones. The centros coordinadores (coordination centers) were the organizational entities that were installed in all the country and through which the INI applied its projects.

Furthermore, the INI was directly depending of the president in turn. The six years of presidential mandate correspond with the six years of leading of the directors of the institute. As a brief contextualization, the literal objectives of the institution may serve as a reference of the transitions it has faced. Since its creation in 1948 until 1970, the institutional objective was to “induce the cultural change of the communities and to develop the integration of the intercultural regions to the political, social and national life of the nation” (CDI 2012). This focus was better known as “planned acculturation” and as implied above, it represented the integrationist period.

The second period, which represented the multicultural turn, was characterized by an emphasis on the indigenous participation and respect of their culture. There was a slightly different emphasis among each six years of government, but the same core of ideas and argumentations prevailed. During the decade of 1970 the institutional objectives were focused on the “enhancement of the indigenous participation in the national life” (1970) and the “achievement and equilibrium between access to modernity, respect to cultural
diversity and participation and strengthening of the national identity”, stated in 1977 (CDI 2012).

As a continuation on the same line of thought, during the decades of 1980 and 1990 the multicultural character of the nation was emphasized, and there was a constant demand on having respect towards indigenous identity and their participation, as well as the need of a constitutional reform. In the decade of 1990, the emphasis on legal reforms took special relevance in the document entitled “New Relation State-Indigenous peoples” (*Nueva Relación Estado-Pueblos Indígenas*) by 1995. In here the new relation supports a “constitutional, legal and programmatic reform” (CDI 2012) as well as the basis for a heavier process of decentralization of the INI, aspect that would be an important element for the future disintegration not only of the institute, but of the *indigenismo* in its traditional form. The political and economic context of such reforms was especially relevant for the ethnic issue’s direction.

2.4 The Instauration of the Neoliberal Project during the Decade of 1980.

The decade of 1980 was a time of an intense economic and political restructuration not only in Mexico but in all Latin America. “The revived classical liberal political economy of that decade, attributed the region’s problems to interventionist statism” (O’Toole 2003:271), creating in this way the conditions for the “ascent of a new breed of technocratic economists hostile, or at best ambivalent, towards developmentalist statism” (2003:269). In Mexico, the decadence of the “golden years” of “Stabilizing Development” that comprehended the decades of 1950 until 1960, which were characterized by a rapid industrialization and an economic environment protected by trade barriers (Lustig 1998:14), culminated in the financial crisis of 1970’s that incentivized the later positioning of neoliberalism. Indeed, this meaningful and multifaceted reform was framed
in the reglobalisation of finances in 1970 and the crisis of the state (O’Toole 2003:269) at a global scale.

The neoliberal project was established as an official economic and political model more precisely during the arrival of the president Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado in 1982; but it took special strength and influence during the presidential six years office of Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994). The reforms during his presidential period were characterized by being especially deep and restructuring in highly diverse spaces of the public sector. “Fiscal policy reform, administrative reform, decentralization, divestiture of public enterprises, and the elimination or relaxation of ownership, price setting, and trade restrictions (that is, deregulation), became the core ingredients of public sector reform” (Lusting 1998:97).

Probably the most relevant reform was the entering to the treaty of NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) in 1994, which opened borders to the commercial exchange with United States of America and Canada. Nevertheless, the changes were much deeper than just economic, and it can be argued that the mere constitution of the State and the society itself were transformed. “The ideological strategy of the Salinas administration aimed to provide the basis for a new political culture which repositioned the parameters of the state and society… developing ideas of a ‘new nationalism’ and ‘social liberalism’” (O’Toole 2003:276) accommodating the social nationalism and the individual in one conceptual frame.

Certainly, under this combination of ideas, the Salinas administration aimed on one hand to diminish the margins of action of the State through a new equilibrium between State and society, and on the other, to enhance the privatization of wide public sectors as well as the opening of borders for the so called “free trade”. Neoliberalism in this context was not merely an economic and political model but an explicitly ideological one, importantly materialized in Salina’s effective ideological campaign. In this sense, neoliberalism or “market fundamentalism”, as called by others, is a solid story built on a body of ideas, an organized political and well founded social movement, aggressive and forcefully evangelizing in its global reach It is based on a set of practices, legal interventions and political techniques and technologies in order to get influence in the social and political orders (Somers 2008:79).
Consequently, the change on the economic and political paradigm during the decade of 1980 has shaped the institutional panorama until the present. The continuation of the neoliberal politics under a privatizing schema advances through an adapting process in a context that still legitimizes it. In this sense, it becomes a necessity to return to that turning point in which the actual model was established in order to read the present shapes and reread the past ones. Evidently, the instauration of this model coincides with the radical shift in the INI. In this sense, the focus on the relation context and institution in its discursive dimension, acquires especial relevance.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

The theoretical bases of the study are in direct relation with the methodological approach, which is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In general, as a school or paradigm, CDA is mainly “characterized by the common interests in de-mystifying ideologies and power through the investigation of semiotic data” (Wodak and Meyer 2009:3). From this and the consideration of the research question, follows the pertinenence of the three intertwined concepts to consider: discourse, power and ideology. Besides, this perspective looks to be of interdisciplinary nature and to not miss the critical focus, which is one of its specific characteristics in comparison to other discourse analysis approaches. In this sense it is evident the influence of the “Critical Theory” represented by the Frankfurt School, which stands that “social theory should be oriented towards criticizing and changing society, in contrast to traditional theory oriented solely to understanding or explaining it” (2009:6). On the other hand, it is included the concept of “neoliberal multiculturalism” as part of the question aiming to trace the tentative relation between the multicultural indigenist paradigm and the neoliberal ideology.
The central concepts to deal with in the present analysis “discourse, power and ideology” respectively, are related with the focus of this study on elite discourse as well as on the context and ideology as relevant aspects for shaping discourses. These concepts are also central for CDA, which assumes that discourses are relevant for the shaping of social realities, that these are widely molded by entities with more access to such discourses (as political or education elites, and media), aspect that empower them over others; and that ideology, which is embedded on such discourses, may legitimize certain social conditions of dominance or exclusion. Accordingly, these three concepts must be understood as in constant interrelation manifested in linguistic acts.

In order to clarify this, it is important to have in mind in the first place, that discourse is understood in its wide sense as a “social practice” in constant interrelation with the context. Accordingly, there is a “dialectical relationship between particular discursive practices and the specific fields of action (including situations, institutional frames and social structures) in which they are embedded” (Wodak 2003:66). Discourse then is conceptualized as “a bundle of simultaneous and sequential interrelated linguistic acts, which manifest themselves within and across the social fields of action as thematically interrelated semiotic, oral or written tokens, very often as ‘texts’ that belong to specific semiotic types, that is genres” (Wodak 2003:67). Discourse in this sense, is in any case conceived as a separated symbolic entity from the tangible material and contextual conditions, but a complex compound of “language and practice”.

Furthermore, in Van Dijk’s perspective power (social) “is defined in terms of the control exercised by one group of organization (or its members) over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies” (2008:65). In this sense, such power may be distributed and acting through a specific domain or scope, resulting in different “centers” of power and elite groups that control them; it is also based on privilege access to valued resources including access to public discourse and communication, and tends to be
organized and institutionalized for better efficiency. In here it is also relevant to mention that often the exercise of such power is gradual and faced with resistance or counter-power (2008:33).

Following this view, it is then assumed that in first place the production, access and distribution of discourse from the INI is privileged in comparison to the indigenous minorities’ discourses which are in a disadvantaged position in the social scale of society; accordingly the institute is superior in its capacity of influence. It is assumed then, that the institute is found in a place of “control” (or intent of) over other minority discourses and over the public opinion in general, being able to produce and reproduce categorizations of otherness that enhance discrimination towards indigenous peoples. This dominant position, certainly have repercussions on the concrete social conditions of groups.

According to Van Dijk, ethnic minorities have less or no access to crucial communicative contexts, as government and legislative discourses and other forms of information and persuasion, bureaucratic discourses of high level policy making and policy implementation, mass media discourse, scholarly of scientific discourse and corporate discourse, for example (2008:67). This again, situates the INI as in a privileged position in the first place in comparison with the indigenous population and public opinion. Although this assertion may seem more or less obvious, it is mentioned now in order to emphasize that it is as a basic presupposition before starting the actual analysis of texts.

Another crucial concept which deserves special mention at this point is the concept of ideology. Within this specific approach, ideology is defined as “the fundamental believes of a group and its members” (Van Dijk 2003:14); and in its macro interpretation, it is described as “group relations” and “power and dominion” among groups (2003:44). In terms of power, ideologies “are the base of the practices of a dominant group”, they are capable of “providing the principles in order to justify, legitimate, condone or accept the power abuse” (2003:47). According to this line of thought, ideologies represent different sets of beliefs held by different groups within society and constitute the main support for their visions of the world, society, politics, etc.; at the same time these believes are embedded in a context of power relations. As these are expressed through discourse, they can be identifiable within it; in this sense, to identify the neoliberal ideology in the INI’s
discourse would be one of the objectives of the present analysis. Van Dijk proposes a conceptual model in order to make the ideological analysis, and it will be a relevant part of the methodological tools to use for the inquiry in course.

3.2 Neoliberal Multiculturalism

The concept of “neoliberal multiculturalism” deserves a brief exposition, because it serves to trace the relationship of the two models explained before, which is one of the main aims of the study, as well it is useful for a better interpretation of the findings. Can we really speak of such relationship? Is there neoliberal multiculturalism? Despite the fact that the concept does not possess a prestigious position in the academic jargon, it has been discussed by authors like Hale (2005) and Kymlicka (2011), for example, and it has been implied at some point by other academics when referring to the transformations that the neoliberal model produces in very different aspects of the social life.

The answers to these questions could imply an extended discussion that goes beyond the present purposes. The main assumption here is that there is a relationship indeed, and it is possible to trace it in discourse. Hale’s studies on indigenous movements across Central America, have lead the author to imply that that “collective rights, granted as compensatory measures to "disadvantaged" cultural groups, are an integral part of neoliberal ideology”, for example (2005:12). According to the author, neoliberal governance transcends mere economic reforms and it “includes the limited recognition of cultural rights, the strengthening of civil society, and endorsement of the principle of intercultural equality” (2005:10).

In Hale’s view, this set of progressive reforms which in here are contained in the called multicultural paradigm have unexpected effects, as “a deepened state capacity to shape and neutralize political opposition, and remaking of racial hierarchies across the region” (2005:12), this when referring to indigenous movements. In any case, the usage of the
concept is “to emphasize the integral relationship between these new cultural rights and neoliberal political economic reforms” (2005:12), idea that gives strength to the nature of the present analysis. Kymlicka\textsuperscript{11} on the other hand, limits himself to recognize that actually neoliberalism has had “marked impact on multiculturalism\textsuperscript{12} around the world” (2011), but in his view, the impact has been uneven and reciprocal, as multiculturalism arose before the expansion of the economic model in the decade of 1980, and not vice versa. In any case, it would be sterile to get into a discussion about which model came first; what will have relevance here, is how these are intertwined in the indigenist discourse.

In this respect, the concept of neoliberal multiculturalism partly represents the assumption that the progressive reforms product of the relation of neoliberalism and indigenist policies, even though enhance an increasing participation from indigenous peoples, at the same time it continues the reproduction of a controlling or powerful position from the state, which seems still reluctant to an authentic recognition of autonomy and legitimate rights. Discursive elements of recognition combined with traditional perceptions and categorizations of the “indigenous other” as inferiorized, may be a proof of this apparent contradiction.

\textbf{3.3 Critical Discourse Analysis}

In order to better operationalize the analysis, it is pertinent now to describe what Wodak calls “the mesotheory” or medium theory (2003), which will deal more directly with the texts and will give the elements to link them with the macro theoretical conceptualizations before referred, which function more as fundaments. One of the main methodological aims of this analysis is to approach to a dialogue between a micro and a macro perspective. Though ambitious, it is an objective that appears essential for a better understanding of the question beyond its specificity as an isolated phenomenon, and also it is harmonic with the most relevant premises of CDA, accordingly, a critical, and interdisciplinary perspective.
As implied before, CDA studies language as a “social practice” and it is particularly interested in the relationship of language and power (Wodak and Meyer 2003). This kind of research takes into account in a concrete manner, the institutional, political, media and gender discourses which show the existence of more or less open relations in conflict (2003). It mostly analyzes the domination, discrimination, power and control reproduced through language; in other words, how the social inequality is legitimated and produced through discourse. Besides power, as stated above, ideology plays a central role in this analytical approach, and it also represents an important aspect “for the establishment and conservation of unequal power relations” (Van Dijk 2003:17). Furthermore, it is focused on problems more that on language as such; this aspect permits to go beyond the focal use of linguistic signs, and it is directed towards an integration of the context and the consideration of the conditions surrounding the problem.

Within this perspective, the closeness to the approach of Van Dijk suits better to the demands, character and aims of the current research for two main reasons. In the first place, his work is closely related to discrimination and racism (in ethnic relations) through discourse in current times and with focus on Latin America13 (at the same time that considers a micro and a macro perspective). And in second place, it emphasizes the study of ideology, elites and power, and makes an adequate conceptual practical model to identify and “demystify” the ideological character of texts; aspect relevant to the research on its aim at finding the neoliberal discursive shift in an ideological sense, as well as the ideological representation of the “indígena” on an institutional context (governmental).

In Van Dijk’s approach, discourse is complex and defines many levels of structures, which include categories and elements that combine themselves in thousands ways. In some of such discourses, it is relatively easy to find the ideological “slant” when it explicitly expresses certain position or opinion, but in many, it is often “hidden” or expressed in a more subtle way, implicit in aspects as the tone of voice and/or pronouns. The analyzed material is precisely found in the last situation. The institutional (governmental) discourse is regularly, for more or less obvious reasons, highly formal, bureaucratic and controlled. Its level of personal spontaneity is extremely limited, and the ideological assertions tend to
be hidden. That is why the ideological analysis is focused on the structures which rest in the underlying ideologies.

It is necessary to mention here, that the following exposure of the conceptual frame tends to be focused on “ideology of racism” or discrimination towards ethnic minorities, as context; but because of its characteristics, it is applicable to other sort of ideologies. In this case, it is a support in order to focus on the ideological perspective of “the indigenous other” (racism or discrimination) and on the ideological presence of neoliberalism in the “new discourse” (during the transition to the neoliberal project). Some additional remarks are relevant to mention in this sense:

First, the discourses referring to “others” are usually polarized in a division of Us (the in-group) and Them (the out-group). It is a typical characteristic on how the groups form their identity and the places they occupy respect other groups, and on these identifications rest much of their ideologies. As a general and practical strategy of the ideological analysis Van Dijk proposes the “ideological square”, applicable to all structures of discourse. According to it, there is the tendency “to emphasize Our positive aspects” and “to emphasize Their negative aspects”; and as an aggregate in order to make the strategy more complex: “to deemphasize Our negative aspects” and “to deemphasize Their positive aspects” (Van Dijk 2003:56). The ways in which such variations can be expressed throughout discourse are multiple, but it is possible to identify them by getting support from the following levels of discourse: “the meaning, propositional structures, formal structures, phrase’s syntaxes, discourse forms, argumentation, rhetoric, action and interaction” (2003:58). Each of them, some more than others, comprehends a list of aspects which deserve to take into account when trying to identify the ideological bias in discourses.

For the current analysis, there were considered mainly two: the meaning and the propositional structures. The “meaning” can be considered as the most relevant because “the ideological content is expressed in a more direct way” (Van Dijk 2003:58). In here the consideration of the “topics, the level of description, the implications and suppositions, the synonymous and paraphrases, the contrast, examples, and negations” (2003:64) deserve special attention. The definition and focus in such aspects at the moment of the analysis is crucial; these will be used as base for the interpretations and reflections got from the text.
Although it could be the case that some of them are not salient in certain texts, which means that only the ones that actually (in a more evident way) are there, will deserve mention and attention.

The second level of discourse to consider in the analysis is the one focused on the “propositional structures”. In here, the aim is to focus on the ideas (true or false) expressed through a complete sentence. According to Van Dijk, the predicates of propositions are more or less negative or positive in function of the underlying opinions (2003), and this can show revealing ideological assumptions. In order to look deeper into this level, “the actors, modality, evidence, ambiguity and topoi”, are the main elements to focus on. As will be the case of the three texts meticulously analyzed, the propositional structures more often referred are the “actors” and the “topoi”.

Of course, the rest of the levels of discourse before mentioned are susceptible to consideration if the text itself “asks” for them. Some of the texts may have certain aspects more salient, meanwhile others may need to be left aside. Another pertinent remark is to emphasize the openness of the analysis as such; meaning that often remarks not exactly taken form this basic model, can be brought to interpretation depending on the role it has in the text and among texts. Furthermore, the “intertextuality” is another aspect to consider, although not in a rigorous manner since it is not the main focus of the analysis.

And finally, to conclude this brief description of the main conceptual tools to use, it is proper to add the need to deal more thoroughly in the argumentation aspect, specifically in the use of topoi (prepared arguments of public dominium). The topoi are especially important when referred to formal or institutional discourse. The arguments to justify certain kind of new laws or institutional changes take special relevance in the present inquiry; that is why a more detailed classification of topoi was taken into account: the topoi classification of Ruth Wodak. According to this author, the “topoi” can be described as “those elements of the argumentation that are part of the obliged premises; are justifications related to the content, and link the argument with the conclusion” (Wodak and Meyer 2003:74). In her classification there are fifteen kinds of typical topoi in the political discourse in order to justify discriminatory practices, or to deny them: “utility, inutility, definition, danger and threat, humanitarianism, justice, responsibility, weight, economy,
reality, numbers, legality and rights, history, culture and abuse” (2003:74). These, if is the case, can bring light to the analysis when justifying the new indigenist “action”, which means changes in legislation, organization and vision of the institution, referred constantly throughout the material.

4. ANALYSIS

An important aspect to take into consideration before starting the actual analysis is to note the relevance that change has in the discourses through time. The attention will be put on how the perception, representation of the “indígena”, of “culture” and of “the state” has taken different connotations; on how language, arguments and perspectives have been transformed in order to justify or support the dominant visions in turn. All of this categories are present in each text because form part of the basic background in which the indigenista rhetoric rests. These categories were obtained from a careful reading of the ten texts analyzed, even though are evidenced here in the three final selected texts.

It must be said too, that in the first reading of the material a conceptual model was prepared and used as the main guide in order to proceed with the coding. This model included in the first place, a clear distinction between the three mentioned categories: indígena, culture and state (nationalism and responsibility). According to the first reading of the whole material, these categories could answer the basic concerns of the research: the category of the “indígena” will focus on the representations that the institution representatives have of the indigenous people, this in relation on how this “other” is portrayed and how is that it could contain discriminative content. The second one, “culture” and the third one “state” (with focus on responsibility), will permit to answer to the question on how the transition to a neoliberal model, ideologically influenced (if is the case) the restructuration of the INI through these categories; this again, assuming that the neoliberal project is not only a
political and economic enterprise, but a cultural one, specifically within the ethnic relations
matters as implied with the concept of “neoliberal multiculturalism” already exposed.

Besides, in the coding process it was prioritized the “discourse topics”, “main proposition
of the text” (Van Dijk, 2003) and the “topoi” proposed by Wodak (Wodak and Meyer
2003) in order to focus on the main arguments. This last part would permit to interrelate the
texts in a clearer manner, and to get some general conclusions from their reading in order to
make the proper selection and category production. Furthermore, the ideological structures
of discourse and the ideological square, served as base for findings related with the positive
or negative portrayals.

The data comprehended a careful selection of the texts that have the potential to offer
enough information for the purposes of the main inquiries of the research. From a vast
compilation of diverse kinds of texts produced by the INI during a wide range of time
(1940 to 1990), a first selection was made considering the need to focus only on the
transition to the neoliberal model in the beginning of the decade of 1980. Accordingly, this
first selection was reduced to the documents comprehending the decade of 1970 in the
preface of the transition, until the beginning of the decade of 1990, when the neoliberal
model was a reality and was taking strength especially with the impulse of the North
American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994; at the same time, a time when the
reshaping of the indigenista paradigm through the restructuration of the INI was established

The second selection was based on the relevance, or the potential of the text to better fulfill
the main questions leaving aside the focus on the kind of text. The main criterion was
reduced on finding the texts with explicit content referring especially to the remodeling of
the institutional premises. These include programs, decrees of law, academic reports and
messages and interviews from the directors. A specific criteria based on sort of text was
ignored in this case, mainly because it is assumed that all the documents, independently of
the type of text, represent somehow the voice of the institution in its most variable and
complex levels, and such characteristics more probably enrich this analysis. All of them
where produced by functionaries of the institution, many of them high representatives,
researchers or the directors themselves; and also the main sources of the material were
official yearbooks or anniversary compilations from the institute containing what were considered important texts\textsuperscript{14}.

Specifically, the data analyzed include 10 documents with an approximate of 150 pages. The material was divided in three periods of time for analytical purposes. The first period comprehends a period before 1970 (two texts, 1957 and 1962); the second one starts from 1970 to the beginning of 1980 (two, 1978 and one, 1983); and the third one includes the end of 1980 and beginning of the decade 1990 (one 1989, two 1990 and three of 1994 and 1995)\textsuperscript{15}.

4.1 Discursive Transitions in three Institutional Texts

As the current study covers texts extracted from different decades, it is easy to deduce that important changes are susceptible for identification throughout discourses, depending on the specific policy stages, visions and directions of the institution (closely linked to the state) in specific contexts. It is important to keep in mind how for example the INI of the decades of 1950 and 1960 was characterized by a strong assimilationist and integrationist perspective were \textit{mestizaje} (miscegenation) was important for the reaffirmation of nationalism; meanwhile the decade of 1970, inheritor of the revolutionary 1968, testified important criticisms and strong questionings and discussions respect the ethnocide character of its politics. At this point, the policy of “selective acculturation” and “indigenous participation” took special relevance, and in a sense, it started to open spaces for the changes that would come in next decades, accordingly, the multicultural policy claiming for cultural respect and multiethnic recognition, which was well defined in the New Relation State-Indigenous Peoples in 1995.

Furthermore, as mentioned before, the texts were divided in three periods of time considering the kind of policy paradigm and the instauration of the neoliberal project. The first period corresponds before the decade 1970, which includes a couple of references of
1962 and 1957 respectively. This period was basically characterized by an integrationist policy with a “selective or planed acculturative” emphasis. The second period covers the late 1970 and the beginning of the 1980; this time represents a shift in the policy towards the “participative” perspective; it is at the same time, the beginning of the neoliberal model together with the establishment of the main discursive basis for the new indigenist policy of the next decade. The third and last period reaches the late 1980 and early 1990, time in which the neoliberal project is actually instituted with aggressive political, economic and social reforms under the presidential mandate of Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994).

Furthermore, it is relevant to consider that the indigenist policy leaded by the INI was in permanent consonance with the national plans of each six years of government; actually, usually the change of presidential period represented also a change of the institution’s director.

In order to better operationalize the approach, the first part of it comprehends a detailed analysis of 3 selected texts extracted one from each period of time. The selected texts are the ones that according to the analysis better represent the discursive characteristics of each period respect the others; this will permit more depth and meticulousness in the analysis.

One of the reasons to choose this general procedure is that it can easily show the coherence in the way texts are approached; besides, it better avoids generalities that may not come from the texts themselves and permits to look into details “walking” in hand with the discursive transformations. However, at first glance this approach may appear highly descriptive and with a lack of connection among texts (aspect that will be tried to be avoided), but consequently the different observations and interpretations in the process, will hopefully transcend this obstacles and succeed in its clarifying objective. As a note, the quotations are translated by me directly from Spanish and the originals are found in the endnotes.
Period I, early 1970 including 1957 and 1962

During early 1970, Mexican economy was stable and with relatively good indexes of growth\textsuperscript{17}. The economic model established since the decade of 1950 better known as “stabilizing development”, was still the economic trend; although the changes would be a prompt reality. Until the late sixties relatively stable fiscal and monetary policies and the absence of major external shocks, explained the low inflation rates (Lustig 2010:16). Yet, the first years of the decade of 1970 the inflation grew and a crisis arose in 1976 (2010:16). Consequently, this would be the preface of the later crisis of 1982, when the new reforms would be implemented.

In this context and until the decade of 1970, the INI was continuing the trends since its foundation: integrationist policies with an “acculturative” character. The following text is situated within this paradigm.

\textit{4.1.1 The ideals of the indigenist action. Alfonso Caso Andrade. 1962.}

Alfonso Caso Andrade was a recognized intellectual, lawyer and archeologist who, among other relevant positions, founded the National Indigenist Institute in 1948 and was its director until 1970 (Robles 1988). He was one of the salient characters who established the main ideological basis of the Institute as well as its guidelines of action. His text entitled “The ideals of the indigenist action” written in 1962, represents one of the main sources which describe the reasons, objectives and general visions of the official institute’s policy at that time.

The text is situated in a context of an intense modernization process, and a still strong welfare state with a wide range of influence and control. The governmental rhetoric was by then relaying on the ideals carried from the Mexican Revolution (equality and justice) as
well as on progress and modernization as the motors of the future ideal society. In this sense, a strong nationalism meant a homogeneous society walking in the same direction towards modernity. This global context was maintained as background along the text, sometimes appearing explicit but often implicit in the form and content of the entire structure. At a more local and descriptive level, the content consists of three pages describing in a formal and academic style the definition of the main “basis” of the indigenist policy (divided in fourteen points), and more indirectly, the role of the INI as part of such basis.

Adding some introductory generalizations, the language in the text is clear and scantily repetitive, which loads the content with authority and certainty. The author appears as a character that has the legitimacy to define and establish the main ideals of the policy without any sort of hesitation. His voice is the voice of the institute (first person of plural) or more explicitly, the voice of the Mexican indigenismo. Besides, it contains a fair amount of conceptual definitions with an apparent aim for clarification as pretending to leave aside misunderstandings. At the same time it is evident for the tone in which it is written, that the institute, and specially the indigenismo, occupy a relevant role in the national political agenda.

The main proposition, which is the general idea or topic of the text, represents “what is better remembered from a discourse” (Van Dijk 2003:59); accordingly, it is particularly important in ideological terms as it represents the principal message of the text. In this case, the main proposition suggests that indigenous communities should be integrated to the rest of the population through a process of persuasive cultural indoctrination. This process must be achieved by supplanting the negative values of the indigenous communities for positive ones, which are to be found in the mainstream society. This appears as a prerequisite in order to continue in the path of development and progress in which the entire nation is found.

Such general proposition in this case has in a first glance, three strong ideological implications according to the analytical concepts implemented here (indígena, culture and role of state): the given for granted backwardness of the indigenous people in the first place; the perception of culture with a polarized and moralized content of “positive and
negative” values, portraying mainly that “we” have the positive ones, and “they” the negative ones; and finally the right of intervention, seen as the government’s responsibility (represented by the institute) to culturally “integrate” the indigenous peoples to the wider society. In order to clarify how are to be considered ideological implications and in which ways can be connected with the main proposed questions of the analysis, it is pertinent a more comprehensive exposition and to pose some examples through the scrutiny of the considered categories. It was evident that there is an interweaving relation among the three categories which seem included one in another; in this sense, the intent to separate them and to delimit some content in each is made just for analytical simplification purposes.

One of the discursive strategies often employed when referring to “the other”, is the **predication**, which “labels to social actors more or less positively or negatively, deprecatorily or appreciatively using stereotypical and evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits with explicit or implicit predicates” (Wodak 2011:74). Accordingly, as a first step will be analyzed the ways in which such attributions are constructed in discourse along the texts, when referring to the indigenous people.

“El indígena”, the polarized other

The first category to consider is “el indígena” (indigenous as prototype); that is, how the indígena is portrayed and represented along discourse. As mentioned previously, one of the main aspects to consider in the ideological discourse is the distinction between **us and them**, which in this case appears represented in all texts, and it seems an obligated categorization when referring to indigenous or “ethnic” matters as well as in ideological discourse (Van Dijk 2003). The main interest here relies in the different ways in which such dichotomy is represented at different moments of the indigenismo in Mexico through the analyzed texts.
In the “Ideals of the indigenist action” by Caso, there is a strong dichotomy of “indígenas” and “no indígenas”, which represent two delimited separated cultural wholes. The constant (although not unique) use of the singular “el indígena” (the indigenous person, in singular); denotes the creation of an “ideal one” which is capable to encapsulate to all indigenous communities or peoples in one prototype essentializing in this way what is to be indígena. This kind of perception of the other as an entire group with uniform characteristics built in an abstract singular personification is common in the inferiorizing rhetoric of one group over another. The other distant, unknown, is portrayed often in this simplified way.

The use of such ideal concept is of course embedded in a specific context and in hand with a specific worldview; it is often used more as a stylistic resource in certain kind of text or discourse (for example, in a presidential speech, which touches very general and abstract conceptualizations). Nonetheless, this lexical resource still reflects the way the concepts are organized and materialized in language. It was noticed for example, how the expression “el indígena” is found more rarely or totally omitted in future similar discourses, aspect that still, do not strictly means the gradual disappearing of essentialization. Further on, this specific terminology will take more relevance and will be better interpreted in future comparisons.

On the other hand, the opposing group is referred in the text as the “not indigenous population”, “the mestizo society” or the “Mexican society”, also in concordance with the definition of “one” belonging group as a mode of essentialization. One of the main observations to make in this classification, is that the ethnic categorization more in cultural than in race terms, is not only applied to the indigenous peoples but also to the other group, in this sense, the “mestizo society”, making explicit reference to the mix not only of cultures, but of “blood”. This is evident in the following negation of the “indigenous problem” as a problem of “race” (which is also an ideological implication to discuss forward):
“The indigenous problem of Mexico is not a racial problem. The distinction between indígenas and no indígenas relies in a cultural difference. Mexico is a mestizo country and the majority of its population has indigenous blood and white blood.”

The tendency to label in ethnic terms appears in this passage as a general characterization not exclusive towards the out-group, but also to the in-group. This takes special interest in future comparisons in the sense that the rhetoric of the “mestizaje” even though implicit, tends to disappear explicitly in the institution’s official discourse. In this case, it is relevant to consider the still at that moment alive nationalist imaginaries product of the building of the nation which were based on the construction of the mestizo identity, and a context in which the issue of race was a topic subjected to academic discussion. Until the decade of 1960, there were yet controversies respect the validity of scientific racist theories (Castellanos 2000), and this aspect is notable as a background of this discourse.

In the passage it is also relevant to note the negation of the “problem” as a matter of race. In the ideological (racist) discourse the negations can have an important function in the discursive structure (Van Dijk 2003); in here, it is in the sense that eliminates the possibility of questioning a matter (in this case the issue of racism), with a simple and radical dismissing. It is nevertheless certain in a way that what the author seems to intentionally dismiss here is the possible interpretation of the question as a racial thing (as an intent to avoid racism) since often, principally in official rhetoric, “the discourse is organized in various ways to avoid a prejudiced or racist identity” (Wetherell and Potter 1992:97).

Additionally, the text appears inserted in an academic context still carrying with some racist (in the race-biological sense) visions especially in anthropology, which was the intellectual base of the indigenismo mexicano. In this sense, the negation appears today (and then) as plenty justified and reasonable; the trick here is the way in which such a “valid” negation carries too the negation of the discussion of racism in Mexico as one of the problematic issues of Mexican society; aspect that has been traditionally, and continues being, practically out of academic discussion. On the other hand, this phrase at the same time that
implicitly denies the legitimacy of the idea of race superiority, it affirms the cultural focus, which later on will show to be sustaining a cultural superiority (in its integrationist vision); aspect that is part of the racist ideologies composition\textsuperscript{19}.

Consequently, the phrase that continues the paragraph “on the other hand, the Mexican society rejects all kind of racial discrimination”\textsuperscript{20}, becomes a double negation (less emphatic) when it dismisses again any chance to question if there actually exists racial discrimination; furthermore, it is a powerful affirmation when Caso speaks in the name of the Mexican society, giving it strength and irrefutability. Ideologically, the \textit{voice} of the actor plays a relevant role in discourse, especially when one speaks in the name of other, in this case, in the name of Mexican society.

The context takes special relevance as the topic of race appears explicit in this text (through the negation mentioned) meanwhile radically disappears in future references; it seems to be certain amount of legitimacy that the topic carried at that moment and did not in the liberal democratic rhetoric achieved in the future.

Continuing with the image of the \textit{indígena}, another interesting phrase:

\begin{quote}
“The \textit{indigenismo mexicano} affirms, therefore, that the \textit{indígena} has inherent capacities as all normal human being in order to modify his/her conditions of existence and that his/her present limitations, in no way congenital but product of historical and social facts, and of which responsibility relies on the other part of the population, can be overcome by correctly conceived and applied means”\textsuperscript{21}.
\end{quote}

Here the reference to the unified concept of “\textit{el indígena}” places again emphasis in the above mentioned essentialization of the group; and it also speaks again in the name of \textit{indigenismo} as such, which gives force to the discourse as it is not an individual opinion or perspective, but the voice of \textit{indigenismo}. Furthermore, it has other implicit meanings that are important to be interpreted as a subjugated representation of the indigenous peoples. In here the racial negation continues being present when mentions that “in no way the
limitations are congenital but product of historical and social facts” giving salience to the cultural aspect. Moreover, at the same time it brings light to its opposite (hidden contrast): the doubtful tone that considers if their limitations are actually a matter of congenital reasons. The more explicit inferiorization comes from the taking as something certain that “they” have “limitations” (in their cultural baggage), referred as a mode of personal attribute. These cultural “failures” remain at the end as the remarkable aspect rather than other social reasons that better could represent the causes of their marginal situation. Indeed, the acculturation policy seems to rest in such “cultural failure” perspective, when the idea is to change their negative values and to assimilate the positive ones of the rest of society.

“El indígena” then, is portrayed more as a recipient that is bearer of negative cultural values in need of change for positive ones. Their participation in the acculturation process is almost absent in this perspective, but mentioned still. Such participation is delimited to the “cooperation” to carry on the projects planned by the institute, with a pragmatic interest as background, that it to say, in order to better succeed in the project of acculturation. This aspect is expressed in the following paragraph when referring to the need of participation:

“It has often been seen, as product of experience, that in order for the indígena to consider the school, the work for drinking water, as own and cares for it…., he/she must be participant in the construction of the work and in the acquisition and plantation of the tree, and must have a retribution for his/her services, even though in a symbolic way. Meanwhile the indígena receives for free or without her cooperation, a benefit, it will be considered as others thing and any responsibility of it, considering it as a beneficence aid or as an obligation from the government”.

As can be noticed, besides the kind of desirable participation in dependent and passive terms; “el indígena” is conceived as a distant other under experimentation, who respond in this or that way to certain situations; in this sense appears as objectivized. In discriminatory language, the objectification of the other is also a common resource in the construction of
discourse; as a matter of fact, this aspect will be appropriated through a common argument in future accusations of the integrationist perspective (in the analyzed texts), that is, how the indigenous peoples were treated as “objects and not subjects” of their own development. According to Wodak, one of the recurrent discursive strategies to name the other is the use of biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors or metonymies (2011:74). This aspect has salience in the current analysis because the essentialization of “el indígena”, or in a more subtle fashion “the indigenous peoples or communities”, are constantly naturalized along the texts through different strategies.

Likewise, the passage referring to the justification of the role of the institute over their lives is illustrative when portraying the indigenous communities as “under aged” and under control:

“The purpose of the institute is not put itself in front of the indigenous communities indefinitely in a tutelary way, as if they were under aged. We wish to awake in the indigenous community, the idea that transformation and improvement can be achieved. But we do not wish that the indigenous community remain indefinitely under our control and direction”.

In this passage it seems that the aim to justify the interventionist and controlling role of the institute over the communities is the most important aspect, even above the evident categorization of the indigenous people in contemptuous ways. And maybe more unintentionally, above the making explicit what the institute is actually doing, in the author’s words: to treating them as “under aged” and having them “under their control and direction”. The justification to temporarily maintain this controlling position over the communities is implicit, and it is referred to the need of initial assistance to be able to function properly in the modern society once they are acculturated enough. As in other similar parts of the text, language is often used in this way, making certain “compromising” remarks direct and transparent.
Another aspect to consider is the way victimization appears along the texts. In this case, the indigenous peoples are victims, for example when is said that “their limitations” are “the other part of the population’s responsibility”. In a sense, it can be notice the ambiguity of who’s or what is responsible, and in other sense it is the only time when the author directly mentions a reference to the social and economic conditions of the indigenous people, considering them as “limitations” in a soft and also abstract and vague way. It will be notice later on how the victimization tends to be more emphatic in future texts, appearing as a common resource to build the discursive basis of the new policy. Some rushed interpretations could derivate from this observation, but instead, this aspect will deserve more attention when compared with similar future texts.

Positive and negative culture

The other category to analyze is culture, that is to say, how culture is perceived as a general category and which are the main aspects to observe that situate culture in relation to the policy in turn. In this text, where the main proposition according to the official policy was to acculturate indigenous peoples in order to integrate them in the mainstream society, culture is seen in an essentialist way explicitly delimiting two contrasted cultures, the indígena and the “mestizo or rest of society”; and appears also seen from a pragmatist or if can be said, materialist angle. Culture (indigenous) here is not a “sacred” entity to protect or enhance, as in future perspectives, but a sort of delimited content of values, positive and negative that can be (and is legitimate to) changed and/or replaced deliberately. This idea is expressed in a tone of experimentalism and pragmatism in order to accomplished a wider objective (to acculturate), in this case justifiable for the “progress of the nation”. This pragmatism is more evident in the phrase referring to the object of the indigenist action (the community, not the individual):
“The indígena that permanently has left his/her town, who speaks Spanish, who works in a factory or reside in a city, is not indigenismo’s interest anymore. He/she has been incorporated to the Mexican culture. But, meanwhile he/she remains in the community, even though accepting new elements of the Mexican culture, is still indígena and his/her attitude is just evidence of the acculturation taking place”

The last sentence of the paragraph implies that being indígena is highly depending on the permanence in the community, which denotes how the attribution of this identity is easily mobile, and it is highly based on the practical objectives of the institution. From the institute’s perspective (through the authors voice), if the indigenous person lives now in the city and has adopted the main cultural traits of the mainstream society, then he/she is not indigena anymore; vision that can be interpreted as pragmatic, strongly concentrated in the acculturative task.

In relation to this point, it is also notable the preponderance of the scientific knowledge and experimentation in the search for efficiency in the acculturative process. For example, when is mentioned: “Slowly, through experimentation, the procedures and techniques are being refined as true experimental results that, in the long future, can be elaborated in a doctrine with then, a general validity.” In here, scientific knowledge preponderance in order to reach progress, and its relation with the ideological visions of the state, is evident. At the same time, this scientific oriented vision of the author is also reflected on the conception of culture and cultural change. Again, culture is a sort of container with good and bad values which can be selected and changed depending on the contextual needs. In the other hand, the tendency to rely in research as a mode of technical improvement in the institute´s action is found along the text. The context still carried the academic tradition characteristic since its foundation, namely the “applied anthropology”, based on practice and action as its distinctive characteristic.

At the same time, the author recognizes the “cultural relativism” as an accepted idea; nevertheless, the implicit inferiorizing of the indigenous cultures seems to be present through the discourse as was seen before. This cultural relativism is seen more as an intention of being in a “democratic position” that refers specifically to, as textually
expressed: the “rejection of compulsive procedures in order to do that the community adopt new ways of life, new cultural patrons”. So the vision of this relativism is limited to this specific point.

For the author on the other hand, the differential treatment of the “indigenous community” (as he expressed) is justified because of their cultural specificity, in his words:

“…against some opinions, is justified the differential treatment of the indigenous community or the indigenous population as a whole, in virtue of its special cultural characteristics, as it is justified to cease the differential treatment, when the community has been already put in the way towards its integration”26.

This phrase reveals in one sense the reaffirmation of the inclusion of the indigenous peoples in one category; and in other sense the justification of the the institution’s labor as a fair bearer of the right to intervene in a particular manner. This heavy affirmation seems surrounded by criticism when mentions “against some opinions”, which gives it a more solid character not just as a clarifying comment, but also as a definite justification.

In here it is also pertinent to mention the topoi used to justify the indigenist action in general, which was precisely the first argument of the text:

“…the indigenismo consists on sustain, from the point of view of justice and the country’s convenience, the necessity of protection to indigenous communities to put them on an equality frame, in relation to the other mestizo communities which form the mass of the Republic’s population”27.

As clearly expressed in this paragraph, the topoi used for the justification of the institutional labor resumed in the intention of acculturation, is that of justice and convenience (utility) as well as that of equality. Besides, it appears implicit that of
responsibility, as it is the state’s role to protect the “indigenous communities”; which denotes the protective role of the big welfare state characteristic of the context. This aspect takes the route for the next category: the role of the state.

The responsible and protecting big state

In this text the state appears as a silent but constant background, nevertheless often mentioned in the name of “the Mexican Government”, “the institution” (representative of government) and the “indigenismo mexicano” itself. These three categories function more or less as synonymous along the discursive structure; this denotes the leading role of the state apparatus as “the” protector and responsible for the alleged integration, as mentioned above. Along the content, the state appears as the unique strong and protective entity which will help the indigenous to integrate to the nation through the institutional acculturative policy materialized in the INI. There is a constant reference to the “action” of the government/institution as a prime focus, and its aim relies in an “integral action” which includes the “cultural and economic transformation” of the indigenous communities. This focus on action will disappear in the participative indigenist shift. There is also explicit the focus on the region more than on the community: “It would be impossible the aisle development of the community, if it is not developed at the same time than the entire zone to which it belongs”28. This aspect will also change in future policies, especially in the decade of 1990’s in which the focus will be put exclusively on the community.

In early 1970, the government’s answer to the slowdown in economic growth, bet for the expansion of public expenditure and an increasing state intervention during Echeverría’s presidency (Lustig 1998:17). However, this strategy was not enough and by 1976 the economy was in recession with a forty percent of devaluation of the peso against the dollar, and for the first time in twenty two years the government turned to the IMF for financial relief with a treaty signed in 1976 (1998:18). The government of José López Portillo from 1976 to 1982 was situated in a context in which there was the discovery of new oil reserves. This discovery directed the economic policy towards wide public expenditure with aims for growth, but the decreasing of oil prices in mid-1981 among other reasons, led again to a deeper crisis by 1982 (1998). The next text is situated within this critical historical moment.


Ignacio Ovalle Fernández was director of the INI from 1977 to 1982. During his six years as head of the institute, and from the beginning of it in 1977, he established and promoted a new perspective that represented a shift from the past integrationist policy embodied by the institute since its foundation. The new schema called “indigenismo de participación” (indigenism of participation) was an important precedent, establishing the new basis for future changes in the institution.

The context of this shift was characterized by the agony of the golden economic period represented by developmental policies. The state was facing an economic crisis by 1976, and although an apparent recovery during the López Portillo’s presidential government (1976-1982) which focused on trying to maintain wide public expenditure, the crisis of
1982 would be a fact (Lustig 1998). At the same time, there was an important influence by international organisms or pacts respect the recommended indigenous policies to be applied in different regions of Latin America, and in this case, of Mexico. The criticism towards the assimilationist indigenist policies that was exacerbated in the political movements of 1968, and the consolidation of indigenous movements claiming for civil rights, contributed to the reshaping of the institutional frame towards the shift to cultural recognition and participation. This year in a way (1968) represents the end of the revolutionary discourse of 1910 and the beginning of the economic and political crisis (Aguirre Beltrán 1988:32) that would be the context of the new indigenist paradigm. The multicultural project for the first time was laying its basis on indigenous politics in the INI from 1977 to 1982 respectively.

Situated in such context, this study takes especial relevance because it establishes the basis of the new trend. In here appears the need to justify the new model, giving innovative arguments and explanations in order to change its basis. At the same time, there are present some of the premises, language style and rhetoric elements which characterized the previous integrationist schema. This text represents part of the discursive transition to the multicultural shift, and again, it acquires special interest not only because it’s foundational character, but because the transitional elements in it, which are meaningful to the present analysis.

The general proposition is that, in concordance with the original precepts of the INI, and due to the lack of efficiency and general insufficiency of the institution; there is the need to strengthen the intervention of other dependencies in the indigenist action. The focus now must be the marginalization and marginal rather than strictly the indigenous peoples, arguing that it is difficult their separation; as well, deserves attention their participation in the implementation and design of projects and also legal, material and cultural recognition. Property of land is intended to be regularized, and also the promotion of cultural identity and respect of cultures in a frame of national unity. The cultural diversity is not an obstacle, but an incentive for development and the construction of nationhood.

In general terms, when this proposition is compared with that of the previous text, it can be noticed a radical diminishing of the emphasis on the indigenous peoples themselves; as well as the participation and cultural recognition as the core topics of discourse.
Furthermore, there seems to be a more marginal conception of the role of the state in the indigenous issue, when is insistently justified the intervention of other governmental organizations.

Respect the general formal content, the discourse is structured in two main parts. The first one is a brief exposition of the antecedents of the indigenist through the institute’s history, probably in order to situate the actual shift and emphasize it; meanwhile the second one, comprehends the definition of the actual policy and the intention of its application through 17 specific objectives to be reached, included in four work areas: productive activities, minimal wellbeing, self-defense capacity of the ethnic groups, the strengthening of the ethnic cultures and their insertion in terms of equality and dignity, in the Mexican nationality frame. Some of these areas represent interesting shifts respect the new policy, which will be discussed forward.

_El indígena_ as marginal

For now, it is pertinent to begin with the focus on the representation of the _indígena_ and to develop some of the main observations mainly respect the comparison of the previous text (Caso, 1962). The dichotomy “us and them” is now less defined or less emphatic from the perspective of the essentialization. In the first place, the lexical resources are expressed more often in plural and stresses the “numerous indigenous peoples , “the indian peoples” (pueblos), or “ethnic groups” instead of accentuating the previously used prototype “el indígena”. In the second place, their portrait as _marginados_ (marginalized) functions as a replacement or _synonymous_ of “ethnic groups”, “indigenous peoples” or “communities”; aspect that makes the line of distinction _us-them_ more blurred. Indeed, the reference to _marginados_ appears quite often, which highlights the specific quality of marginalization of the indigenous peoples. As explicitly mentioned in the text, the national project posed by the six mandate in turn aims to be “politically defined in relation to the most serious
problem of Mexico, that of marginalization, that affects substantially to the indian peoples". In this sense, marginality as a generic situation not exclusive of the indigenous communities becomes now the focus when it is portrayed as the most serious problem of the country. The phrase “of the most serious problem” ("del más grave problema") is a **dramatization** resource which functions as emphaser of the marginality as the central aspect to attend. The rhetorical resource of dramatization is often used in discourse in order to exaggerate the facts in favor of something (Van Dijk 2003:105). In this case, it functions to accentuate the focus on marginality, diverting attention from the indigenous peoples and consequently, from the primordial role that the institution used to have in the indigenous issue.

Furthermore, the lack of naming the explicit word “indigenous” along the text, which is a common characteristic of these kind of discourses, and instead the constant reference to “these groups” or again “marginals”; gives the impression of taking out the focus on indigenous people; at the same time, these references tend to increase the distance towards the “other group”. Indeed, phrases like “these groups” or in some cases “this people”, etc., shows **distancing**, a common lexical resource in discriminatory discourses in order to emphasize **polarization** (Van Dijk 2003:105) Nevertheless, in this case it seems to work more as an expression in favor of the amelioration of the indigenous specificity, if the context of meanings is to taken into account, namely the context characterized by the often use of generics as “groups” instead of “indigenous” groups, peoples or communities” as was used in previous texts.

The distancing function is notable though, since it is part of the way that the constructed dichotomy is represented. It is also relevant to note that the increasing distance in this respect is paradoxical, because at the same time it is emphasized the need of their cultural recognition as a general precept of the policy. But a more notable remark is that the diminishing of the indigenous aspect as something novel in the indigenist tradition, which was created and dedicated to indigenous peoples explicitly and emphatically. Apparently this aspect is not fortuitous, and seems linked to the aim of decentralization of the institute in the sense that the new policy aims to include other dependencies of the government to attend the “marginalized” population, in general.
Some other novel references in comparison with the previous text, are also categories like “ethnic groups” and “human groups” with “ethnic specificity”. It appears the general human aspect, groups instead of communities and also the ethnic issue, as a separate quality of such groups. This sort of lexical resources were practically absent in previous texts; the new emphasis in “groups” instead of “communities and peoples” (pueblos), tend to deemphasize at the same time the meaning of “community” and its connotation of not a mere group as any other, but a congregation with certain cultural characteristics practicing a specific mode of organization. The texts comprehending this period and the next one are more prompt to implement this novel terminology from this point, occupying a normalized position since then.

As a continuation with the image of the *indígena*, the contrast indigenous-no indigenous people is present as a background that remains, but even though evident, it is ameliorated by the focalization in the marginal label rather than in the indigenous identity. Additionally, there is not a single explicit reference, as in the previous case, to *mestizaje*; in this case, the ethnic categorization is applied only to the indigenous peoples. The opposite group is always referred as the “rest of society” with any mentioned specific cultural attribute. This omission does not mean necessarily that the previous dichotomy was less ethnically categorized than this one, but nevertheless it is a reflection of a different way to characterize such dichotomy. Likewise, the present division of the three categories “peasant/worker/indígena”, is a way of essentializaing the *indígena* as a separate delimited category in the fashion of preceding discourses. In this respect, it still appears the influence of previous essentializing forms, even though the formal use of plural.

In other aspects, the level of *victimization* in discourse in this case is also emphatic in the condition of marginalization and exploitation, “left aside from the benefits of national development”\(^32\). This insistence on their marginality, seems again to reify the justification on the marginalization focus (as national general policy) and serves also to sustain the argument of the inefficacy of previous policies in order to justify the change, as is the case that indigenous peoples’ situation of marginality remains without being solved. In comparison to anterior texts, their victimization becomes more explicit and emphatic; even though, it is not a dominant resource as it will appear in future 90’s texts.
The *indígena* then is portrayed as a victim who, as anteriorly, in constant necessity of support from the state, but who at the same time has “potentialities and capacities” (product of their cultural specificity) to develop themselves. Therefore, the state renders now more cultural recognition and in a sense, it gives a step back in order to permit more participation. The portrayal as “capable and with potentiality” would become a new *topoi* of the indigenist rhetoric in future discourses along the analyzed texts; as well as the explicit representation of “subjects and not objects” of their development; this not only different but in contraposition to earlier policies. In this sense, the next passage is illustrative:

“Exists, and we have to recognize it in the indigenous communities, the capacity of decision and material improvement with own dynamics, as subjects and not objects of the political, economic and cultural decisions”\(^{33}\).

In here there is a salient implicit meaning which remains precisely in the recognition itself; a sort of mirror which reflects the ideological opposite: the recognition that they have “decision capacity” (*capacidad de decisión*) actually implies the dubious existence of such capacity as if the actual recognition brings the “lack” of it towards the textual surface, to finally be affirmed through the unnamed. In like manner, the power relation in language is evident when the powerful (in this case the institution in the author’s voice), is rendering a good as a mode of beneficence. This discursive strategy becomes a “must” in the multicultural future rhetoric in general, where often are interesting meaning implications in the “cultural respect” speech, denoting “superiority over the other in/through the very gesture of guaranteeing his equality and his respect for their difference” (Zizek 2011:44, 2013).
The discovered goodness of culture

Moreover, in contrast with past discourses here the concept of culture has only positive connotations; culture is novelty portrayed as a “source of development”. In this sense, there is the need not only to preserve but to “fortify and develop” (fortalecer y desarrollar) culture. When establishing the main objectives of the institution, the following phrase is representative of this new cultural strengthened trend:

“…in general, the objectives presented forward, pretend to achieve that indigenous culture and ways of life can be develop and strengthen, parting from a reasonable and autonomous decision from the communities themselves and that at the same time come to enrich the cultural plurality that integrated the Mexican nationality”\textsuperscript{34}.

It is often, as this example show, to find similar expressions along the text in subsequent discourses. Culture is now a source of richness and it is also linked with a potential for development, which implicitly denotes the potential for productivity in an economic sense. Nevertheless in the present text this economic sense is not that evident as it will become later on. In discourses of the next decades, the link culture-development becomes more explicit. This new relationship seems more on hand with the predicaments of the World Bank’s definition of social capital. It is understood in terms of ethnicity as provider, sustaining that “ethnicity can be a powerful tool in the creation of social capital…” (World Bank 2013). This recent conception was already promoted by then with different enunciations, and that highlights the relevance of the international influence in the conceptualizations of the policy shift.

Another interesting aspect in this case, is the lack of argumentation to make such a shift. Supposedly, the context of critical perspective towards the assimilative policy permits to legitimate this position at this point and there is no need of specific justifications; in here the topoi resource seem to accomplish the argumentation part.
The **topoi** to justify this richness and the need to preserve culture are: respect (implicitly in the name of justice), development (utility) and reality/economy. Furthermore, the “pluralism of cultures” contrary to the previous conception, is also a source of richness and as this paragraph shows, it is typical the framing and insistence in the national limits. Accordingly, in order to better convince or to better legitimate the cultural diversity turn, there still appears the need to highlight that the new participatory and cultural conservation schema in no way threatens the national integrity as was feared before. In the contrary, it is a plus for the “national consciousness”. One aspect to notice is that the nationalist rhetoric is always present as a relevant **topic** subject to constant reification, from the integrationist to the participative multiculturalist perspectives. It represents one of the main common discursive backgrounds along texts.

In the current case, although present an innovative rhetoric, the text still bears conceptions from the past integrationism. In the representation of culture, is found implicit as well the anterior portrayal of culture as a sort of container of positive and negative values. In the same line of essentialization, the author mentions that indigenous cultures “contain valuable elements” which need to be rescued and enhanced. This aspect implicitly denotes that there are also negative values, in the same tone of the previous selective acculturative vision.

Moreover, culture takes value for itself, and in considerable opposition to the past integrative perspective, now it is capable and has the potential to enhance not only economic development, but national unity. In this case, indigenous people’s cultural specificity is not anymore an obstacle but an advantage. In here it is pertinent to contrast a phrase from the previous text, in which Caso rejects emphatically the idea of what later became a legitimate and obvious idea: “The system of separating the indigenous peoples from the other ethnically different communities… is disgusting for the Mexican comprehension of the problem. Instead, and against some opinions…”35. This vision contrasts widely with the new vision; the verb “*repugna*” (disgust) denotes a complete disapproval respect the intention of keeping the ethnic peculiarities intact and different from others. It is interesting to note also the expression “against some opinions”, which indicate the existence at that moment of the cultural diversity vision, which later would become the official one.
Retreatment of the heavy and protectionist State

And finally, respect the category of the role of the state this text has special relevance for the variety of new elements and observations that can be obtained from it, since it gives more light to the neoliberal shift, considering that this period represents the preface of the neoliberal project officially installed in 1982. One of the main focuses in the text is a process of decentralization of the functions of the INI. This aim of decentering would be the beginning of the dismantling the traditional role of the institute, in the sense that begins to be portrayed as an “auxiliary” arm among many of the government. The INI becomes a helper to deal with the indigenous peoples in a marginal position as part of a wider project that attends the rest of the population considered marginalized, aspect that makes more opaque the indigenist action. As mentioned in the text, the action of the INI is “strictly normative and tend to establish guidelines for the attention of human groups characterized by their ethnic specificity”; is “auxiliary, executor and limited to the creation of conditions for the activities of the other dependencies”36. One of the topoi used to justify this descentralization is the description of reality and economy, when he says that “the socioeconomic global context of accumulation of power and resources in few hands is a reason why the centralization and marginalization of a majority opens the need to give power to others”.

The INI, according to the new vision, is portrayed as an institution that has not succeeded enough in the purpose of providing better conditions to the marginalized indigenous peoples; it has a “lack of political influence, in the administrative sense” and as just one among other institutions “destined to marginalization”. It is interesting to note that for the first time there is such conception or definition of the institute as focused on marginalization, aspect never before mentioned as a characteristic of the institution. The relevance of it is discursively minimalized and put in the periphery.

The “feudalism of the administrative apparatus” with a “traditional incapacity for coordination”, and the “lack of comprehension of the labor of the institute”, urges now to the “virtual participation of all the governmental organs and administration”. Such
expressions are mainly focused in the topoi of inutility or inefficacy, sources often used by neoliberal governments to enhance decentralization as is the case, or privatization of resources. There appears the implicit negative connotation of the “feudalist government” as a critic towards a heavy apparatus, which is characterized by inefficiency. Again, the ideological character of such meanings appears evident when related to the shift that was taking place; the discourse here matches with other argumentative typical topoi.

In this line, when the author makes reference to the previous institute’s role (the government), it is expressed the clear rejection of “homogenization, and paternalistic means, which inhibit the free development of the creative potentialities of these groups”37. In here it is implicit the paternalistic and protectionist character of the institute as something negative, opposite to the “freedom” of the “group’s potentials”. This language is also innovative and evidently ideological. On one hand there is the opposition paternalism as negative against freedom as positive, this was a lexical resource often used in the time of instauration of neoliberalism. The contrast made in this highlighted polarization, reflects a high level of contrast, and functions as a marker of “our positive” aspects and “their negative” aspects with an ideological load (Van Dijk 2003:63). The general portrayal of the big state and specifically of the institute in this case, is negative in its previous policies because of its inefficiency and control, which is a common neoliberal discursive resource.

Another evident aspect in the ideological discursive shift is the accentuation that the objective of the marginalization focus is to cover the “minimal of wellbeing”; this aspect form part of the wider national project tending to neoliberalism. One of the basic premises, that later on would be a national policy with the central program Solidaridad (Solidarity) implemented by Carlos Salinas, is the reduction of “extreme poverty” by covering such “minimal” needs.
Period III, late 1980 and early 1990

The government of Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado from 1982 to 1988 had the task to rebuild the economy after the 1976 crisis and the worsening of the economy in that moment. The group of De la Madrid policymakers saw the crisis as the result of the development strategy followed after the post-World War II period (1998:28). Consequently, their medium range goals “included increasing the competitiveness of the Mexican economy, relying more on internal than on external savings, and promoting the deregulation and decentralization of economic life” (1998:28). This would be the start of the new economic model, namely, neoliberalism. De la Madrid’s successor Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994), was the main promoter of the new model, signing the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994; and implemented radical changes in the economic policy as well as important constitutional reforms as the reformation of the article 27. His successor Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de León (1994-2000), continued the same neoliberal path; his government was highly questioned when the perpetration of one of the worst indigenous massacres perpetrated by paramilitary forces in Chiapas (Acteal in 1997).


Carlos Tello Macías was the director of the institute from 1994 to 1998. His six year period was parallel to the mandate of the president Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de León, which was characterized by the continuation of the neoliberal project, previously named by his predecessor Salinas as “liberalismo social” (social liberalism). The indigenist policy in this context was marked by the configuration of a schema called “New Relation State-Indigenous People”39, which would represent the more consistent basis of the multicultural policy in turn. This period is a continuation of the policy of participation exposed in the past text, but in here appear different elements that are of interest since represent the
consolidation of the current paradigm respect the relation indigenous peoples-state. It is important to remember the arising during this time of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation EZLN (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional) in 1994, as well as other important indigenous movements that nurtured the political scene of the moment.

The content of the text is an exposition of 36 brief points of the premises of the new relation, making the text easy to read and to grasp the main ideas. The narrative is structured in a conventional order that makes the text coherent and clear. The first part exposes the poor conditions of the indigenous peoples followed by a brief enunciation of the past indigenist policies from the state which at the same time are slightly criticized. Consequently, there are exposed the challenges and the future desirable visions of the indigenist policy, highlighting the need of a new relation of state-indigenous peoples as well as the participation of the entire society. The voice is not a personal voice, but it speaks in name of “us” the Mexican society, the no indígenas, the nation; even though, the author refers to the pronoun “us” just occasionally. This aspect officializes and empowers the text because it takes the face of an apparatus; it is not a personal opinion.

The main proposition of the text is that, in the recognition that Mexico is a multiethnic country arises the need to propose a new institutional model based on the participation and cooperation of diverse actors in the “acción indigenista” (indigenist action). Central to the new model is the decentralization of the INI and the participation of “organizations and indigenous communities”, among others. The four areas of its focus are economic development, health and wellbeing, justice and promotion of the “cultural heritage”; which acquire the same relevance. The INI is now a coordinator, regulator and director of different actors working together.

This general proposition makes evident a continuation of the participation schema before referred, but it goes a step forward in the emphasis on diversification of the actors. In the first place, it goes beyond the aim of decentralization of the INI and makes more explicit the need of participation not only of other institutions from the government, but of the “entire society”, specifically when mentions that “the absence of joint responsibility of the other power of the state at different levels of government and of the entire society”. And
in second place, it is a fact that the role of the INI is now of coordination, and it has ceased to occupy a leading role in the indigenist frame.

The indigenous peoples as bearers of capacities and potentialities

Respect the representation of the indígena; in this case, as in the case of the previous text, the dichotomy “us and them” is present but not as emphatic as in the first one. The indígena is named here in a variety of ways, some of them “indígenas”, “pueblos y comunidades” (peoples and communities), and quite often “indian cultures”, always refereeing to the plural and highlighting the “very diverse indians”. The label of “indio”, was brought again to discourse in this text, meanwhile during anterior texts in the period of the participation model this label was completely omitted. Moreover, it is often present the denotation of “cultures” as a synonym of groups, communities or peoples (pueblos). Here the accentuation of culture takes especial relevance because it is a constant in the text, direct or indirectly mentioned.

Following the line of the anterior text, in this one it is also omitted the reference to mestizaje, ethnicizing only to indigenous peoples in the same fashion. Furthermore, there appears explicit positive portrayals again as “subjects and not objects”, emphasizing the wrongness of previous assimilationist policies. They are shown as “with capacity of decision” again, as well as bearers of “cultural richness” at the same time that “directs heirs of Mesoamerican peoples”. Other reference is for example, bearers of “potential for solutions”. This last qualification shows in a different manner than in previous discourses, the recognition of their ways to solve “their needs”, emphasizing “their capacities”. The preference for the concept of “capacities” is one of the lexical shifts that may deserve special attention, in the sense that it appears constant in this period’s discourses, making emphatic the capacity as a personal individualized quality directly related with economic development success. The focus on individual attributes and their relation with economic
individual success is one of the main ideological bases of neoliberalism; in this respect, this influence appears evident.

On the other hand, the level of victimization is strong when it is focused once again on their marginality, but overall on poverty, here indigenous peoples are “unified by poverty”. They are portrayed as “victims of poverty, inequality and exploitation”. In this case, there is explicit numeric references respect the level of poverty as well as certain statistics showing the level of marginality. This in part serves to justify the focus on “extreme poverty” which is seen as a degradation of the “cultural richness they possess”. This observation is better reflected in the following sentence: “The extreme poverty that unifies to the very diverse indians in Mexico, paradoxically enclosed, degrades, and hide cultural richness in hundreds of communities”41.

Cultural diversity, a source of vigor and richness

In the same sense, the category of culture follows the line of a highly positive entity, aspect constantly emphasized along the text, as well as it continues the tone of the previous text in the accentuation of the nation’s multicultural character. The first point starts with a phrase that would be constantly repeated in this period’s texts in a similar protagonist position: “Mexico is, and legally recognizes itself as a multiethnic and multicultural country”42. This strong affirmative sentence located in the introduction, denotes a relevant ideological impact in this context because it is capable of capture a fact, an unquestioned fact that nevertheless was dubious in precedent traditional perspectives of the INI. The order of the sentences in the entire structure, or of the words in a sentence, is part of the formal propositions exposed by Van Dijk, and may have ideological implications depending on other contextual meanings (2003). As can be noticed in this case, it appears evident the leading ideological role that the phrase has, because of the way it is expressed and because it is the first one, indicating the main topic of the entire content. This can be interpreted as a
starting point intention, leaving behind a past that will never return. In any case, it brings strength to the whole followed argumentation.

Furthermore, the term diversity is constantly mentioned and acquires an accentuated meaning when diversity (cultural) is desirable to be the “truly core of the state policy to follow”. Diversity enriches, and expands its limits beyond indigenous peoples in the affirmation that the challenge is that “diversity can be an attribute of all and not just of indian peoples”. In here the term diversity seems to have value by itself as an ethereal entity now desirable in all senses. In the same line, the phrase: “It has gained spaced in the national conscience the conviction that we are a multicultural nation and that that diversity just can derivate in vigor and richness”. In here, from diversity derives “vigor and richness”, which are insistently enounced along this and the other texts of the period.

Besides, appears the rejection of previous integrationist policies arguing that were “insufficient” and that it “derived in contempt of their capacities to define their own alternatives of progress based in millenarian cultures…” In this sense, the capacity is again accentuated as a now recognized characteristic of indigenous peoples at the same time that neglects all previous visions. This sort of expressions gives weight once again to the main argument of the need to create something new, to turn the page.

The State as facilitator

And finally, respect the category of the role of the state, it can be perceived the retreatment of its influence and control when for example discourse is emphatic in the participation of more organizations and the rest of society, the last one as an insistent new actor; besides, it is mentioned the New Alliance between “indian peoples and Mexican society” with a vague tonality. This diversification of actors denotes an evident minimizing of the role of the institute and the state. In this sense, can also be added the omission of the INI in the entire
text as is not mentioned once; but of it is necessary to consider here the character of the
text, which is focused more on government in general terms.

The role of the state appears now as a “facilitator of their own development” rather than a
protector or a provider, as portrayed in the past. The facilitator image instead, implicitly
connotes a marginal role or at least not central; nevertheless, the influence and action from
it, is there. In the previous text, for example, it was still more emphatic the presence of the
state in the sense that was focused on other governmental organisms besides the INI. In this
case, in an insistent fashion, it appears a third element also responsible: the “Mexican
society” as such. This new element is enounced in a vague fashion, and it can be interpreted
as an aspect charged with ideological implications harmonic with the neoliberal model. It is
not, as was in traditional statist indigenismo, an issue between the state and the indigenous
peoples; but also the responsibility reaches the whole society. The empowerment of diverse
actors indeed, appears in a frame of the retreatment of the state from its traditional
functions (Assies, van der Haar and Hackema 1999:511). This represents another neoliberal
precept: the “sharing of responsibilities”. The vagueness or ambiguity is a “very powerful
political and ideological tool” (Van Dijk 2003:67) in discourse; in this case it produces the
function of taking off the focus of the state and at the same time, this responsibility remains
in a sort of limbo space: “The secular marginalization that defines the contemporary
situation of the indigenous peoples of Mexico demands, for its solution, the conjoint of the
Mexican society”.

The topoi used for this retreatment of the state and the enhancing of different actors to
participate, in this case the “entire society”, is on one hand the inutility of previous
paradigms, but more than that, democracy and humanitarianism (human rights). It is
interesting how in here appears the discourse of human rights as such, meanwhile
practically absent in the previous texts, at least in an explicit manner.

Finally, another relevant aspect to note is the intention to build new “political equilibriums”
which are able to “involve all the national actors”. In this sense, the political aspect takes
special relevance when accentuates the political rights that the indigenous peoples as
subjects, may exert. The emphasis in rendering such political rights is of course related to
the context of appearance of the EZLN and other indigenous movements, and the urgency
to, at least in discourse, accentuate the role of political participation, in a sense as a mode of political conflict mitigation. The text concludes with a nicely expressed phrase, which highlights one of the main ideas of the text: “The great task is today create and consolidate in our country a deep culture of plurality and respect to diversity, a culture of the full recognition of ourselves”

5. CONCLUSIONS

The construction of the indigenist discourse by the INI followed an apparently continuous path during decades, resting upon the premises and linguistic resources typical of the institute since its foundation. This “hard” aspect of the institutional language tended to more or less remain static meanwhile a process of change was taking place at the same time. Some structural and rhetorical resources characteristic of the institutional indigenist tradition remained in form, for example the recurrent victimization or characterization in a positive and negative fashion of the indigenous population, or the constant reification of nationalism through the “national unity” trope. On the other hand, this aspect was often accompanied by new resources, like the addition of concepts or different forms of argumentation, as well as evident omissions respect the previous typical usage of certain words, which represent the more dynamic aspect of discourse. From a “distant” perspective, discourse appears reshaped and slightly changed, while maintaining a similar structure and always following more or less the typical ways of organization and argumentation. The different actors, embedded in the institutional roles they represent, tended to reproduce the subsequent discursive lineaments established in the different moments in which their discourse was enounced.

Although the continuous character of discourse, a radical shift was indeed perceived when the instauration of the multicultural project occurred as a kind of interruption of a model (which appeared as already exhausted), and the innovative and often contradictory
acquisition of new linguistic elements. From that moment, the reference to the *indígena* ceased “to be and object” to become instead a “subject”; indigenous culture was not anymore one of “backwardness” but one of “enrichment”; and the state stopped its “dependence” fostering to instead be a “facilitator” for “free development”. These innovative three main aspects seemed to become the core of the new paradigm according to the present analysis, at the same time many of the previous forms remained.

As regards the representation of “*el indígena*” it was observed a constant essentialization of the indigenous peoples that remained through the paradigm transitions, even though constructed differently. The formal change of reference to the plural form (*los indígenas*) that appears in the new model did not prevent discourse of being still essentializing, as was showed. The constant expression “very diverse indigenous peoples” apparently did not deeply reshape discourse to an authentic recognition as the typical dichotomization and essentialization remained almost the same. The “distant other” remained as such, now novelty encapsulated in the essential naturalized “owner of traditions” trope. Nevertheless, it was indeed perceived a diminishment in polarization and enunciation of open explicit discriminatory references that were more evident during the integrationist period; aspect from which may be assumed a tendency of “democratization” of discriminative discourse towards the “indigenous other”.

Moreover, in the case of the concept of culture there was a sudden revival of its relevance in the paradigm transition. The new perspective of culture was highly contrasting with the previous one; in fact it appears contradictory. From an indigenous culture of “backwardness”, it became a “source of development” (which denotes a more direct relation culture-economy); from an entity with “positive and negative values” (negative in respect to development and progress) which was legitimate and desirable to change, now it turned into an essence as a whole that cannot be changed but it had to be preserved. At the same time, there tended to be an increasing “culturalization” of indigenist discourse, in the sense that culture and its value represented the central topic of discussion, meanwhile other indigenist topics like education or health, legal or political rights, tended to be absent or to become opaque by the cultural trope.
In the matter of the representation of the State’s role, from being portrayed as a big protector with great responsibility, the tendency with the new paradigm was to diminish its scope of action through the decentralization of the INI as the principal institution of *indigenismo*. The institution was seen later as “inefficient” to solve indigenous problems, and as ethnocide with its acculturative aims. The state was seen as over protectionist and feudalist, as well as dependency enhancer. From this perspective, the need of diversification of participants in the indigenist action emerged legitimate and the inclusion of other governmental actors, the indigenous themselves, and as an important element “the Mexican society”, became relevant for the multicultural paradigm.

In this sense, especially in the discursive changes of the concept of culture and state, there can be observed the main ideological influences that the instauration of the neoliberal model had over the indigenist discourse: the centrality on the culture trope and the no intervention; the decentralization of the INI and the marginalization in its reach as well as the diversification of actors in the indigenist action (retreatment of the state); and “inefficiency, protectionism and dependency enhancer” as the main negative characteristics of the previous policy of the state and the INI.

Furthermore, it was observed a change in the typical usage of arguments in order to justify the state’s intervention or not in the acculturative task. In the texts comprehending the first period, the typical topoi to intervene are justice, responsibility and equality; meanwhile the subsequent topoi in the participation model were: economy, inefficacy and reality. Moreover, in the arguments of the last period, the topoi found are efficiency, democracy and humanitarianism (human rights). These changes show that the dominant topoi comprehending the new paradigm left behind previous arguments product of the post-revolutionary state as justice and equality; and instead supplied them by those of economy, efficacy, reality; together with those of democracy and human rights. This shift on the kind of topoi used towards a more utilitarian and economist perspective can be read as also on hand with the neoliberal paradigm.

Accordingly, as seen along the present analysis, the ideological aspect of the neoliberal project actually did influence the reshaping of the INI’s indigenist multicultural discourse, more so in the texts analyzed in the decade of 1980 and 1990. Constant direct and indirect
ideas and meanings related to the neoliberal ideology are embedded in these discourses since the radical shift. Certainly, multiculturalism may go beyond neoliberalism, and many of its statements might be product of democratic social and indigenous movements claiming for recognition and participation in political decision making. However, paradoxically this model responds to the political and economic project in course at the same time, through the power of discourse and ideology. In this respect, I suggest it may be legitimate to name the current indigenist policy of the Mexican State as “neoliberal multiculturalism”.

Besides, this paradigm, far from limiting itself to just open spaces for indigenous participation, may be also exerting new ways of control and management of the indigenous issue that are far from being authentically democratic. The discourse changes observed in this study showed indeed an evident effort to dismiss the traditional statist perspectives and supplant them with democratic and liberal visions in favor of diversity; but at the same time, there was the impossibility to actually reconstruct language free from discriminatory conceptions of otherness. How then to promote a multicultural model claiming for respect and recognition towards “others”, when at the same time and in the same discourse, coexists a continuous reproduction of inferior representations of that “other”?

In order to advance in the understanding of this issue, it would be necessary to analyze more closely the contemporary discourses in the new institution CDI (replacement of the INI) created in 2003, and to compare its current postulates in relation to previous ones, as well as to relate them to the findings of this study; this in order to continue in the path to investigate the ideological composition of the contemporary Mexican indigenist discourse.
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1. Kymlicka does not acquire this concept as one main issue, but discusses it in “Neoliberal Multiculturalism” 2011.

2. There is a distinction between the population who speaks an indigenous language, 6.6 million; and the population self-defined with 9.1 million, according with the INEGI, 2011.


4. The indigenous movements’ revival during the decade of 1970 lead to a great boom of indigenous movements in the decade of 1990. For example, the Consejo Mexicano de los 500 años (Mexican Council of the 500 Years) had in 1991, around 350 organizations from 23 states (Bartra and Otero, 2008).

5. Authors like Héctor Díaz Polanco, in 1987.

6. Mestizo refers to miscegenation in society.


8. ‘Texts’ can be conceived as “materially durable products of linguistic actions”, in Wodak 2003.

9. Different perspectives, but both in a frame on ethnicity and indigenous or minorities policy.

10. See for example Somers 2008.

11. One of the main promoters of the multicultural model especially in Canada.

12. Understood as a policy cultural model from the state.

13. See for example his research on racism in Latin America in Van Dijk 2007.

14. The main source is the compilation titled “Fundamentos” (fundaments), collected by the institute itself (in INI 30 años después, INI 40 años).

15. A reference concerning the criteria for such periodization is included further on in a brief historical reference of such periods.

16. The inclusion of these two years before the paradigm shift, may give more emphasis to the discursive transitions before and after the change.

“El problema indígena en México no es un problema racial. La distinción entre indígenas y no indígenas estriba en una diferencia de cultura. México, es un país mestizo y la inmensa mayoría de su población tiene sangre indígena y sangre blanca”.

According to Castellanos (2000), the central visions of racist doctrines along history have both racist and cultural perspectives of superiority.

“Por otra parte, la sociedad Mexicana rechaza toda discriminación de origen racial”.

“El indigenismo mexicano afirma, por lo tanto, que el indígena posee capacidades inherentes a todo ser humano normal para modificar sus condiciones de existencia y que sus presentes limitaciones, en modo alguno congénitas sino productos de hechos históricos y sociales, cuya responsabilidad recae en la otra parte de la población, pueden ser vencidas por medidas correctamente concebidas y ejecutadas”.

“Con frecuencia se ha visto, como producto de la experiencia, que para que el indígena sienta como propia y cuide la escuela, la obra de agua potable…, debe hacérsele participar en la construcción de la obra y en la adquisición y siembra del árbol, y debe retribuir sus servicios, aunque sea en forma simbólica. En tanto el indígena reciba gratuitamente o sin su cooperación un beneficio, lo considerará como cosa ajena sobre la que sentirá poca o ninguna responsabilidad, estimándolo como una obra de beneficencia, o como una obligación del Gobierno”.

“El propósito del Instituto no es colocarse frente a las comunidades indígenas indefinidamente en una forma tutelar, como si fueran menores de edad. Deseamos despertar en la comunidad indígena la idea de que la transformación y el mejoramiento pueden lograrse… pero no deseamos que la comunidad indígena permanezca indefinidamente bajo nuestro control y dirección”.

“El indígena que sale permanentemente de su pueblo, que habla español, que trabaja en una fábrica o reside en una ciudad, deja de interesar al indigenismo. Se ha incorporado a la cultura mexicana. Pero mientras permanezca en su comunidad, aun cuando acepte elementos de la cultura mexicana, sigue siendo indígena y su actitud no es sino una muestra de la aculturación que se está llevando a cabo”.

“Lentamente, a través de esta experiencia, se va logrando afinar los procedimientos y técnicas que constituyen verdaderos resultados experimentales que, a la larga, podrán elaborarse en una doctrina que tenga ya una validez general”.
26. “...en contra de algunas opiniones, es a todas luces justificado el tratamiento diferencial de la comunidad indígena o de la población indígena en su conjunto, en virtud de sus especiales características culturales, como justificado es cesar el tratamiento diferencial, cuando la comunidad ha sido puesta ya en camino de su integración”.

27. “... el indigenismo consiste en sostener, desde el punto de vista de la justicia y de la conveniencia del país, la necesidad de la protección de las comunidades indígenas para colocarlas en un plano de igualdad, con relación a las otras comunidades mestizas que forman la masa de la población de la República”.

28. “Sería imposible el desarrollo asilado de una comunidad, si no se desarrolla al mismo tiempo toda la zona a la que pertenece”.

29. International Monetary Fund.

30. Like the mentioned ILO Convention 169 (signed in 1989), or recently, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (adopted in 2007).

31. “definido políticamente en función del más grave problema de México, el de la marginación, que afecta sustancialmente a los pueblos indios”.

32. “separados de los beneficios del desarrollo nacional”.

33. “Existe, y hay que reconocer en las comunidades indígenas, capacidad de decisión y de avance material con dinámica propia, como sujetos y no objetos de las decisiones políticas, sociales y culturales”.

34. “… en general, los objetivos que se presentan a continuación, pretenden lograr que la cultura y modos de vida indígena se fortalezcan y desarrollen, a partir de una decisión razonada y autónoma de las propias comunidades, y que al mismo tiempo vengan a enriquecer el pluralismo cultural que integra la nacionalidad mexicana”.

35. “El sistema de separar a los indígenas de las otras comunidades, étnicamente distintas... repugna a la comprensión Mexicana del problema. En cambio, y en contra de algunas opiniones…”

36. “es esencialmente normativa y tiende a establecer lineamientos para la atención de grupos humanos caracterizados por su especificidad étnica”.

37. “homogenización como medidas paternalistas que suplanten la iniciativa propia de las comunidades e inhiban el desarrollo de las potencialidades creativas de estos grupos”.

67
The article 27 gave the campesinos (peasants) the right of property of land and communal organization of production. The reformation of this law in 1992 dissolved the communal property and privileged the private one. In the same way the government diminished its responsibilities of the distribution of land, among others (Domínguez 1993).

“Nueva Relación Estado-Pueblos indígenas”.

“la ausencia de responsabilidad de los otros poderes del Estado en los diversos niveles de gobierno y de la sociedad en su conjunto”.

“La pobreza extrema que unifica a los muy diversos indios en México, paradójicamente encierra, degrada, y oculta esa riqueza cultural en cientos de comunidades…”.

“México es y se reconoce jurídicamente como un país pluriétnico y pluricultural.”

“ha ganado espacio en la conciencia nacional la convicción de que somos una nación pluricultural y que de esa diversidad sólo pueden derivar vigor y riqueza”.

“El rezago secular que define la situación contemporánea de los pueblos indios de México reclama, para su solución, el concurso de la sociedad mexicana”.

“La gran tarea es hoy crear y afianzar en nuestro país una cultura profunda de la pluralidad y del respeto a la diversidad, una cultura del reconocimiento pleno de nosotros mismos”.