H-Diplo ROUNDTABLE XXVI-7

Sarah Foss. *On Our Own Terms: Development and Indigeneity in Cold War Guatemala*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2022. ISBN: 9781469670324

21 October 2024 | PDF: https://hdiplo.org/to/RT26-7 | X: @HDiplo | BlueSky: @h-diplo.bsky.social

Editor: Diane Labrosse
Commissioning Editor: Kevin Grimm
Production Editor: Christopher Ball
Pre-Production Copy Editor: Katie A. Ryan

Contents

Introduction by Amy C. Offner, University of Pennsylvania

Sarah Foss's *On Our Own Terms*, a deeply researched history of Indigenous Guatemalans' engagement with development during the Cold War, is an impressive accomplishment. Reviewers John Aerni-Flessner, Nicole Pacino, and Dustin Walcher, who come from the fields of Latin American and African studies, affirm its important contributions to Guatemalan and twentieth-century Latin American history, as well as the wider history of Cold War development. Pacino lauds the book as "beautifully written," "deeply engaging," and "both theoretically sophisticated and accessible." Aerni-Flessner, a historian of Africa, emphasizes the book's relevance beyond the field of Latin American history. *On Our Own Terms* speaks to Africanists' interest in "the multiple and varied meanings of the idea of 'development,'" he writes, and its creative use of oral, visual, and textual evidence "pushes historians of Africa to think harder about possible sources for recovering and rewriting…difficult histories." As Walcher notes, Latin Americanists have long rejected the idea that the region was shaped primarily from without: Latin Americans made their own history within "asymmetrical power relationships." But he rightly observes that stories about the negotiation of imperial power in post-independence Latin America have often focused on "political and economic elite[s]" within the region. Foss's argument that Indigenous people shaped international development is thus "refreshing and significant."

Within the historiography of international development, *On Our Own Terms* is indeed one of the first books to explore seriously the way that Indigenous people in Latin America experienced and shaped international development programs.[1] As all three reviewers note, Foss mobilizes extraordinary research in three

[1] For selected works in the historiography of development, see Joseph Love, *Crafting the Third World: Theorizing Underdevelopment in Rumania and Brazil* (Stanford University Press, 1996); Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard, eds., *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge* (University of California Press, 1997); Michael Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Sarah Babb, *Managing Mexico: Economists from Nationalism to Neoliberalism* (Princeton University Press, 2001); David C. Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Harvard University Press, 2003); Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); Barbara Weinstein, "Developing Inequality," *American Historical Review* 113:1 (Feb. 2008) 1-18; Bradley R. Simpson, *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and US-Indonesian Relations, 1960–1968* (Stanford University Press, 2008); David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission* Princeton University Press, 2009); Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World* (Harvard University Press, 2010); Eric Helleiner, *Forgotten Foundations of Bretton Woods: International Development and the Making of the Postwar Order* (Cornell University Press, 2014); Thomas C. Field, *From Development to Dictatorship: Bolivia and the Alliance for Progress in the Kennedy Era* (Cornell University Press, 2014); Priya Lal, *African Socialism in Postcolonial Tanzania: Between the Village and the World* (Cambridge University Press 2015), Nancy Kwak, *A World of Homeowners: American Power and the Politics of Housing Aid* (University of Chicago Press, 2015); Daniel Immerwahr, *Thinking Small: The United States and the Lure of Community Development* (Harvard University Press, 2015); Tore C. Olsson, *Agrarian Crossings: Reformers and the Remaking of the US and Mexican Countryside* (2017); Christopher Dietrich, *Oil Revolution: Anticolonial Elites, Sovereign Rights, and the Economic Culture of Decolonization* (Cambridge University Press, 2017); Artemy Kalinovsky, *Laboratory of Socialist Development: Cold War Politics and Decolonization in Soviet Tajikistan* (Cornell University Press, 2018); Erez Manela and Stephen Macekura, eds., *The Development Century: A Global History* (Cambridge University Press, 2018); David C. Engerman, *The Price of Aid: The Economic Cold War in India* (Harvard University Press, 2018); Giuliano

countries, including sixty oral history interviews that she interprets with great sensitivity. She brings to her sources the insights of Latin American historians who have long explored Indigenous people's relationships to state formation, and she redeploys their methods to understand power relations that extend beyond the nation-state. Taking up classic historiographic questions about the negotiation of power, Indigenous people's uses of hegemonic concepts, and the historical construction of racial ideologies, she deftly rereads development reports and correspondence produced by government officials, social scientists, local development workers, international development institutions, and the US government. Where most historians of development have read such sources to understand their authors, Foss reads against the grain to understand the ways that Indigenous people experienced and shaped development projects, as well as the nested power relations and changing notions of Indigeneity that development programs generated.

Within the field of Guatemalan history, Walcher notes that the book deepens our understanding of Indigenous people's experience of the much-studied Guatemalan Revolution (1944-1954) and the counterrevolution that followed. While Foss generally affirms the notion that the revolution offered liberatory possibilities that were foreclosed in subsequent decades, she finds that Indigenous communities did not universally embrace the revolution in its moment and attends to local understandings of key political concepts, most importantly the idea of communism.

Garavini, *The Rise and Fall of OPEC in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford University Press, 2019); Amy C. Offner, *Sorting Out the Mixed Economy: The Rise and Fall of Welfare and Developmental States in the Americas* (Princeton University Press, 2019); Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination* (Princeton University Press, 2019); Christy Thornton, *Revolution in Development Mexico and the Governance of the Global Economy* (University of California Press, 2021); Joanne Meyerowitz, *A War on Global Poverty: The Lost Promise of Redistribution and the Rise of Microcredit* (Princeton University Press, 2021); David Johnson Lee, *The Ends of Modernization: Nicaragua and the United States in the Cold War* (Cornell University Press, 2021); Gabriela Soto Laveaga, "Beyond Borlaug's Shadow: Octavio Paz, Indian Farmers, and the Challenge of Narrating the Green Revolution," *Agricultural History* 95:4 (Fall 2021): 576-608; Margarita Fajardo, *The World that Latin America Created: The United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America in the Development Era* (Harvard University Press, 2022); Jamie Martin, *The Meddlers: Sovereignty, Empire, and the Birth of Global Economic Governance* (Harvard University Press, 2022); Jeremy Friedman, *Ripe for Revolution; Building Socialism in the Third World* (Harvard University Press, 2022); Alessandro Iandolo, *Arrested Development: The Soviet Union in Ghana, Guinea, and Mali, 1955–1968* (Cornell University Press, 2022); Timothy W. Lorek, *Making the Green Revolution: Agriculture and Conflict in Colombia* (University of North Carolina Press, 2023); Melissa Teixeira, *A Third Path: Corporatism in Brazil and Portugal* (Princeton University Press, 2024).
From the perspective of Latin American history, the problem with any attempt to define a historiography of development is that much of what has recently fallen under that heading has long been the core of the field: the study of political economy; imperialism and international economic relations; social revolution and counterrevolution; labor and social movements; industrialization; urbanization and urban poverty; land and resource conflicts; and the history of economic thought. The best of this work surpasses most of the current "historiography of development" in its theoretical sophistication and its integration of social history and political economy. Barbara Weinstein's 2008 article, cited above, offers a sketch of some of this work. *On Our Own Terms* addresses the current historiography of development, but its attention to Indigenous and social history owes to these deeper currents in Latin American historiography.

Just as important, the book offers a new understanding of continuities and ruptures across the period of the revolution, the 1954 coup that brought an end to democracy, the decades of authoritarian rule, civil war, and state terror that followed, and the turn to democracy and neoliberalism at the end of the twentieth century. On the one hand, Foss argues for some long continuities: in each of these periods, she finds governments of very different characters seeking to define and create the "permitted Indian" (14-15)—that is, seeking to incorporate Indigenous people into the polity and nation on terms that could be quite restrictive. In each of these periods, she argues that development policies were designed to cultivate the "permitted Indian," although they never quite achieved that goal. Yet the book is also careful to note distinctions between these periods, and for Foss, the most important distinction is the level of autonomy and control that Indigenous people and communities were able to exercise within development programs. The revolution and its immediate aftermath, for all their constraints, allowed Guatemalan development workers and local people to shape programs that diverged from the prescriptions of national planners and US modernization theorists. Where modernization theorists sought to transform supposedly backward cultures through the introduction of entirely new values, habits, and norms, Foss finds that local people created bilingual education programs that taught Spanish without attempting to wipe out Indigenous languages and built health centers that offered Western medicine without trying to eliminate *curanderos* (healers). Beginning in the 1960s, however, Guatemala's authoritarian regimes increasingly interpreted such expressions of local autonomy as intolerable expressions of subversion. The government folded development programs into a counterinsurgency war, centralized policy decisions, and concerned itself chiefly with securing local compliance.

The book offers particularly sensitive readings of two groups involved in the local negotiation of policy. First are development workers, most of them Guatemalan professionals. *On Our Own Terms* offers a fascinating reconstruction of the careers of Guatemala's first anthropologists, who trained with Sol Tax and Robert Redfield of the University of Chicago, made what they would of their education, and went on to shape the Guatemalan Revolution. Later, it offers memorable, sympathetic portraits of local development workers who, in the wake of the 1954 coup, found themselves at odds with national policymakers and defied some of their expectations. Foss's interviews with elderly veterans of these projects, and her insightful interpretation of their conflicting memories, are highlights of the book.

The second group at the center of the story, of course, are Indigenous people themselves. Foss rightly notes the difficulty of ascertaining their beliefs and priorities, given that we learn about them primarily through the writings and memories of development workers. And she rightly chose not to interview people about the years when the government carried out genocidal violence against Indigenous people, recognizing that interviews could retraumatize survivors. Given all that, she thoughtfully reads her sources against the grain, and she makes brilliant use of photographs. Aerni-Flesser highlights her interpretation of images in chapter 7 as "an exemplar" and Walcher regrets only that "the quality of many of the photographs precluded reproduction."

Using these sources, Foss is able to show that Indigenous people picked and chose among projects, that they prioritized those improvements in education, sanitation, health care, nutrition, and housing that allowed them to preserve aspects of their cultures that they valued, and that they often prioritized their own well-

being over the priorities of the national state. So, for instance, we find an agricultural cooperative in Ixcán that built a health clinic and cooperative store, postponed the construction of a school, and outright rejected the idea of petroleum exploration in the area. So, too, do we find refugees who fled genocidal violence during the late Cold War and created new clandestine communities; there, for the purposes of survival, they transformed the gender division of labor and built houses in entirely new ways in order to hide from the military.

The second half of the book chronicles escalating repression and cataclysmic state violence; in the midst of it, Foss offers remarkable portraits of potentially transformative experiments that local people carved out amid dictatorship, war, and genocide. The book's final chapter contrasts the Guatemalan government's authoritarian Poles of Development, which was modeled on the strategic hamlet program in Vietnam, with self-made *Comunidades de población en resistencia.* It offers a deeply moving portrait of survival and of attempts to preserve humanity, community, and democracy against incredible odds. This chapter alone represents a significant contribution to Guatemalan history and deserves a wide readership.

Ultimately, *On Our Own Terms* affirms several key insights that are foundational to the historical literature on development: as Walcher observes, the book critiques "top-down" programs and emphasizes "the relationship between development…and political violence." But Foss adds something new and important in revealing "the remarkable ability of indigenous communities to survive."

While there are many reasons to read Foss's book, the key reason to read a roundtable is the dialogue between author and reviewers. Aerni-Flessner's comparison of Indigenous communities in Guatemala to Africans in the late colonial and postcolonial periods prompts a thoughtful exchange with Foss on the relevance of decolonization as a concept for understanding the desires of the communities that she studies. Foss sounds a cautionary note, displaying her characteristic attention to the concepts used by her own subjects: she prefers the concept of autonomy to that of decolonization. Meanwhile, *On Our Own Terms* left Walcher wanting more: ultimately, he asks, how does Foss evaluate "the opportunities and limits of community agency at critical conjunctures"? Foss offers no simple answer, but her response reveals her sensibility as a historian: she is devoted to understanding the will and creativity of the people she studies, even as she confronts the limits of what was possible.

Contributors:

Sarah Foss is Assistant Professor of Oklahoma State University. She is the author of *On Our Own Terms: Development and Indigeneity in Cold War Guatemala* (University of North Carolina Press, 2022), as well as articles and chapters examining Guatemalan revolutionary movements and its internal armed conflict and state programs such as *indigenismo* and agrarian reform. She is currently working on a project about the contested Belize-Guatemalan borderlands and is a co-founder of the Latino Oklahoma Oral History Project.

Amy C. Offner is Associate Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania and the author of *Sorting Out the Mixed Economy: The Rise and Fall of Welfare and Developmental States in the Americas* (Princeton University Press, 2019).

John Aerni-Flessner is an Associate Professor of African and World History in the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities at Michigan State University. His research has focused on the idea of development in Lesotho, southern Africa, and on the history of borders and border crossers between Lesotho and South Africa. He is the author of *Dreams for Lesotho: Independence, Foreign Assistance, and Development* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2018). He led the editorial team for the Third Edition of the *Historical Dictionary of Lesotho* (Rowman and Littlefield, forthcoming 2023) and is a co-editor with Munyaradzi Mushonga, Chitja Twala, and Grey Magaiza of *Migration, Borders, and Borderlands: Making National Identity in Southern African Communities* (Lexington, forthcoming 2023). He is also currently working on a book detailing the history of the negotiations between 1966 and 1986 around the Lesotho Highlands Water Project that today supplies forty percent of Johannesburg, South Africa's water through a series of mountain reservoirs and tunnels situated mostly in Lesotho.

Nicole Pacino is an Associate Professor of Latin American History at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Her research interests include twentieth-century Andean history, public health, revolutions and social movements, and gender. Her work, which focuses on the history of public health programs during the Bolivian Revolution, has been published in journals based in the United States, Europe, and Latin America, including *Diplomatic History*, the *Journal of Women's History*, the *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, and *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos*. She also has chapters in the edited volumes *Peripheral Nerve: Health and Medicine in Cold War Latin America* (Duke University Press, 2020) and *Healthcare in Latin America: History, Society, Culture* (University of Florida Press, 2022).

Dustin Walcher is Professor of History and Political Science, and Director of the School of Social Sciences at Southern Oregon University. He is a specialist in international affairs, with emphasis on the United States and Latin America. With Jeffrey F. Taffet, he published *The United States and Latin America: A History with Documents* (Routledge, 2017). He is the Co-Editor-in-Chief and Host of *Historias*, the podcast from the Southeastern Council of Latin American Studies (SECOLAS).

Review by John Aerni-Flessner, Michigan State University

As development discourse has played an ever-increasing role in diplomatic circles, humanitarian organizations, and in the language used by wider swaths of the populace in many countries, histories that trace the idea and practice of development like Sarah Foss does in *On Our Own Terms* become more important. This is true not just because it fulfills the historian's urge to seek the ideological germination of important ideas—in this case, the idea of development in a variety of contexts. Rather, as this book intriguingly points out, the language of development is not adopted as a coherent idea that is immutable across cultural and national lines but has different meanings and ways of knowing as it is inflected by culture and the experiences of individuals and communities. When this happened in Guatemala, as Foss argues, "development simultaneously served multiple functions as it reinforced state attempts to control, surveil, simplify, and racialize but also allowed for access to resources and a means to challenge racism and forge alternative identities" for indigenous individuals and communities (233).

While the author of this review, being an Africanist historian, is not conversant with Guatemalan historiography or the broader literature on development in Latin America, it is notable how many parallels there are in Foss's work to literature on the history of development across the African continent. *On Our Own Terms*, therefore, can be situated in the broader literature seeking the multiple and varied meanings of the idea of "development" in its broader social contexts.[1] Thus, the book makes an important contribution in the Guatemalan context to a growing and important body of work that argues that this diversity of meaning around "development" has important implications for understanding our current social and economic moment.[2]

Published in the University of North Carolina Press's series on *The New Cold War History*, Foss's book situates development interventions in Guatemala in the context of the Cold War, and especially the United States' effort to ensure that Communist or left-leaning governments did not become entrenched in the Western Hemisphere. While this meant orchestrating the CIA's "successful" coup in 1954 with the overthrow of the revolutionary government of President Jacobo Arbenz, American efforts took on even more urgency after the Cuban Revolution. This led to continued American support for a succession of right-wing military governments in Guatemala up to and through the 1980s. While a few African governments were directly enmeshed in the Cold War in similar ways to Guatemala, Cold War ties for most

[1] John Aerni-Flessner, *Dreams for Lesotho: Independence, Foreign Assistance, and Development* (University of Notre Dame Press, 2018); Allen Isaacman and Barbara Isaacman, *Dams, Displacement, and the Delusion of Development: Cahora Bassa and Its Legacies in Mozambique, 1965–2007* (Ohio University Press, 2013; Leslie Hadfield, *Liberation and Development: Black Consciousness Community Programs in South Africa* (Michigan State University Press, 2016). Muey Saeteurn, *Cultivating Their Own: Agricultural in Western Kenya During the "Development" Era* (University of Rochester Press, 2020); Alice Weimers, *Village Work: Development and Rural Statecraft in Twentieth-Century Ghana* (Ohio University Press, 2021).

[2] Robert Ahearne, "Development and Progress as Historical Phenomenon in Tanzania: "*Maendeleo*? We Had That in the Past" *African Studies Review* 59: 1 (2016): 77-96; Corrie Decker and Elisabeth McMahon, *The Idea of Development in Africa: A History* (Cambridge University Press, 2021; Kara Moskowitz, *Seeing Like a Citizen: Decolonization, Development, and the Making of Kenya, 1945–1980* (Ohio University Press, 2019).

African countries and leaders tended to be much more ephemeral and shifting than they were for Latin America.[3] And yet, the rhetorics and goals of "development" that Foss documents for rural Guatemala sound familiar notes for Africanist scholars who have looked at development efforts in the late colonial and early independence periods.[4]

These similarities in ideas and rhetorics have, on the one hand, been long noted in the scholarship. James Ferguson pointed out in 1990 that the "'development industry' is apparently a global phenomenon" with a "common discourse and the same way of defining 'problems,' a common pool of 'experts,' and a common stock of experience."[5] This was more true for development efforts across the formerly colonized areas of Africa, Asia, the Pacific, and the Caribbean in the post-World War II era than for Central American states, as Foss documents. Many of the non-Latin American interventions in the middle and late decades of the twentieth century were undertaken with cooperation from international humanitarian organizations or with funding from various World Bank and United Nations' institutions.[6] They derived from late-colonial efforts to justify a continuation of empire in the post-World War II period, as well as being crucial components of nation-building after independence.[7] Through these efforts, and as was true for colonialism in general, Corrie Decker and Elisabeth McMahon argue that the idea of development—the "episteme of development" as they call it—contributed to the global perception of Africa and Africans as being second-class citizens in the western imagination.[8]

However, development has always been more than simply an idea in the minds of planners and officials in governmental and non-governmental institutions. It has also been a potent idea and ideology in the minds of people who have been put forth as the recipients of development efforts. These individuals and communities have often used development as a liberatory ideology to reimagine their own communities and nations, even when that was not how planners designed or hoped it would be used.[9] This idea has been successfully mined in many contexts, but perhaps nowhere better than in Tanzania where Robert Ahearne and Emma Hunter explored how conceptions of the Swahili term *maendeleo* morphed from meaning simply

[3] For an example of explicit Cold War intervention and its ephemeral nature, see Alessandro Iandolo, *Arrested Development: The Soviet Union in Ghana, Guinea, and Mali 1955–1964* (Cornell University Press, 2022). The Congo is an exception to this generalization, largely due to the large quantities of strategic minerals. See Georges Nzongola-Ntalaja, *The Congo from Leopold to Kabila: A People's History* (Palgrave, 2002).

[4] Joseph Hodge, Gerald Hödl, and Martina Kopf, *Development Africa: Concepts and Practices in Twentieth-Century Colonialism* (Manchester University Press, 2014).

[5] James Ferguson, *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho* (Cambridge University Press, 1990), 8.

[6] Emily Baughan, *Saving the Children: Humanitarianism, Internationalism, and Empire* (University of California Press, 2021); Amy Staples, *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, and World Health Organization Have Changed the World, 1945-1965* (Kent State University Press, 2006).

[7] See Isaacman and Isaacman, *Dams, Displacement, and the Delusion of Development*; Moskowitz, *Seeing Like a Citizen*; Leander Schneider, *Government of Development: Peasants and Politicians in Postcolonial Tanzania* (Indiana University Press, 2014); Julie Tischler, *Light and Power for a Multiracial Nation: The Kariba Dam Scheme in in the Central African Federation* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[8] Decker and McMahon, *Idea of Development in Africa*, 3.

[9] Aerni-Flessner, *Dreams for Lesotho.*

"to make progress" to "development" over time in the minds of members of populations which had been impacted by the failure of colonial and post-independence development interventions.[10]

To excavate the voices of people who understand development in different ways from planners, officials, and financiers, however, requires a different kind of research. Rather than focusing so heavily on the formal development plans and project blueprints, these histories "from below" have to "take individual agency as a starting point, while emphasizing small-scale projects and local communities."[11] In other words, this scholarship explores "community development" in its broadest sense.[12] It is in this register that *On Our Own Terms* resonates so well with the Africanist scholarship and even pushes historians of Africa to think harder about possible sources for recovering and writing these difficult histories. Foss's reading of colonial-style sources, like the fragmentary record of the Instituto Indigenista Nacional de Guatemala (IING), is impressive and builds the necessary framework for her to argue about how development interventions worked under the revolutionary government of Guatemala (1944–1954) and the post-coup governments before the Civil War really started in earnest. In chapters 6 and 7 on the cooperative settlements in the Ixcán jungle, however, the book really starts to shine. Relying on a vast array of sources including national archives, private papers in Guatemala and the United States, oral histories, and photographic collections, Foss deftly brings to life the stories of residents of isolated, and all-too-often massacred, indigenous cooperative communities in the Ixcán during the worst years of the Guatemalan Civil War. Since the voices from these communities are not well represented in state archives, using a wide array of sources to tell their stories is a necessity. The creative work done in these chapters, especially with the photographs taken in these rural communities, to tell these stories is both central to the main argument of the book about how indigenous communities deployed development in their own ways, and an exemplar to historians who think about how to excavate stories from communities that are underrepresented in traditional archives.

But this is not simply a recovery mission to tell the stories of the brave individuals who founded, maintained, and carried forward their own visions of community amid a brutal crackdown by government security forces. Rather, the book tells these stories as an integral element that is needed to fully understand the contested nature of development projects, the idea of "development" itself, and how these individuals understood themselves and argued for their own places in a Guatemalan society that had long neglected them and denied them full citizenship. It was through their own definitions of "development" that the indigenous communities argued for their full citizenship and, really, humanness. And it is in this argument where Foss's book crosses over from a narrow, if situated, history of Cold War struggle in Latin America into a stronger methodological statement about how historians represent and work in and with indigenous communities that for too long have been marginalized by governments, planners, and even other historians. It is in this difficult work, that many would call a form of "decolonization," even as Foss does not use the term directly, where this book demands our attention. The scholarship on development in

[10] Ahearne, "*Maendeleo*? We Had That in the Past"; Emma Hunter, "A History of *Maendeleo*: The Concept of Development in Tanganyika's Late Colonial Public Sphere" in Joseph Hodge, Gerald Hödl, and Martina Kopf, eds., *Development Africa: Concepts and Practices in Twentieth-Century Colonialism* (Manchester University Press, 2014: 87-107.
[11] Kara Moskowitz, "International Development in Africa: Historiographical Themes and New Perspectives," *History Compass* 20: 2 (2022), e12712, 5.
[12] See Hadfield, *Liberation and Development*.

Africa has long been moving toward an analysis of the idea that foregrounds how state efforts were used for alternative purposes by broad swathes of society to claim citizenship and rights, and Foss's work situates nicely within this literature.[13]

As with the best of the Africanist scholarship, however, Foss is careful not to overplay the evidence in this book. While telling the stories of previously neglected and marginalized communities is important, overstating the ability of these communities to surmount and access power structures would do them a disservice and render the experiences of their communities illegible to those who lived through the periods under examination. Foss certainly does not make that mistake in *On Our Own Terms*. Rather, she elegantly narrates the history of both development projects and the idea of development to show "not only project goals and intended outcomes but also the ways in which the recipients interacted with, challenged, and appropriated these projects" (232). The careful way in which the book does this, expanding the base of sources that can be used without stretching this evidence past its breaking point, suggests ways for other historians to unearth more of these previously hidden histories and further complicate our understandings of the history of development. While the book does not explicitly link the struggles of indigenous communities in the Guatemalan highlands and lowland jungles to global struggles for rights and independence, Foss does suggest that her work can be used to explore "why initiatives throughout the twentieth century have failed to improve standards of living in Guatemala (and elsewhere), effectively contributing to the impossible choices that individuals like Central American migrants have to make on a daily basis today" (241).

Thus, using the frame of development opens new possibilities to write global histories that link indigenous communities in the Americas to previously colonized communities in the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia, as well as to contemporary policy questions around migration and inequality. This work could use the "episteme of development" to interrogate how state actors, international organizations, and non-governmental groups saw poor or marginalized communities, and how these communities put forth alternative conceptions. The challenge to doing this well will be in centering, as Foss does, how individuals and communities saw themselves, how they defined their struggles, and how their own efforts have pointed the way to a better life as they defined it. This model for scholarship, when conducted in the sensitive way that Foss clearly carried out her research, holds out the promise of better telling the stories of marginalized communities. Scholarship of this type will also tell stories that contemporary policy makers, aid organizations, and development planners all need to hear and internalize into their future projects.

[13] Abou Bamba, *African Miracle, African Mirage: Transnational Politics and the Paradox of Modernization in Ivory Coast* (Ohio University Press, 2016); Saeteurn, *Cultivating Their Own*; Weimers, *Village Work.*

Review by Nicole Pacino, University of Alabama in Huntsville

Sarah Foss's *On Our Own Terms: Development and Indigeneity in Cold War Guatemala* takes a long view of development initiatives in Guatemala, examining changes and continuities across democratic and dictatorial rule from the 1940s to the 1990s. The book is beautifully written and deeply engaging, and it manages to be both theoretically sophisticated and accessible. Foss engages with a range of scholarship on Latin America and beyond, making her work relevant to a diverse set of scholarly conversations. She situates the book's analysis within recent work on Guatemala as well as Latin America in general, and uses ideas and concepts that span the colonial to the modern period.[1] For this reason, *On Our Own Terms* will be valuable to a range of scholars and students irrespective of their particular time period, country, or topic of research.

The book is tightly argued and easy to follow. Each chapter has a clearly stated main idea and contributes to the overall argument, giving the book cohesiveness and clarity. As the subtitle indicates, Foss primarily interrogates the relationship between development and ideas about race and citizenship in the context of the Cold War. She highlights the multifaceted nature of development as an idea and a set of programs, and underscores that what development meant in Guatemala depended on who was in power and at what time.

Overall, Foss focuses on how various actors understood and interacted with development ideology, explaining what development meant for state agencies, the people tasked with implementing state programs, and Indigenous communities. From the state, or top-down perspective, Foss details the myriad ways that different Guatemalan governments used development in the service of national progress and political stability. This approach was sometimes humanitarian, often paternalistic, and increasingly anti-Communist as the Cold War progressed. In this way, she explains how development programs worked as a tool of both democratic state-building and dictatorial repression of leftist subversion. Yet she also recognizes that state discourses about development did not translate seamlessly into the implementation of these programs; mid-level actors, including a diverse panorama of Guatemalan anthropologists, leftist sympathizers, revolutionaries, and members of the Maryknoll Society, which sent Catholic missionaries to poor and marginalized communities, had their own ideas about development. For this reason, development initiatives had striking regional variations, as these actors translated their ideas into practice in collaboration with, or sometimes in opposition to, the wishes of the communities they served. Additionally, Foss's bottom-up analysis emphasizes that Indigenous people were central actors in these affairs, and that they embraced some aspects of development while they rejected others (hence, the book's title, *On Our Own Terms*). The interplay among these many actors and variations in development's goals

[1] For example, Foss traces the concept of the "Indian" from colonial Latin America to Cold War Guatemala. She draws primarily from Nancy Applebaum, Anne Macpherson, and Karin Alejandra Rosemblatt, eds., *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America* (University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Laura Gotkowitz, ed., *Histories of Race and Racism: The Andes and Mesoamerica from Colonial Times to the Present* (Duke University Press, 2008); Peter Wade, *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America*, 2nd ed. (Pluto Press, 2010), as well as other works that cover the colonial period and the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For Guatemala, see Greg Grandin, *The Blood of Guatemala: A History of Race and Nation* (Duke University Press, 2000).

and intentions is nicely summarized in the book's conclusion, where Foss states, "the history of rural development in Guatemala underscores the importance of analyzing development as a dialectical and multilayered process, one that considers project goals and intended outcomes but also the ways in which recipients interacted with, challenged, and appropriated these projects" (232). In the conclusion, she notes that when local people actively participated in development programs, projects were often more successful than when they were imposed by the state or orchestrated by well-meaning middle actors. Therefore, she argues, the intended beneficiaries of development programs, Indigenous communities in this case, need in the future to play a principal role in order to maximize their potential benefit and minimize harm.

Foss uses an impressive range of sources drawn from archival research and oral histories. Government and municipal archives document the state perspective on and approaches to development, and Foss cites a number of sources, including program proposals, reports, and news coverage, as well as materials related to the programs themselves, such as training manuals or pamphlets. To detail the perspective of intermediaries who worked between the Guatemalan government and local communities, she draws upon anthropological field notes, priests' journals, survey records, and newsletters. Finally, she conducted more than sixty oral histories with community members, development workers, and military officers, and in some cases gained access to their personal archives, including photographs. These sources lend themselves to a multifaceted analysis that examines multiple perspectives on the "intended and unintended consequences of community development" (18).

Foss's engagement with a variety of different scholarly literatures is equally impressive. As one might expect, the book contributes to conversations about rural development, modernization, and the Cold War—conversations that have a long history of overlapping with each other—and considers the uniqueness of Guatemala's experience with development under both democratic and dictatorial regimes.[2] Foss's narrative interacts with well-established ideas in Latin American history, for instance that hegemony is a concept that can be used to trace state building and popular politics, and also tackles more recent historiographical topics, such as the role of mid-level actors.[3] Not content to consider Guatemala in isolation, she looks to the history of other revolutionary moments and Cold War development programs,

[2] Prominent examples include Gilbert Joseph, Daniel Nugent, and Daniela Spenser, eds., *In from the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War* (Duke University Press, 2008); Michael Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present* (Cornell University Press, 2010); Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[3] For the former, see the classic edited volume Gilbert Joseph and Daniel Nugent, eds., *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern* Mexico (Duke University Press, 1994). For the latter, a good recent example of this approach is Nicole Bourbonnaise, "Population Control, Family Planning, and Maternal Health Networks in the 1960s/70s: Diary of an International Consultant," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 93:3 (2019): 335-364, DOI: 10.1353/bhm.2019.0048. Foss does not cite the article directly, but engages in a similar analysis of mid-level actors who negotiated between international organizations, national governments, and local communities in the service of transnational initiatives.

including in Bolivia, Chile, Cuba, and Mexico, which allows her to draw parallels with other contexts as well as note the ways that Guatemala's experience with development was unique.[4]

Additionally, she provides an excellent discussion of race and development by examining the racialization of political concerns, changing ideas about acceptable expressions of Indigeneity, and how different actors invoked *Indigenismo*, an intellectual movement that placed "Indians" at the center of conversations about nationality, citizenship, and rights. Particularly noteworthy is the way she unpacks the concepts of the "permitted Indian"—acceptable expressions of Indigenous culture and history which are compatible with modern citizenship—and the "prohibited Indian"—traits which are considered antiquated and unmodern, also increasingly coded as dangerous or subversive under military rule.[5] While these ideas have colonial roots and developed more fully in the nineteenth century, she argues they were "significantly reconceptualized in the mid-twentieth century within the context of the Cold War" (14). These concepts are not just presented in the introduction and subsequently forgotten, but rather are woven intricately throughout the book's chapters to help readers understand the complex interplay between race and development in twentieth-century Guatemala.

The book is organized chronologically and details the changes and continuities in development programs from the democratic transition caused by the October Revolution in 1944 through the military dictatorships and civil war that ended in 1996. Chapters 1-3 focus on the period of the Guatemalan Revolution, with specific attention to the tension within development ideology between modernization as a state-driven enterprise and the state's desire to address systemic inequality. While the chapters do address the conversations taking place within the presidential administrations of Juan José Arévalo and Jacobo Arbenz (1944–1954) about how to wed development, progress, and revolutionary goals, the main actors are Guatemalan anthropologists, who worked as intermediaries between the state and communities, and the community members themselves, who shaped the implementation of the development initiatives. Chapters 1 and 2 describe the work of the Instituto Indigenista Nacional (IING), which was tasked with creating knowledge about Indigenous communities as much as providing resources for development. These state-employed anthropologists helped render rural communities intelligible and proposed that centuries of racism, marginalization, and inequality could be fixed by state intervention in order to create the "permitted Indian." In these chapters, Foss analyzes an array of topics under the development umbrella, including, among others, public health, nutrition, education, and agrarian reform. Chapter 3 documents community reactions to these programs, noting that despite state discourses that homogenized Indigenous

[4] For example, see Thomas Field, *From Development to Dictatorship: Bolivia and the Alliance for Progress in the Kennedy Era* (Cornell University Press, 2014); Tanya Harmer, *Allende's Chile and the Inter-American Cold War* (University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Sarah Hines, *Water for All: Community, Property, and Revolution in Modern Bolivia* (University of California Press, 2021); Renata Keller, *Cuba, the United States, and the Legacy of the Mexican Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).

[5] The "permitted Indian" comes from Charles Hale and Rosamel Millimán, "Cultural Agency and Political Struggle in the Era of the *Indio Permitido*," in Doris Summer, ed., *Cultural Agency in the Americas* (Duke University Press, 2006): 281-304. The "prohibited Indian" comes from María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development* (Duke University Press, 2003).

peoples, those peoples did not respond universally: some initiatives engendered enthusiasm while others generated conflicts within communities.

Chapter 4 discusses the shift from democratic government to military dictatorship, and the rest of the book explains how military regimes used development as a method to contain Communism and fight political subversion. The central theme of the book's second half is that, contrary to the revolutionary period, military dictatorships embraced development as a United States-sponsored modernization program and used a top-down model that imposed projects instead of making them collaborative. Foss terms this approach "counterrevolutionary Indigenismo," which is distinguishable from the revolutionary era by its "focus on quick applied programming, as opposed to knowledge creation, its insistence on avoiding property redistribution, and its framing of problems and the appropriate solutions as technical and thus solvable by expert intervention instead of … political problems that required structural change" (111). Chapters 5 and 6 explain how military regimes used development to racialize rural areas and their inhabitants as being in need of order and progress. Additionally, development programs provided an opportunity for surveillance of the "prohibited Indian," who was now rebranded as subversive rather than unmodern. These regimes considered development to be either a modernizing opportunity or a danger to the state depending on who was in charge and what their goals were; for example, a successful Maryknoll project in the 1970s became subversive when it empowered communities and challenged the status quo, resulting in escalating state violence, including disappearances and massacres.

The final chapter on photography and development is equally engaging, given its analysis of the power dynamics displayed by photographs, and chilling, given its recounting of the dictatorship's use of Poles of Development, or model communities, to control people who had been displaced by its genocidal civil war. Foss deftly contrasts development models, comparing the military's authoritarian Poles of Development, where the state forced victims of the civil war to become "permitted Indians," with the *Comunidades de población in resistencia* (CPRs), clandestine communities of displaced persons who engaged in communal living in order to survive and resist state violence on their own terms. This juxtaposition highlights the fundamental differences between top-down authoritarian and bottom-up needs-driven development.

The conclusion discusses why development initiatives have often failed and how this failure continues to impact the present, considering, for instance, the recent mass migration of Central American migrants from their home countries as a legacy of Cold War development projects. In this way, Foss articulates exactly what the reader learns from the history of development in Cold War Guatemala, and emphasizes that its lessons continue to reverberate today.

In sum, *On Our Own Terms* is an engrossing book that situates Guatemala within a hemispheric and international context while using personal stories to articulate the successes and failures of development initiatives in twentieth-century Guatemala. Due to the book's engagement with a range of topics, concepts, and academic literatures, it should interest an array of scholars and students of Latin American and Cold War history.

Review by Dustin Walcher, Southern Oregon University

Few countries have confronted the level of political and social dislocation that Guatemala experienced between the 1940s and 1990s. Following the 1954 coup that overthrew the Jacobo Arbenz government, the country descended into a civil war that lasted from 1960 until 1996. That conflict killed approximately 200,000 people, overwhelmingly at the hands of the state during the genocidal campaigns of the early 1980s. Another 1.5 million Guatemalans were internally displaced (234). Like Guatemala's overall population, the majority of them were indigenous. The story of Guatemala's revolution and its counterrevolution (including the role of the United States), is well documented.[1] The particular stories of its indigenous communities during that era is not.

More broadly, over the past generation questions surrounding development have attracted considerable attention in the historical literature. Much of that scholarship, particularly examples involving US foreign policy, examines the ideological and material foundations of policy at a high level—both within US policymaking circles and among elite Latin American political actors. The literature is sophisticated, and relies on increasingly multinational sources. At the same time, the lives of the intended beneficiaries of development assistance, and the myriad ways in which local community actors sought to shape the politics of development, rarely come into clear focus.[2]

Enter Sarah Foss's *On Our Own Terms*, which is grounded in the broader context of Guatemalan politics, the Cold War, and international development efforts. However, Foss is ultimately interested in "how local, regional, and international processes intersected on the local level" (16). It is, in other words, a book about the local implementation and, often, reimagining of development policies within predominantly rural and indigenous-majority Guatemalan communities. Foss advances two central arguments. "First," she contends, "while for the Guatemalan state, development projects were intended to curb political instability and ensure national progress, this top-down, homogenizing project was not neatly implemented, as local-

[1] On the revolution, counterrevolution, and US foreign policy, see especially Piero Gleijeses, *Shattered Hope: The Guatemalan Revolution and the United States, 1944–1954* (Princeton University Press, 1991); Nick Cullather, *Secret History: The CIA's Classified Account of Its Operations in Guatemala, 1952–1954* (Stanford University Press, 1999); Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, *Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala* (Doubleday, 1982). For more on the human and political costs of the long counterrevolution, see Greg Grandin, *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War* (University of Chicago Press, 2004).

[2] Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (The University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Michael E. Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present* (Cornell University Press, 2010); David C. Engerman, C. Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham, eds., *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton University Press, 2010). For particular studies on Latin America, see Thomas C. Field, *From Development to Dictatorship: Bolivia and the Alliance for Progress in the Kennedy Era* (Cornell University Press, 2014); Christy Thornton, *Revolution in Development: Mexico and the Governance of the Global Economy* (University of California Press, 2021); Amy C. Offner, *Sorting Out the Mixed Economy: The Rise and Fall of Welfare and Developmental States in the Americas* (Princeton University Press, 2019).

level staff and mid-level bureaucrats reworked it and applied it to different contexts" (2-3). Second, she finds that "Indigenous people were central actors in determining the meanings that Cold War development acquired, actors that contemporaries and historians alike have often relegated to the margins of Cold War history" (3).

In light of the direction that scholarship on Latin America's Cold War has taken for the past generation, neither of these conclusions are especially jarring. Historians have thoroughly demonstrated the considerable degree to which Latin Americans have been active political participants—not merely the pawns of powerful outsiders—even as they have operated within systems characterized by asymmetrical power relationships.[3] Nonetheless, most of the Latin Americans who are analyzed in those narratives themselves comprised the political and economic elite within their countries. Though the extant scholarship is suggestive that, to put it bluntly, local actions mattered, historians have been slow to connect thoroughly local and community histories to regional and global developments. There is even less scholarship linking the experiences of indigenous communities to Cold War dynamics.

Situated in that light, *On Our Own Terms* is a thoroughly refreshing and significant book. Foss's analysis of the contested politics of development in specific Guatemalan communities informs a number of issues in the broader literature while simultaneously offering a distinct point of engagement with the subject. The relative power and influence of indigenous community members is central to her analysis. While virtually everybody from state leaders (hailing from diverse political and ideological backgrounds) to local *campesinos* sought some type of development initiative, the meaning and preferred shape of development was contested. Foss argues that "Indigenous Guatemalans insisted on the pursuit of their own versions of development that did not necessarily exclude all aspects of modernization but called for a reconfiguration of power, a recognition of Indigenous rights, cultures, and histories, and the right to determine their own futures" (243).

The ultimate results were not encouraging for indigenous communities, even as they continued to fight through even the most dramatic of setbacks. Foss uses the conceptual spectrum of 'permitted Indians' through 'prohibited Indians' to great effect. Quoting María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, Foss explains that permitted Indians constituted "the modern, fully developed citizen," whereby prohibited Indians

[3] Gilbert M. Joseph, "What We Now Know and Should Know: Bringing Latin America More Meaningfully into Cold War Studies," in Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniela Spenser, eds., *In From the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War* (Duke University Press, 2008): 3-46; Greg Grandin, "Living in Revolutionary Time: Coming to Terms with the Violence of Latin America's Long Cold War," in Greg Grandin and Gilbert M. Joseph, eds., *A Century of Revolution: Insurgent and Counterinsurgent Violence During Latin America's Long Cold War* (Duke University Press, 2010): 1-42; William A. Booth, "Historiographical Review: Rethinking Latin America's Cold War," *The Historical Journal* (2020), doi:10.1017/S0018246X20000412 ; Andrew J. Kirkendall, "Cold War Latin America: The State of the Field." *H-Diplo* (Essay No. 119; 14 November 2014), http://issforum.org/essays/PDF/E119.pdf; Thornton, *Revolution in Development*; Offner, *Sorting Out the Mixed Economy*; Renata Keller, *Mexico's Cold War: Cuba, the United States, and the Legacy of the Mexican Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 2015). Grandin, *The Last Colonial Massacre*, runs against this grain, connecting a number of individual Guatemalan stories to larger political and economic developments.

embodied the "premodern underdeveloped counterpart" (14).[4] Permitted Indians adapted themselves to the social and political mainstream of non-Indigenous, often elite, society. Prohibited Indians, by contrast, advocated for greater autonomy or otherwise sought to achieve integration without assimilation. A permitted Indian remained within the bounds of acceptable national citizenship, and subordinated the indigenous elements of their identity to that of the Guatemalan nation. Conformity and acceptance as a permitted Indian required assimilation. The challenge was made more difficult by the impossibility of defining 'Indian,' despite some effort to do so (52).

Ongoing tension between top-down and bottom-up approaches to development policy comprises a critical theme in *On Our Own Terms*. Local communities sought to exercise real influence over the policymaking process, and not simply serve as objects upon which outside ideas about development could be acted upon. It was an enduring challenge. Probably the most important institution facilitating development efforts was the National Indigenist Institute (IING), which was founded in 1945 and remained in operation until 1988, albeit with different priorities and approaches over time. The IING's initial staff included no indigenous members. Often the leadership appeared to be seeking to develop 'permitted Indians.' Notably, as is reflected in the IING's period of existence, state-led development efforts occurred under both revolutionary and counterrevolutionary governments. Indigenous efforts to assert influence persisted.

Another key theme lurking beneath the book's surface centers on the relationship between development, or perhaps more specifically the ideas underlying various potential modes of development, and political violence. Readers with knowledge of Guatemala's history will recognize from the start that the narrative will ultimately arrive at the massacres and genocidal campaigns of the late 1970s and early 1980s. But while Foss forces readers to face the extraordinary violence, depravity, and inhumanity of the counterrevolutionary state—assisted by the United States—her analysis lingers on the remarkable ability of indigenous communities to survive, in hiding, in Guatemala's jungles. Thousands of people could not return to their previous homes. They had no resources, and by necessity could not connect with other elements of society. Yet they persevered and recreated the institutions they needed (such as schools) in their hidden locations. State-led development efforts had failed, yet bottom-up development, or at least community sustainability, persisted. This theme could be highlighted more explicitly, but it nonetheless occupies the book's latter chapters.

Even the promises of the 1996 peace, which included a degree of regional autonomy, collaborative development efforts, and a recognition of Guatemala as a "multiethnic and pluricultural" state, ultimately failed to materialize (236). Neoliberal policies created conditions of austerity and led to divestment from communities (234-239). Promises made were not kept. Rural development disappeared as a national priority under any ideological guise. The same story of ultimate neglect, the same cycle, continued.

Foss's scholarship contributes to other issues in Guatemala's political history. For example, the context of development policy offers a useful window for examining the disparate legal treatment indigenous peoples

[4] María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development* (Duke University Press, 2003), 27.

had routinely been subjected to despite their majority status in the country. Among the accomplishments of the Guatemalan Revolution was the introduction of universal manhood suffrage (though indigenous women were still required to demonstrate literacy), the repeal of indigenous vagrancy laws, and the repeal of the indigenous head tax. But the Revolution was nonetheless limited in terms of how it applied to indigenous peoples. Though it made some strides in incorporating permitted Indians into the state, by the 1970s the counterrevolution had adopted a "narrow and inflexible" definition of citizenship that was consistent with the objective of "a state-defined de-Indianization" (137).

Similarly, Foss's analysis complicates our understanding of the politics of Guatemala's rural indigenous communities. For instance, poor indigenous peoples are generally understood to have been among the key beneficiaries of the policy changes brought by the Guatemalan Revolution. However, as Foss's detailed analysis of those communities reveals, the Revolution was not universally welcomed by suspicious indigenous citizens, some of whom preferred the 'devil they knew.' The same is true of the heralded Arbenz land reform program. Suspicious of change, many individuals questioned whether they would truly be better off under the revised land tenure regime. Similarly, political labels were understood differently in local communities than they were in national and international circles. Communism, for instance, was equated with danger, instability, sexual license and violence; ideas about political economy had comparatively little to do with its local understanding (80-82). Foss revises without fully reversing interpretations of some institutions that have garnered attention in the literature. The IING, which served as the state's preferred development institution, provides a good example. It has been portrayed predominantly as a neocolonialist institution of the state, enforcing top-down conformity on indigenous peoples. Foss does not dispute that it carried some of those tendencies, but nonetheless finds that its period of "Action Anthropology" was more nuanced. The organization's restoration following the 1954 coup led it to better encapsulate the neocolonialist characterization.

On Our Own Terms is based on archival research conducted in Guatemala, Mexico, and the United States. Foss also makes judicious use of oral histories. The archival research for this book was complicated by inconsistencies in the types of records retained in local communities. It was also hampered by the widespread destruction of records; the IING, for instance, disposed of its archive upon ceasing operations in 1988 (55). Intriguingly, in addition to textual sources, Foss systematically scrutinizes photographs of hidden indigenous camps during the era of state terror—a type of primary-source analysis that is relatively uncommon in the monograph literature. It is unfortunate that the quality of many of the photographs precluded reproduction.

Foss has produced a valuable and important book. To the extent that it possesses a shortcoming, *On Our Own Terms* could more fully provide explicit analysis of the opportunities and limits of community agency at critical conjunctures. At what times and in what locations did the local indigenous actors that are central in Foss's narrative have the ability to fundamentally shape development initiatives? At what points were structural factors, or decisions made elsewhere—in Guatemala City or Washington, for example—so limiting that they compelled either conformity or outright rebellion? How was power exercised and negotiated in the countryside?

Foss adds considerably to our collective understanding of Guatemala's mid-to-late twentieth century history, as well as the history of capitalist-led international development, by bringing readers into rural indigenous communities that often struggle to be seen. Through this approach, the follies of top-down development are visible at close range. *On Our Own Terms* shows the consequences of elite political action, and also the sometimes subtle though considerable significance of local actors. Moreover, Foss puts local histories in conversation with broader political and economic events. All in all, *On Our Own Terms* is a compelling accomplishment.

Response by Sarah Foss, Oklahoma State University

With gratitude I am pleased to respond to the reviews by John Aerni-Flessner, Nicole Pacino, and Dustin Walcher of my book, *On Our Own Terms: Development and Indigeneity in Cold War Guatemala* and am grateful to Amy Offner for her introduction to this roundtable. Given the book's inclusion in the University of North Carolina Press's New Cold War History series, it is fitting that one of the reviewers, Aerni-Flessner, is an Africanist, and that together, the three reviews productively identify thematic, theoretical, and political connections across scholarship that analyzes the Global Cold War. Indeed, all three reviewers point out that *On Our Own Terms* speaks to an audience beyond Latin Americanists, as it aims to situate rural Guatemala within international geopolitics and center Indigenous Guatemalans as protagonists in the Cold War. Further, I am pleased that all three reviewers note that the book offers methodological considerations for future scholarship on development history.

Guatemalan community development, which is rooted in competing conceptions of modernity and wrought with political tension, is part of a broader story of Cold War-era development projects in the Global South. Much scholarship exists that analyzes how policy makers pursued high modernist visions through development and how the ruling elite used development to control populations, enact Cold War ideologies, and cultivate geopolitical allies and rivalries, a historiographical trend that all three reviewers identify.[1] However, this literature largely leaves on the margins the actions of development's intended recipients and the ways that the manifestation of these projects became entangled with complex local histories, values, and systems.

All three reviewers praised the methodology and broad source base that I utilized in *On Our Own Terms*, which, as I hope the book's acknowledgments make clear, would not have been possible without the generosity of many Guatemalans in and outside the academy, and archivists in both Guatemala and the U.S. Aerni-Flessner writes that my methodology was not just a "recovery mission" but sought to question how we understand and employ the term development to describe historical projects and ideologies that sought in some way to change society. I am grateful for this assessment, as my intention was to use localized histories to expand what we consider to be development history and who we frame as central actors in these stories. As Walcher points out, my book emphasizes the "local implementation" of development initiatives, viewing these as dialectical processes and mechanisms through which individuals and institutions contested social categories and identities, particularly those pertaining to race and ethnicity. Local actors imbued international discourses of development with their own meanings and interpretations, and, in turn, their rhetoric reshaped ethnic relations and identities in rural Guatemala. This framework still permits an analysis of what policymakers and experts hoped to accomplish with development projects and how these initiatives fit within larger state formation processes occurring elsewhere in the world during the Cold War,

[1] To give but a few examples, see James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (: Yale University Press, 1998); Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (The University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, paperback reissue (Princeton University Press, 2012).

but it also adds the important dimension of local voices, which I broadly categorize as expert intermediaries and intended beneficiaries.

As Pacino emphasizes in her review, I highlight not only the actions of program directors and state politicians, but also the careers and reflections of low-level bureaucrats and project staff who were tasked with creating tangible projects out of abstract state policies. Recent scholarship on Latin American development history has focused on the role of the so-called expert—the agronomists, the anthropologists, the sanitation officers, etc.—and how they often became important intermediaries who dialogued with local communities and with funding agencies or state and international organizations.[2] *On Our Own Terms* emphasizes the histories of several of these individuals, and their papers, fieldnotes, and oral histories serve as key sources. I include less detail, however, on the role of outside institutional actors, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the United States Agency for International Development, or the World Bank, as both a methodological choice to focus on actors who were in some way connected to Guatemalan state programs and as a practical decision to maintain a viable scope for the project. Further research into these intersections of international agencies with localized projects is needed and would enrich our understanding of development practice and politics in Guatemala, just as Aerni-Flessner explains it has done for the historiography of development in Africa.

On Our Own Terms also pursues an important line of inquiry that questions how development's intended beneficiaries experienced these interventions, and in the cases I analyze, these were largely non-elite Indigenous Guatemalans. I argue that they used their involvement in an international geopolitical struggle to express their rights as citizens in new ways and to pursue their own localized agendas. All three reviewers emphasize the breadth of archival sources I utilized to examine localized agency, which include photographs, anthropologists' fieldnotes, municipal records, and oral histories. Theoretically, I utilize Charles Hale and Rosamel Millamán's theorization of the "permitted Indian," added in its antithesis, the "prohibited Indian," and argued that in this historical moment, these constructions overlapped with what María Josefina Saldaña Portillo has referred to as development's two manifest subjects: one fully modern and "developed," and its "premodern, undeveloped counterpart."[3] Furthermore, as the reviewers indicate, in Guatemala these constructions were politicized, as individuals conforming to the state's version of the "permitted Indian" were understood to be modern citizens while those who challenged this model were deemed "unmodern" at best, and subversive and dangerous at worst. Thus, though Guatemala underwent multiple, significant political transformations during the period under study, one consistency is how state policies and programming directed at Indigenous communities combined powerfully with development

[2] For example, see Andra B. Chastain and Timothy W. Lorek, Eds. *Itineraries of Expertise: Science, Technology, and the Environment in Latin America* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020) and Eve E. Buckley, *Technocrats and the Politics of Drought and Development in Twentieth Century Brazil* (The University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

[3] Charles Hale and Rosamel Millamán, "Cultural Agency and Political Struggle in the Era of Indio Permitido," *Cultural Agency in the Americas*, ed. Doris Sommer (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 297-98; María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development* (Duke University Press, 2003), 27.

discourse to frame the way Guatemalans revised the category of "the Indian" and reshaped ideas on Indigenous citizenship and political participation.

The reviewers offer few critiques, but two points are worth discussing here. First, Walcher raised the important question about the "opportunities and limits of community agency at critical conjunctures." Certainly, as the war escalated in Guatemala and increasingly moved into the western highlands, rejecting or even questioning the state's presence—whether that presence was through overt militarization or projects that were ostensibly touted as humanitarian or development efforts—became increasingly dangerous and life-threatening. In the case of the Ixcán Grande, multiple contingencies shaped the military state's labeling of the region as a "red zone" that they would attempt to eradicate through genocidal scorched earth tactics. Pursuing a form of development apart from that of the state was one of these contingencies, alongside renewed state interest in the region for petroleum exploration and the presence of guerrilla troops. Similarly, *comunidades de población en resistencia* (CPRs) were clandestine communities that survivors of genocide formed within Guatemala's national borders after becoming internally displaced people when the military destroyed their towns. Certainly, their options in this moment were severely hampered by structural forces beyond their control, to Walcher's point. In joining a CPR, however, survivors deciding against fleeing to refugee camps in Mexico, relocating to other cities in Guatemala, or surrendering to a model village. Survival meant more than the literal continuation of physical life; for these people it also reflected an understanding that life entailed the ability to continue their pursuit of autonomy and a connection with the land near where they once resided, as evidenced in CPR statements and survivor testimonies. CPR residents daily faced multiple threats, including disease, starvation, and military violence. Certainly, community and individual agency in these horrific circumstances was extremely curtailed, with available options all pointing to, statistically speaking, a likely death. But what I emphasize in the book is that even in these trying moments, Indigenous Guatemalans in the Ixcán and in the CPRs still decided to fight to pursue a form of development that they designed, that would create the type of future that they envisioned for themselves and future generations. In writing these later chapters, I took great care to responsibly portray the violence enacted upon these communities and make clear that though depressing, this history is not a declension narrative but one that shows tremendous resilience and survival—and the continued pursuit of development on their own terms that persists in Guatemala today. But I agree with Walcher that employing my "zoom lens" approach here a bit more and stepping back to unpack power dynamics and how outside decisions reduced the range of possible state responses to local actions, thus raising the stakes of rejecting state development ideals, would make the overall situation clearer to the reader and strengthen the argumentation.

The reviewers also note the parallel cases and ways that my book dialogues with literature examining Cold War development in Latin America and beyond. I was pleased to see these connections drawn, and while the reviewers did not frame this discussion as a critique, I do think there was a missed opportunity to situate the Guatemala case more clearly in a broader comparative framework. Of course, *On Our Own Terms* is not a comparative history, nor does it claim to be representative of any larger regional or global trend. Though it offers a methodological call for other historians to consider the actions of local beneficiaries and the ways that development informed and was shaped by local understandings of race, modernity, and citizenship, it

remains rooted in local histories in Guatemala. Aerni-Flessner points out that while my book does not claim to be decolonizing development history, such an approach could lend itself to this goal.

I agree that there are glimpses of this process in my work, though I am hesitant to frame it as such, given that I approach development history as a multilayered process and because I have no evidence that the Indigenous communities and individuals that I worked with and studied understood their actions within this framing of decolonization. Still, in carefully engaging with development initiatives in a variety of ways, they did view their actions as a pursuit of autonomy and a way to retain local control over outside interventions while acquiring oft-desired material resources. And it strikes me that this pursuit does parallel decolonization struggles elsewhere in the post-World War II world that also engaged with development initiatives in a variety of ways. Indeed, recent scholarship on Latin American development history is pointing to solidarities across the Global South, and there are many fruitful and necessary avenues for future research to take similar localized approaches to global phenomenon and trace parallels and even possibly direct influences and interactions.[4]

To conclude, let me reiterate my appreciation to the H-Diplo editors, the three reviewers, and to Amy Offner for organizing and contributing to this roundtable conversation. It is exciting to see the broad field of diplomatic history continue to analyze and value diplomacy-from-below and the lived experiences of geopolitics, and I am thrilled that *On Our Own Terms* was featured in the network's outstanding roundtable review series.

[4] To give but a few examples, see Thomas C. Field Jr., Stella Krepp, and Vanni Pettinà, eds., *Latin America and the Global Cold War* (University of North Carolina Press, 2020; Christy Thornton, *Revolution in Development: Mexico and the Governance of the Global Economy* (University of California Press, 2021); Margarita Fajardo, *The World that Latin America Created: The United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America in the Development Era* (Harvard University Press, 2022).