RADICAL AMERICAS

UCLPRESS

Research article

What's at stake in the plurinational state debate? The case of Bolivia

Chris Hesketh[1],*

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK
* Correspondence: c.hesketh@sussex.ac.uk

How to cite
Hesketh, C. 'What's at stake in the plurinational state debate? The case of Bolivia'. *Radical Americas* 10, 1 (2025): 1. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.ra.2025.v10.1.001.

Peer review
This article has been peer-reviewed through the journal's standard double-blind peer-review process, where both the reviewers and authors are anonymised during review.

Open access
Radical Americas is a peer-reviewed open-access journal.

Abstract

The idea of a plurinational state is one that has gained currency in parts of Latin America in recent decades. Driven by the demands of Indigenous social movements and communities, countries such as Bolivia and Ecuador have rewritten their constitutions to acknowledge the diverse populations that make up the different 'nations' within their state. The notion of a plurinational state carries with it the potential to offer a set of counter-topographies and ways of being that challenge the Westphalian conception of sovereignty. Plurinationalism thus offers a means of worlding beyond the West. However, despite this promise, there remains a major debate between the more utopian horizons for plurinationalism, grounded in Indigenous self-determination, and what I term 'actually existing plurinationalism'. The latter continues, in many ways, the colonial dominance of the nation-state in the politics of scale and furthers the practical realities of natural resource extraction, undermining the material basis for alternative sovereignties to be realised. This article therefore asks: what is at stake in the debate over plurinationalism, and what possibilities remain for its original decolonial impulse, driven by insurgent spatial praxis or counter-topographies?

Introduction

Latin America was once described by historian Greg Grandin as 'empire's workshop'.[1] This expression served to denote how the region was used as a testing ground for advancing the policies and strategies conducive to maintaining the dominant world order. However, equally, for at least the last three decades, Latin America has been a laboratory for thinking about radical, transformative possibilities. From participatory budgets, the inception of the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre (Brazil), social movements such as the Zapatistas or the *Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra* (MST), or the experience of the Pink Tide era and countless more examples, Latin America has been central to the challenging and interrupting of neoliberalism.[2] Moving from resistance to transformation, Latin America has also inspired reflection and debate on the possibility of socialism in the twenty-first century and what this might mean. There has been a change in the region that has reinvigorated a radical lexicon of politics, focusing on themes of anti-imperialism, decolonisation and emancipation.[3] In relation to how emancipation and decolonisation can be realised, autonomy has also emerged as a frequent demand of many movements and communities.[4] The above points to a broader politics of post-neoliberalism that has sought to challenge hegemonic configurations of state-formation and citizenship in Latin America.[5] This can be interpreted through the notion of 'border thinking' where knowledge production from the margins challenges the colonial world order.[6]

The notion of plurinationalism is another contribution to such border thinking. In various countries, subaltern social forces attempted to fundamentally challenge, reconfigure and multiply the spaces of sovereignty.[7] Driven by the demands of largely Indigenous social forces, countries such as Bolivia and Ecuador have rewritten their constitutions to acknowledge the diverse, historically original – and yet politically excluded – populations that make up the different 'nations' within their currently configured nation-states. Plurinationalism therefore carries with it the potential to offer an alternative set of cartographies that challenge the Westphalian concept of the sovereign state and provide new ways of thinking about democracy and justice, linked to an Indigenous episteme.[8]

This article focuses specifically on the case of Bolivia where plurinationalism has long been seen as a means of grappling with the legacy of colonial domination and racialised state structures. Exemplifying this notion, the former vice president of Bolivia, Álvaro García Linera, described the country as a 'living laboratory' in the historical movement of transition from one form of state to another.[9] However, despite this promise, there remains a major debate between the more utopian horizons for plurinationalism, grounded in Indigenous territorial self-government and what I term in this article 'actually existing plurinationalism'. Drawing on Brenner and Theodore, the concept of actually existing plurinationalism serves to move from abstract theorisation to explore the real-world implementation of plurinationalism in practice, and as a hegemonic order.[10] This has seen plurinationalism conjoined to the state as a political project, and has, in many ways, continued the colonial legacy of the nation-state in the politics of scale as well as furthering the practical realities of natural resource extraction in its major mode of accumulation. Such actions have undermined the material basis of enacting alternative sovereignties.[11] The question of how nominally progressive governments interact with emancipatory social forces that facilitated their rise thus remains an urgent problem to be explored.[12]

This article therefore asks: what is at stake in the debate over plurinationalism, and what possibilities remain for a decolonial impulse, driven by insurgent spatial praxis? I seek to contribute to debates on plurinationalism more broadly by highlighting how Latin America offers a more radical contribution to the concept. Although plurinational projects have been the subject of reflections and analyses by scholars of the region, this is rarely done by paying attention to state-theoretical debates, a gap which I attempt to fill. I also extend the debate on plurinationalism in the Latin American context into wider conversations within Indigenous studies around the concept of sovereignty. Finally, in the conclusion, I discuss how plurinationalism remains largely ignored within international studies, despite offering some important contributions that might unsettle the dominant framings of global politics.

My argument will unfold in the following sections. First, I briefly set out the meaning of plurinationalism and the limitations of the dominant understandings of this concept. Here I demonstrate why the study of Latin America offers an important alternative conception of plurinationalism to that found in the mainstream literature. Second, I show why this notion holds such importance and radical potentiality in a country such as Bolivia, where a plurinational state was declared in 2009. Finally, I explore the contemporary contradictions and limitations around actually existing plurinationalism as it became codified into a state project, with a focus on issues of contested sovereignties and articulations of power from above and below. I make the case for why the concept and practice of plurinationalism needs to be decoupled from the state to realise its radical potential. This involves basing it in the constituent power of subaltern, Indigenous social forces.

The promise of plurinationalism

From the Paris Commune[13] and the Zapatista rebellion,[14] radical experiments at different economic sites of activity,[15] to the current struggles still unfolding in places such as Rojova,[16] the Left has long debated the potential and possibilities of transformative politics emanating from subaltern social forces, enacted below the level of the nation-state, that seek to explicitly challenge such logics of political power. In recent years, the concept of plurinationalism has added to this debate.[17] Plurinationalism is usefully defined by Keating as 'the coexistence within a political order of more than one national identity, with all of the normative claims and implications this entails'.[18] However, while providing a useful discussion of the concept, Keating's work remains restricted in a number of respects. First, it focuses solely on transformations within liberal democracies, which are seen as markers of a new potential normative order. Indeed, liberalism is elevated to a 'universal principle'.[19] Second, there is little focus on popular agency from below. Keating's discussion of plurinationalism is largely about how abstract demands are mediated by already constituted power, rather than about how it could be a political project driven by constituent power from below. Finally, his work remains explicitly Eurocentric in nature.[20] Little is said, for example, about Indigenous challenges to the idea of the nation-state form (despite Canada being invoked as an example of plurinationalism). Indigenous modes of nationalism remain both understudied and under-theorised.[21] This is a major lacuna given that place-based struggles by Indigenous movements across the Americas have unsettled the logic of state sovereignty.[22]

In mainstream accounts of plurinationalism, the term is understood largely as a means of political accommodation within existing power relations. I will argue that, by contrast, in the Latin American setting, plurinationalism was invoked by Indigenous social forces precisely to challenge liberal means of inclusion, as well as the hegemonic neoliberal political economy more fundamentally.[23] The Latin American context, therefore, offers a new window for thinking about plurinationalism and can give the concept a more radical impulse. As mentioned, plurinationalism in the region has been driven from below by the demands of Indigenous social forces. As well as acknowledging the diverse Indigenous/Originario populations that make up the different 'nations' within their state, notions such as that of 'living well' (*vivir bien* or *buen vivir*) have been anchored within the new constitutions of Bolivia and Ecuador in an explicit acknowledgement of the need to think differently about development and being in the world.[24] Plurinationalism in this context therefore immediately challenges Western norms. In theory at least, plurinationalism in Latin America represented a move beyond the limited recognition of Indigenous cultural practices and language rights, as signified by the era of liberal multiculturalism that took place in many parts of Latin America during the 1990s and early 2000s.[25] It did so by explicitly advancing the goal of Indigenous autonomy as central to the project of plurinationalism – thereby moving beyond what Hale referred to as '*lo-Indio permitido*', whereby limited means of recognition were provided, but with no major alterations in the wider power relations.[26] In a broad brush stroke, plurinationalism offered the basis for a political project that would provide material recognition to Indigenous territorial claims and thus radically unsettle dominant ideas of how nation-states appear and operate.[27] In doing so, a different form of power, politics and political economy was to be fostered, which would challenge the colonial legacies of exclusion and alienation. As Tockman and Cameron summarise, 'plurinationalism has emerged as a way of reconceiving the nation-state, positing a departure from a liberal multicultural framework for constructing state-society relations to a conceptualisation of the state as the composite of multiple nations to which greater rights are extended.'[28]

However, despite the radical possibilities held out by plurinationalism, which also came with associated discourses of *vivir bien*, communitarianism and a move towards the decolonisation of the state, the reality of the *proceso de cambio* (process of change) in Bolivia has led many radical Bolivian intellectuals to distance themselves and become more critical of its practice.[29] Others have explicitly argued that the period of rule by the *Movimiento al Socialismo* (MAS) in Bolivia from 2006, far from leading to emancipation, has in fact led to aggressive, colonial regressions.[30] This is the conundrum with which the article engages, namely the gap between plurinationalism as a theory and the possibility of radical emancipation that was proposed to grapple with difference and engage in decolonisation, versus the reality of reinscribing the power of the centralised state (justified in the name of safeguarding the broader politics of change). I now turn to the specific case of Bolivia to see why the radical possibilities of this concept were so important.

(Plurinational) state, power, socialism

To understand why a concept like plurinationalism matters in a place such as modern Bolivia, it is useful to provide what geographer Cindi Katz refers to as a critical 'topography' for political engagement.[31] Topographies in this sense involve a detailed examination on a particular scale to understand its key features and broader relationships, and can reveal their 'tensions, contradictions and affiliations'.[32] The main argument to be advanced here is that plurinationalism represents a major decolonising impulse that stems from Indigenous movements from below in response to the contradictions of a racist, colonial state order. It is a fundamental attempt to pose an alternative set of territorial arrangements to those of a modern, centralised nation-state. Plurinationalism thus has the potential to create a set of counter-topographies[33] or what Henri Lefebvre referred to as 'differential space', counterposed to the logic of capitalist development.[34]

The words of the Pact of Unity, which comprised the most significant Indigenous, Originario and Peasant social forces in Bolivia, are significant as a departure point to this endeavour as they represent the most important statement of subaltern collective will.[35]

> We understand that the Plurinational State is a model of political organisation for the decolonisation of our nations and peoples, reaffirming, recovering and strengthening our territorial autonomy to achieve a full life, to live well, with a vision of solidarity, and in this way to be the engines of unity and social welfare of all Bolivians, guaranteeing the full exercise of our rights.[36]

Like broader Indigenous struggles taking place across the Americas, the sovereign state is problematised in this strategy as a colonial construct.[37] Writers in the Marxist tradition have long argued that the state should be conceived of as a form of social relations.[38] However, beyond an abstract characterisation of a state as a capitalist form of social relations, a nuanced application of state theory also requires a close analysis of *actual societies* and their specific differences.[39] As Poulantzas explained, 'The theory of the capitalist state cannot be simply deduced from general propositions on the state.' Rather, the basis of a particular capitalist state has to be found in 'the relations of production and social division of labour.'[40] In the case of Bolivia, the social terrain, both metaphorically and literally, becomes complicated, as there is no simple story about social relations conforming to capitalist imperatives, but rather what inhered was the co-existence of multiple modes of production.[41] What does this mean politically? To answer this, we need to recognise the colonial origins of the modern nation-state as the beginnings of any topographical analysis.

State formation in Latin America was only made possible from concomitant processes of dispossession of the Indigenous population.[42] From its birth, the Bolivian state was not grounded in a sense of the national-popular, but rather was constructed against the majority (Indigenous) population.[43] Zavaleta Mercado thus talks of the 'incapacity for an experience of space as national reality' in Bolivia. He distinguishes the cartographic fact of a state's claimed territory versus the actuality of what he calls 'socially incorporated space'.[44] The result of this weak state formation in Bolivia meant that the state was not an integral state, as theorised by Gramsci,[45] but rather an 'apparent state' that lacked hegemony within civil society.[46] Taking up Zavaleta's thesis, Luis Tapia identifies what he calls a 'non-correspondence'

between the Bolivian state and the lived reality of Indigenous, Originario and Peasant communities, who maintained self-organised, governing authorities.[47] Importantly, this demonstrates the practical existence of non-state forms of power, not separated from society, and in which the form of the community assembly remained as the highest organ of authority.[48] Modern state formation in Bolivia thus remained elusive.[49] In simple terms, the classical model of modern state formation is one in which a single sovereign source of power exists and in which citizens are granted formal equality before the law. This public equality versus private means of exploitation is vital to the functioning of capitalism.[50] However, in Bolivia the idea of a singular, national space has never existed, owing to the colonial legacies of racism and class exploitation. Fausto Reinaga referred to this as the problem of 'two Bolivias': a white/*mestizo* Bolivia (which was dominant) and an 'Indian Bolivia' (which remained excluded).[51] Plurinationalism as an insurgent spatial praxis, defined in terms of a counter-proposal of sovereignty, represents a project to overturn the historical legacy of oppression through a revival of Indigenous practices and customs. This is sometimes referred to as the *pachakuti* (meaning turning the upside-down world of colonialism on its head).[52]

The outright exclusion of Indigenous peoples in Bolivia was challenged somewhat with the national revolution of 1952. However, while the revolution did address the direct disenfranchisement of the Indigenous population, it also resulted, more broadly, in a state-managed process from above where ethnic identities were subsumed under class identities to better satisfy the requirements of the corporate tutelage of the ruling Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR).[53] In this era, to hegemonise was to homogenise. This found expression in the politics of *mestizaje* (the mixing of Indigenous and European peoples). However, this was not a straightforward case of incorporation, and resistance remained an important feature. To that end, a revival of Indigenous culture as a political movement started taking place in Bolivia from the 1970s.[54] Intellectuals such as Fausto Reinaga, political groups such as the Kataristas and organic intellectuals associated with the Taller de Historia Oral Andina helped promote this revival of Indigenous identity and cultural practices.[55] Proposals for reconfiguring sovereignty began to be put on the agenda from this time. Central to this project was a revival of the Indigenous *ayllu* as a political form. This is a model of organisation based on the pre-Hispanic past of Indigenous communities and collective ownership of land that is inalienable, where kindship ties are fundamental to the political system.[56] Although Indigenous communities had been the victims of waves of territorial dispossession since the time of colonialism, their own forms of authority had remained as a form of practical governance and as a source of resistance.[57] The Indigenous resurgence in Bolivia provided politics with a new conceptual vocabulary – away from class and union (the dominant terms post Revolution) to notions of community, the right to territory and the claiming of autonomy.[58] In short, it was via the agency of Indigenous, Originario and Peasant communities that state, space and territory began to be rethought.[59] Luis Tapia has thus argued that the context of the national-popular of Bolivia is unique as it comprises an anti-statist form of struggle that aims to unify diverse, excluded political subjects.[60] The idea of the plurinational state is therefore an effort to grapple with the historical legacy of colonial imposition and an order that has marginalised Indigenous peoples. Crucially, however, unlike European nationalist movements, this generally did not translate into demands for secession.[61] Proposals from Indigenous movements instead called for the rethinking and refounding of Bolivia in terms of its territorial geography. This explicitly included the transcending of the liberal and monocultural model of state formation based on individual citizenship. Instead, a break was demanded from vertical forms of state power. In its place were calls for Indigenous autonomy, popular votes, the possibility of revoking mandates and respect for Indigenous/Originario customs. Crucially, autonomy would include the right to decide on exploration and exploitation of resources found within Indigenous territories, which would link to place-based consultations and studies around their environmental and socio-economic impact. Finally, three scales of authority were proposed. These were (1) local (Indigenous/Originario/Peasant autonomy), (2) intermediate (regional/urban) and (3) national.[62]

Demands for Indigenous territorial autonomy as a centrepiece of emancipation can be traced back specifically to the Indigenous March for Territory and Dignity in 1990 from the Bolivian lowland communities.[63] Such demands continued to be central to Indigenous protest movements over the next two decades.[64] As Anthias summarises, 'After long histories of dispossession, ethnic territories may represent the spaces indigenous peoples can fight *for and from*.'[65] Such proposals were a key

part of the broader social demands that began to be articulated during the period of social uprising from 2000–5, referred to as the 'Left-Indigenous insurrectionary cycle', which would ultimately bring the MAS to power.[66] Alongside claims linked to territory and self-governance, proposals for a plurinational project in Bolivia were also grounded in an alternative vision of political economy. At its heart this was a call to base a new Bolivia in a plural political economy.[67] This was to signify a fundamentally different set of relationships in terms of ownership, regulation and usage of natural resources. The 2000–5 insurrectionary cycle, inspired by the contestation over natural resources (namely water and gas), effectively ended the neoliberal period in Bolivia, opening a new 'horizon of desire'.[68]

Prior to the election of the MAS it must be remembered that the momentum for political transformation came from below.[69] Drawing from Gramsci, Luis Tapia refers to this time as a moment of 'catharsis', defined by a more extensive revolutionary consciousness among the population.[70] At the heart of this mobilisation, led by Indigenous groups allied with Peasant and workers' unions, was the question of who gets to participate in decision-making surrounding resources and development.[71] In short, this can be defined as a struggle for the communal (*lo común*), which, while often being generative from Indigenous struggles, also went beyond them to include a wider variety of social groups seeking to generate alternative social relations.[72] Let us now explore the difference between the rhetoric and the reality of the plurinational state, the competing visions for transformation and the premises that underlay these. At the heart of this is a question of whether autonomy is gained *through* the state or whether autonomy should be realised *outside of* the state.[73]

Actually existing plurinationalism

If the previous section set out the possibility of radical transformative politics offered by plurinationalism in a theoretical sense, this section explores the reality of actually existing plurinationalism in the context of Bolivia. As noted in the introduction, I draw inspiration from Brenner and Theodore's notion of 'actually existing neoliberalism'.[74] As opposed to any pure version of neoliberalism, 'the notion of actually existing neoliberalism is intended to illuminate the complex, contested ways in which neoliberal restructuring strategies interact with pre-existing uses of space, institutional configurations, and constellations of socio-political power'.[75] In a similar vein, I want to move from the ideal theorisation of what plurinationalism was supposed to look like and examine its complex, contested reality as a political project as it became instantiated into a state form. I argue that we can understand the contestation over plurinationalism as a struggle between social movements from below and a social movement from above.[76] Social movements fighting for plurinationalism from below have been co-opted and constrained by the MAS which has acted as a social movement from above.[77] In short, there has been a statisation of social struggles.[78] This should provide for reflection about the meaning and scope of plurinationalism and whether it can be reinvigorated in the future. I turn to those issues in the conclusion.

From constituent power to constituted power

The new constitution pronouncing Bolivia as a plurinational state was passed in 2009, seemingly as the culmination of struggles by subaltern social forces. The proposals informing this new state were developed by a constituent assembly from 2006–8, in which a range of social movements participated.[79] The constituent assembly crucially served as a space to reconcile key differences among the various Indigenous movements that made up the Pact of Unity.[80] The resulting constitution has been described as 'probably the most extensive framework of indigenous rights ever recognised by a nation-state'.[81] To provide some illustrative examples, in its preamble, the constitution makes reference to former conflicts over water and gas, the role of Indigenous activism and asserts that the re-founded state has 'left the colonial, republican and neo-liberal state in the past'.[82] Article 1 references the plurality of the country and Article 8 commits the state to promoting Indigenous ethical and moral principles.[83] The idea of a unitary and homogenous mode of citizenship was to be abandoned and instead plural modes of belonging within the overall territory of the state were proclaimed.[84] This was supposed to represent the basis of a transition to communitarian socialism.[85] A key tenet of this new model was the right of Indigenous/Originario peoples to self-governance, which was a longstanding demand.[86]

An explicit aim of the plurinational state was therefore to achieve decolonisation (which was codified in law), and to recognise the reality of Bolivia in terms of what Zavaleta called a '*socieded abigarrada*' (motley, or heterogeneous society).[87] Indeed, the plurinational state was said to capture this motley society in its institutional form.[88] However, from the outset, a politics of the national-popular sat in tension with demands at the community level or what has instead been termed the 'community-popular horizon' for emancipation.[89] Constituent power sat in tension with constituted power,[90] and the influence and political will of social movements sat in tension with the leadership of the MAS itself.[91] In short, Indigenous autonomy was subordinated to the state in terms of a legal hierarchy.[92] It is here that we can see the start of the MAS becoming a social movement from above. Illustrative of this is that more than 100 articles proposed by the constituent assembly were altered, weakening the project of plurinationalism from below pushed by subaltern social forces. The lava of the social eruption from 2000–5 was clearly beginning to solidify into the form of state power.[93] Insurgent spatial praxis was therefore becoming ossified as the radical possibilities of plurinationalism coalesced into actually existing plurinationalism as a state-based project.

Surveying the political topography, a key contradiction running through all the above revolves around the spatial scale of resource appropriation and distribution. My argument now explores the contradictions of the accumulation strategy and hegemonic project of the MAS, linked to the usage of Marxist and Indigenous state theory.[94] This contributes to other work that has sought to question whether the state can be used as an instrument for the sorts of radical change that subaltern subjects propose.[95] A useful way of exploring these contradictions is to examine the writings of some of the major 'intellectuals of statecraft'.[96] In this case, I explore the writing of former Vice President Álvaro García Linera as well as current President Luis Arce (who also served previously as the finance minister). However, first it is useful to contextualise some important points via the state theory of Nicos Poulantzas outlined in his landmark text *State, Power, Socialism*. The influence of Poulantzas's thinking on the intellectual justification for the process of change in Bolivia is acknowledged specifically to be García Linera's writings.[97] Poulantzas's state theory provides several important postulates that comprise a crucial departure point for evaluating the emancipatory potential of the plurinational state. Poulantzas argues that (1) we must examine the 'material substratum' of the state to derive is character, (2) the state is always beset by class contradictions and is not a monolithic formation, (3) political struggles always take place within the state, (4) in thinking about issues of radical transformation, any transition to socialism should be a gradual rather than rapid process (which may involve the retention of capitalism for some time). Nevertheless, Poulantzas argues that (5) for a meaningful transition to occur, mass movements must remain in active support of this project and alternative grassroots forms of popular democracy must proliferate as a dual form of power of the Left. The last point especially remains deeply questionable in Bolivia.[98]

With the writing of the new constitution, Bolivia was recognised as a fundamentally plural society (both in terms of multiple nations and economically in terms of the state's material substratum). The model of development was defined as following a 'plural economy' made up of four key sectors: the state, the private sector, the co-operative sector and the communitarian sector. The main goal of the plural economy was to move Bolivia away from its historic reliance on the exportation of primary commodities by building up industrial capacity. The state was therefore to play a key strategic role in integrating these various sectors, most notably in redistributing resources from 'strategic sectors' (which include hydrocarbons and the mining sector) to 'employment and income generating sectors' (which include industrial, farming, commercial and service sectors), as well as redistributing profits to fund key social programmes.[99] However, despite the promise of pluralism, this strategy is reliant upon making the state the main 'collective entrepreneur' and geographically expanding the territorial presence of the state.[100] As Perreault and Valdivia outline, 'Popular imaginaries of natural gas and its role in the national story are in this way rooted in nationalist understandings of Bolivian resources as the fulcrum on which turn the country's relations with the global economy.'[101]

The redistribution of rents from hydrocarbons has become essential to the hegemonic project of the MAS in what has widely been termed 'resource nationalism'. For the MAS project, this recovery of natural resources by the central state is the basis for decolonisation and it provides the material basis for lifting the majority of the population out of poverty. On the one hand, this has been a popular strategy and the foundation for the substantial support the MAS enjoys.[102] On the other, it instantly raises the question of whether this national spatial imagery clashes with an alternative spatial project of Indigenous autonomy

that likewise makes claims over resources.[103] As Tapia puts it, 'the problem arises of who is the owner and sovereign of the territory and the resources.'[104] In this respect, rather than transform the character of the state to one that reflects (and proliferates) Indigenous modes of organisation and customs, the MAS's reforms have increased the bureaucratic presence of the state (often in areas where such state presence was formerly weak).[105] Rather than the slow eroding of state power, by contrast this is a strategy for the consolidation of regulatory state power.[106] To make the obvious point here, resource nationalism implies a singular spatial logic. Resource nationalism thus looks inherently different to resource plurinationalism.

As many have pointed out, therein lies a key contradiction between the resource-nationalist project of an extractivist, rentier state and the promise to respect territorial sovereignty, pluralism and difference.[107] The former invokes an understanding of popular sovereignty against global capitalism as the key to decolonisation, whereas the latter remains concerned with the reality of internal colonialisation (resulting from the practices of state-led development).[108] The reclaiming of territory and self-governance is central to this understanding of decolonisation.[109] This differentiated understanding of decolonisation and sovereignty has also caused a split in the original historical bloc of subaltern social forces, with the peasant and urban Indigenous sectors more supportive of the MAS's developmentalist agenda, and territorially rooted groups (exemplified by CONAMAQ and CIDOB), breaking from the Pact of Unity to oppose the government.[110] Other Indigenous, Originario and Peasant social forces remained broadly supportive of the MAS meanwhile. This split can be linked to what Ravindran calls expansionist (nationally oriented) and revivalist (community-based) Indigenous demands.[111] While expansionist demands are concerned with spatial mobility, for example, furthering the presence of Indigenous people within historically inaccessible spaces, revivalist demands seek protection of ancestral territories and the expansion of self-governing possibilities.

For the intellectuals of statecraft under the MAS, their strategy has been a justifiable one in leftist terms. If the old Bolivian state was only an 'apparent' state, the creation of the plurinational state was argued to represent a move to create an integral state (in the Gramscian sense of the word), capable of recognising the majority of subaltern interests in Bolivia.[112] In this conception, the role of the state was vital to the unification of social forces that, on their own, were only able to exercise localised forms of power.[113] As Webber has documented, the MAS shifted their stance from a largely extra-parliamentary force to one that prioritised the electoral arena.[114] This brought with it a spatial and political strategy to win over a cross-regional and cross-class constituency. However, a clear tension has existed around the meaning and scope of autonomy, between a state-based understanding and that emanating from below via the Pact of Unity.[115] From the outset of the foundation of the plurinational state, the original demands for Indigenous autonomy, which were conceived of as parallel and equal to state authority, were watered down and tempered by constituted forms of power. Moves to autonomy in Bolivia have since taken place on a political terrain circumscribed by the state, whereby radical Indigenous proposals have become 'domesticated'.[116] Such domestication of insurgent social forces by the state has been recognised as a hallmark of a passive revolutionary form of statecraft.[117]

The new constitution as well as the Framework Autonomies Law (Ley Marco de Autonomías y Decentralización) set out the scope for achieving Indigenous, First Peoples and Peasant autonomy (Autonomía Indígena Originario Campesina, AIOC). This can be achieved through the conversion of an existing municipality or the conversion of a region (both by popular referendum) or through the consolidation of already existing titled Indigenous lands known as Territorio Indígena Originario Campesino (Indigenous Originary Peasant Territory, TIOC) via the appropriate norms and customs of that community.[118] However, state support for this process has been, at best, ambivalent. It has often been tied to questions of electoral support for the MAS and the reality of whether it makes certain political subjects more governable.[119] Owing to the clear limits to self-determination, this has led some to question the professed break with liberalism.[120] As a result of these limitations, many communities have eschewed the bureaucratic entanglements and conflicts that the autonomy process has required and stuck with the status quo.[121] Only a limited number of AIOCs (see Table 1 below) have thus far been established (although a further 25 remain in process). A key criticism that has been made of the autonomy process is that it has remained within the bounds of dominant cartography (in the form of municipalities, which new autonomous regions may not bisect). Actually existing plurinationalism thus fails to respond to the initial demand to recuperate pre-colonial Indigenous territories.[122]

Table 1. Established autonomous governments in Bolivia (Source: https://cejis.org/cpta/territorios-y-autonomias-indigenas/)

Municipality and department	Region	Form of autonomy
Charagua (Santa Cruz)	Lowlands	Municipal
Kereimba (Santa Cruz)	Lowlands	Municipal
Uru Chipaya	Highlands	Municipal
Salinas (Oruro)	Highlands	Municipal
Raqaypampa (Cochabmba)	Highlands	Territorial

Such tension has led to a fracturing of the historical bloc that made up the MAS's support base and the broader plurinational project. Articulating a left critique of the MAS, Tapia argues that 'it is not that the main leaders of the MAS are being co-opted by the old dominant patrimonialist and bourgeois bloc in Bolivia, but that they themselves are becoming the leading nucleus of a new capitalist project in the country'.[123] In short, the MAS has moved from its original purpose as a political instrument of social movements to becoming a social movement from above.[124] Its chief purpose has been to consolidate its own hegemonic position underpinned by a strategy of 'resource nationalism' or extractive development. Such extractive development is presented by the MAS government as a necessary policy to reduce poverty. However, Tapia's argument is that this has meant that socio-economic horizons have come to displace ethico-political horizons.[125] In keeping with broader regional trends linked to neo-extractivism, the negative environmental consequences are either denied, minimised or accepted as part of a greater overall good.[126] In this situation, communities opposing this mode of development have been labelled as an enemy and as obstacles to progress.[127] The stark reality is that, although the state has indeed managed to capture larger amounts of rents derived from primary commodities, it has done so while failing to challenge the fundamental dependency of Bolivia on such primary commodities and thus its subservient position in the global political economy. Indeed, under the MAS government, Bolivia has increased such dependency.[128] MAS policy thus far has also favoured capital-intensive sectors above the more labour-intensive manufacturing sectors.[129] Limited progress has been made in expanding the social, co-operative sectors, and the MAS government has shied away from pursuing land reform that would challenge the power of large landholders.[130] Indeed, rapprochement with elites in the countryside was actively pursued, further demobilising the power of social movements.[131] The character of the state thus remains tied to its resource dependence and its role in reproducing the exploitative conditions for surplus appropriation.[132] Actually existing plurinationalism, despite its radical discourse, has reinforced capital accumulation rather than challenging it.

Unsettling sovereignty?

A key tension at the heart of the plurinational-state has been the question of sovereignty.[133] Notions of Indigenous sovereignty, grounded in territorial autonomy, have often come into conflict with the desire to create a stronger national sovereignty.[134] According to García Linera there is a need to construct both homogenous territoriality and polycentric territoriality.[135] He does not specify, however, how contradictions between these different logics are to be adjudicated. Rather, issues such as the struggle between the state and social movements are described as 'creative tensions' which are capable of driving the 'process of change' forward.[136] However, as Simpson has argued, 'In situations in which sovereignties are nested and embedded, one proliferates at the other's expense.'[137] The question has to be asked whether we are in fact dealing with 'incommensurable sovereignties'.[138] Luis Tapia warned early in the era of the MAS government that, 'If plurinational unity takes the form of a state, political unification will take place around the political form of the old dominant culture; that is, communitarian or non-statist cultural diversity will be unified in a form external to its organisational principles.'[139]

Here debates on the plurinational state resonate with broader contemporary discussions within Indigenous studies around challenging colonial logics. One issue to address here is the very notion of sovereignty itself, which has been problematised by some scholars.[140] In Alfred's view the concept of sovereignty is a European discourse distinct from Indigenous traditions.[141] The latter, he argues, contains no absolute authority, hierarchy, coercive enforcement of decisions and, finally, does not rule as an entity separate from the people. However, this rejection of sovereignty is contested by other Indigenous scholars such as Simpson, who conversely argues that the issue of sovereignty matters 'because it speaks from jurisdictional authority'.[142] On closer inspection, Alfred's position seems primarily to be about the rejection of sovereignty associated with the state model.[143] In his own words, 'The challenge, then, is to de-think the concept of sovereignty and replace it with a notion of power than is based on more appropriate premises.'[144] This has become a major point of debate within the field of Indigenous studies.[145] One method of thinking through a different vision of power comes from Manuela Picq's notion of 'vernacular sovereignties'. This is a non-state-centric notion of power which not only challenges the authority of individual states but also the broader notion of the Westphalian system.[146] This can be seen as important for a number of reasons. First, it removes the locus of political authority away from the state. This is a vital task in recognising Indigenous forms of social organisation that pre-date the state form and have remained integral features of localised governance.[147] Second, this notion of vernacular sovereignty captures well the more recent Indigenous struggles in Latin America. Svampa has noted, for example, that a major response to extractive development in Latin America has been an explosion of socio-environmental movements characterised by assembly-style decision-making and demands for autonomy.[148] In the Bolivian context, Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar, surveying the period 2000–5, argued that a new 'epistemic horizon of desire' opened during this time.[149] This saw an emergent 'community-popular' perspective which emphasised a new relationship between communities and wider society, proposals for autonomy and the decentralising of power. However, rather than struggle within and through the state serving to empower such communities, many scholars have highlighted how the social movement component of the state has become increasingly disciplined by the MAS's electoral focus.[150] Alternative forms of organisation have not proliferated but rather have been subdued, at times actively repressed by the MAS and at other times supportive of their policies that enable a greater flow of immediate economic resources to their communities.

As Nancy Postero has argued, Indigeneity has been transformed from a site of radical emancipation into one of state-building and legitimation.[151] In an excoriating critique, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui refutes the notion that Indigenous liberation has taken place in Bolivia and instead submits that the role of the MAS has been to 'appropriate the symbolic surplus value of their ancestors in centuries of struggle, to use these tools in the consolidation of new and old elites in power'.[152] The task of constructing state hegemony has thus limited the possibility of pluralism.[153] In short, the MAS has largely reproduced the colonial structures of power.[154] Contesting this line of thought, García Linera argues that the role of the state is vital in its ability 'to articulate expectations and collective needs'.[155] Here the importance of a centripetal rather than centrifugal force is essentially postulated. García Linera thus argues that the state is essential in overcoming Indigenous factionalism by providing a country-wide scale for the articulation of a hegemonic project in the Gramscian sense of having moral and intellectual leadership and the ability to construct a broader historical bloc.[156] In a revealing passage, García Linera – who was at the time writing in his capacity as Vice-President of Bolivia – argued that the country was in a process of transition. The Bolivian state had gone through a period of crisis (dated from 2000). However, in his view a new power bloc had emerged, transforming class relations in the country.[157] He called this process of overcoming the crisis of the state with a newfound stability the 'point of bifurcation'.[158] García Linera explicitly poses the logic of the state as crucial to the harmony of social life, as revealed in the following quote: 'to the extent that no society can live perpetually in a state of generalised and antagonized struggle for power, society, sooner or later, must lean towards the stabilisation of the system or *construction of a state order* that returns certainty to *the structures of domination* and political leadership'.[159] The project of both pursuing state power and autonomy are not viewed as contradictory but rather are said to form a 'living tension'.[160] It should be noted that this represents a drastic change of position for García Linera. In an earlier work, he stressed the autonomist, anti-statist character of radical transformation, and argued that 'We must abandon, once and for all, the vulgar idea of the "conquest

of power" that has resulted in the occupation of an alien power.'[161] The crucial question, therefore, is whether that country-wide scale must necessarily take on the form of a state, or whether in fact a state as a mode of sovereignty is antithetical to Indigenous forms of sovereignty.[162]

This issue is best illuminated in the dispute over the MAS government's proposed highway construction through the Territorio Indígena y Parque Nacional Isiboro Secure (TIPNIS), a protected national park, and home to several lowland Indigenous communities. As Laing explains in relation to this proposal, 'the road is intimately tied in to the MAS's economic model based on the appropriation of land and natural resources'.[163] This conflict, which would lead to a major fracture within the Pact of Unity, is thus tied to what she describes as 'resource sovereignties'. García Linera defended the state's proposals on the basis of expanding the national state's sovereignty.[164] The proposed highway, he said was 'a mechanism for territorialisation of geography by the state and the establishment of sovereignty', against what he termed 'hacendado-patrimonial power'. However, in this argument, the social dynamics were reduced to a struggle between the sovereign state and the capitalist class over territory. The possibility that there might be separable Indigenous interests for territorial sovereignty – and their own agenda for development – was therefore elided. This episode is emblematic of the many ways in which the promise of pluralism has been replaced with a single emancipatory subject, the politics of dialogue replaced with a politics of monologue and the polyphonic replaced with the monophonic.[165] Alternative sovereignties have been precluded by the expansion of the resource frontier.[166] As Bret Gustafson concludes, 'The gaseous state has now overtaken the social movement state.'[167]

Conclusion: a new dialectic of struggle?

'A brief period of mass euphoria' that 'gave the regime a lasting dose of legitimacy but also concealed the mechanisms through which the state usurped the popular will.'[168] This description by Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui is of the 1952 Revolution in Bolivia. However, it could equally apply to the period from 2006 onwards. Plurinationalism as a proposal for alternative sovereignty/ies remains an unfinished business and with competing understandings and meanings.[169] In the context of Bolivia, as I have shown, the promise of plurinationalism was an idea, a method and a practice to confront the homogenising effects of colonialism and to reassert a political economy of unity in diversity. Beyond Jose Carlos Mariátegui's recognition of the survival of 'practical socialism within Indigenous communities' in Latin America,[170] plurinationalism appeared to offer a means for actively building a political project for emancipation by and for Indigenous movements, peoples and communities. This was obviously not expected to be a straightforward or non-contested process, and yet worryingly it does look like its radical potential has been arrested. Most immediately, therefore, there is a political question to be answered in Bolivia: can decolonisation be achieved through the state? The answer to that question would appear to be 'no'.[171] There remains a substantive difference between political projects that come from the world of social movements and those that come from government programmes.[172] There remains a challenge to organise a mode of plurinationalism that is social-movement driven and that has real respect for autonomies at its heart.[173] Such a recognition has even come from the MAS itself since their return to power after the coup of 2019, with a public professing of a new commitment to grassroots forces.[174] A huge difficulty here is how to foster a form of unity without the state form – a project that is locally sensitive but multi-scalar in articulation. A politics, in other words, that is place-based but not place-bound. When thinking about the production of counter spaces, we have a clear choice: 'either reconstitute society as society, or reconstitute the state; either action from below, or acts from the top down'.[175]

Here I would suggest that the political terrain has shifted to a new dialectic of struggle. Previously a plethora of radical social forces, including both pro- and anti-extractivist positions, could unite under the banner of opposing neoliberalism and the private appropriation of resources this implies.[176] The challenge now is for those social forces grounded in the defence of territory to become hegemonic in their struggle for a non-state-centric project of plurinationalism. This will require the forging of a new political project that is able to account for concerns of true plurality of interests, which include territorially rooted Indigenous groups, but also urban Indigenous peoples, especially Indigenous women who are still lacking in rights.[177] Concurrent with a variety of critical intellectuals within Bolivia, to revive the political dynamic of 2000–5 requires not simply the euphoria of the time, but critical reflection on the

experiences of what has followed and what the limitations of this have been in terms of decolonisation and emancipation.[178] Any such struggle for a counter-topography in Bolivia will also have to consider how it relates to broader socio-spatial struggles elsewhere in terms of its material connections or what Katz refers to as contour lines.[179] However, in relation to a broader, global struggle, the struggle for plurinationalism in Bolivia also offers a window into social forces often considered peripheral to world politics. Indigenous peoples are recast: as creative and active agents within world politics who are challenging established shibboleths, rather than as victims or simply recipients of global dynamics. The debate over the plurinational state is thus one that is not over but has the capacity to define the horizons of Indigenous and subaltern emancipation in the twenty-first century and provide an alternative set of possibilities for rethinking participation and belonging in world politics.

Notes

[1]   Grandin, *Empire's Workshop*.

[2]   Goodale and Postero, *Neoliberalism Interrupted*.

[3]   Svampa, 'Movimientos Sociales', 4.

[4]   Burguete Cal y Mayor, 'Autonomía'; Dinerstein, *Politics of Autonomy*, 31.

[5]   Elwood et al., 'Learning from postneoliberalisms'; Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 'Postneoliberalism'.

[6]   Mignolo, *Local Histories*.

[7]   González, 'Autonomías territoriales indígenas', 36.

[8]   Jameson, 'The indigenous movement'; Lupien, 'The incorporation of indigenous concepts'; Rivera Cusicanqui, *Un mundo ch'ixi es posible*, 11.

[9]   García Linera, 'El estado en transición', 5.

[10]   Brenner and Theodore, 'Actually-existing neoliberalism'.

[11]   Hesketh, 'Indigenous resistance'. This has been identified as part and parcel of a broader process of 'transformism' and 'passive revolution' in Bolivia, referring to the manner in which the state has displaced social groups and expanded processes of capital accumulation. See also Hesketh, 'Between Pachakuti and passive revolution'; Hesketh and Morton, 'Spaces of uneven development'; Tapia, *El estado*.

[12]   Dinerstein, *Politics of Autonomy*, 6.

[13]   Marx, 'Civil war in France'.

[14]   Hesketh, *Spaces of Capital*.

[15]   Gibson-Graham, *Post-capitalist Politics*.

[16]   Küçük and Özselçuk, 'The Rojava experience'.

[17]   Keating, *Plurinational Democracy*; Oksanen, 'The rise of indigenous (pluri-)nationalism'; Tapia 'Una reflexión'; Tapia, *El estado*.

[18]   Keating, *Plurinational Democracy*, 26–7.

[19]   Keating, *Plurinational Democracy*, 2.

[20]   Keating, *Plurinational Democracy*, 169.

[21]   Oksanen, 'The rise of indigenous (pluri-)nationalism', 142.

[22]   Lightfoot, 'Decolonizing self-determination'; Picq, *Vernacular Sovereignties*; Tapia, 'Una reflexión'; Wildcat and De Leon, 'Creative sovereignty'.

[23]   Merino, 'Reimagining the nation-state'; OSAL, 'Propuesta'; Tapia, *El estado*, 34.

[24]   Escobar, 'Thinking-feeling', 51; Gudynas and Acosta, 'La renovación'.

[25]   Hale, 'Neoliberal multiculturalism'.

[26]   Hale, 'Rethinking indigenous politics'.

[27]   Garcés, 'The domestication of indigenous autonomies', 53.

[28]   Tockman and Cameron, 'Indigenous autonomy', 46.

[29]   Solón, 'Vivir Bien'; Tapia, 'Una reflexión'; Tapia, *El estado*.

[30]   Rivera Cusicanqui, *Mito y desarollo en Bolivia*; Rivera Cusicanqui, 'Indigenous peoples and women in Bolivia', 8–10.

[31]   Katz, 'On the grounds of globalization'.

[32]   Katz, 'On the grounds of globalization', 1228.

[33]   Katz, 'On the grounds of globalization', 1230.

34 Lefebvre, 'Space and state', 248.

35 Tapia, *El estado*, 43, 93, highlights that the role of the Pact of Unity was vital as a collective 'organic intellectual' representing peasants and Indigenous peoples, driving the project of the plurinational state in Bolivia. Indigenous, Originario and Peasant refer to different markers of identity in Bolivia.

36 OSAL, 'Propuesta', 167.

37 Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*; Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*.

38 Holloway and Picciotto, 'Capital, crisis and the state'.

39 Radhuber, 'Indigenous struggles', 169.

40 Poulantzas, *State, Power, Socialism*, 22, 14.

41 Hesketh, 'Modes of production debate'.

42 Castro and Picq, 'Stateness as landgrab'.

43 Zavaleta Mercado, *History of the National Popular*.

44 Zavaleta Mercado, *History of the National Popular*, 28.

45 Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, 260.

46 Tapia, 'El Estado en condiciones de abigaramiento', 102; Zavaleta Mercado, 'El estado en América Latina'.

47 Tapia, 'Una reflexión', 50.

48 Zibechi, *Dispersing Power*, 7.

49 Hesketh, 'Modes of production debate', 10.

50 Marx, 'On the Jewish question'.

51 Reinaga, *La Revolución India*.

52 Rivera Cusicanqui, *Ch'ixinakax utxiwa*, 48.

53 Hesketh and Morton, 'Spaces of uneven development', 151–8.

54 Albó, 'El retorno del indio'.

55 Dangl, *Five Hundred Year Rebellion*, 89–90.

56 Choque and Mamani, 'Reconstitución del ayllu'.

57 Rivera Cusicanqui, 'Liberal democracy and *ayllu* democracy'.

58 Albó, 'El retorno del indio', 302.

59 Fabricant and Gustafson, 'Introduction'; Marmani Ramirez, 'Cartographies of Indigenous power'; Tapia, *El horizonte plurinacional*.

60 Tapia, 'Una reflexión', 56.

61 Albó, 'El retorno del indio', 302; Oksanen, 'The rise of indigenous (pluri-)nationalism', 100.

62 OSAL, 'Propuesta'.

63 Tapia, *El estado*, 82.

64 Cameron and Plata, 'Indigenous autonomy', 127.

65 Anthias, *Limits to Decolonization*, 38.

66 Webber, *Red October*, 147.

67 Andreucci and Radhuber, 'Limits', 287.

68 Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms of the Pachakuti*, xx.

69 Salazar Lohman, 'The anticommunalism of the plurinational state', 153.

70 Tapia, *El estado*, 79. According to Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, 366, 'The term "catharsis" can be employed to indicate the passage from the purely economic (or egoistic-passional) to the ethicopolitcal moment.'

71 Postero, *The Indigenous State*, 32.

72 Gutiérrez-Aguilar, 'Statisation of the social'.

73 Doyle, 'The contentious politics of *vivir bien*', 4.

74 Brenner and Theodore, '"Actually-existing neoliberalism"'.

75 Brenner and Theodore, '"Actually-existing neoliberalism"', 361.

76 Cox and Nilsen, *We Make Our Own History*.

77 Hesketh, 'Between Pachakuti and passive revolution'; Webber, *From Rebellion to Reform*.

78 Gutiérrez-Aguilar, 'Statisation of the social'.

79 Anthias, 'Pluri-extractivist state', 128.

80 Prada, 'Entrevista a Raúl Prada', 48–9.

81 Anthias, *Limits to Decolonization*, 7.

82 Bolivia, 'Bolivia (Plurinational State of) 2009'.

83 Bolivia, 'Bolivia (Plurinational State of) 2009'.

84 Cordero Ponce, *La Plurinacionalidad desde abajo*, 5.

85 Arce, 'El nuevo modelo económico', 3.

86 Augsburger and Haber, 'Constructing indigenous autonomy', 54; Merino, 'Reimagining the nation-state', 782.

87 Zavaleta Mercado, 'Las masses en Noviembre'.

88 García Linera, *Socialismo comunitario*, 8.

89 Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms of the Pachakuti*.

90 Opposing the idea of a fixed constituted power, Negri argues that a hallmark of democracy is the constituent power of people to alter their form of governance: 'the paradigm of constituent power is that of a force that bursts apart, breaks, interrupts, unhinges any preexisting equilibrium and any possible continuity. Constituent power is tied to the notion of democracy as absolute power. Thus, as a violent and expansive force, constituent power is a concept connected to the social preconstitution of the democratic totality.' Negri, *Insurgencies*, 10.

91 Prada,'Entrevista a Raúl Prada', 35, 40.

92 Cameron and Plata, 'Indigenous autonomy', 138.

93 García Linera, *Hacia el Gran Ayllu Universal*, 313.

94 As Jessop explains, 'An accumulation strategy defines a specific economic "growth model" complete with its various extra- economic pre- conditions and also outlines a general strategy appropriate to its realisation.' Jessop, *State Theory*, 98.

95 Doyle, 'Can states be decolonized?'; Salazar-Lohman, 'The anticommunalism of the plurinational state'; Tapia, 'Una reflexión'; Zibechi, *Dispersing Power*.

96 Tuathail and Agnew, 'Geopolitics and discourse'.

97 García Linera, *Forma valor y forma comunidad*.

98 Poulantzas, *State, Power, Socialism*.

99 Arce, 'El nuevo modelo económico'; McNelly, 'Neostructuralism', 420.

100 García Linera, 'El Estado en transición', 23–5.

101 Perreault and Valdivia, 'Hydrocarbons, popular protest', 694.

102 Angosto-Ferrández, 'Reframing resource nationalism', 114–15.

103 Marston and Kennemore, 'Extraction, revolution, plurinationalism'; Postero, *The Indigenous State*, 5.

104 Tapia, 'Una reflexión', 60.

105 Doyle, 'Can states be decolonized?', 5.

106 Svampa, 'Movimientos Sociales', 18.

107 Anthias, *Limits to Decolonization*; Fabricant and Gustafson, 'Introduction', 2.

108 Riofrancos, *Resource Radicals*, 45.

109 Doyle, 'Can states be decolonized?', 23.

110 Marston and Kennemore, 'Extraction, revolution, plurinationalism'; Postero and Fabricant, 'Indigenous sovereignty', 103.

111 Ravindran, 'Geographies of indigenous identity'.

112 García Linera, 'El Estado en transición', 8; García Linera, *Forma valor y forma comunidad*, 318.

113 García Linera, *Forma valor y forma comunidad*, 226.

114 Webber, *From Rebellion to Reform*, 63.

115 Cordero Ponce, *La Plurinacionalidad desde abajo*, 80, 200; Merino, 'Reimagining the nation-state', 789.

116 Garcés, 'The domestication of indigenous autonomies'; Tapia, *La sustitución del pueblo*; Zuazo, '¿Los movimientos sociales en el poder?', 134.

117 Hesketh, 'Between Pachakuti and passive revolution'; Hesketh and Morton, 'Spaces of uneven development'; Morton, *Revolution and the State*, 254.

118 Alderman, 'Indigenous autonomy', 4; Tockman, 'Decentralisation', 156.

119 Augsburger and Haber, 'Constructing indigenous autonomy', 54; Tockman and Cameron, 'Indigenous autonomy', 48.

120 Cordero Ponce, *La Plurinacionalidad desde abajo*, 73, 201.

121 Cameron and Plata, 'Indigenous autonomy'; Tockman, 'Decentralisation', 154.

122 Cameron and Plata, 'Indigenous autonomy', 141; Tockman, 'Decentralisation', 163.

123 Tapia, *El estado*, 125.

124 The full name of party is the Movement for Socialism – Political Instrument for the Sovereignty of the Peoples (Movimiento al Socialismo – Instrumento Político por la Soberanía de los Pueblos, MAS-IPSP).

125 Tapia, *El estado*, 35. Indeed, the possibility of obtaining enhanced funding from the government within the existing municipal structures has been cited as one major factor as to why many municipalities led by Indigenous leaders have rejected further moves towards autonomy, Cameron and Plata, 'Indigenous autonomy', 136.

126 Gudynas, 'Diez tesis urgentes', 205.

127 Anthias, *Limits to Decolonization*, 143; Riofrancos, *Resource Radicals*, 12.

128 Andreucci and Radhuber, 'Limits', 280–1; Veltmeyer, 'Between voluntarist developmentalism', 84.

129 McNelly, 'Neostructuralism'.

130 Arze and Gómez, 'Bolivia', 100, 92.

131 Webber, 'Consolidation of agrarian capitalism', 331.

132 Hamilton, *Limits of State Autonomy*, 7.

133 Tapia, 'Una reflexión'.

134 Postero and Fabricant, 'Indigenous sovereignty', 102.

135 García Linera, *Hacia el Gran Ayllu Universal*, 332.

136 Garcia Linera, *Las tensiones creativas*.

137 Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*.

138 Moreton-Robinson, 'Incommensurable sovereignties'.

139 Tapia, 'Una reflexión', 61.

140 Alfred, 'Sovereignty'; Alfred, 'Sovereignty: an inappropriate concept'; Salgado, 'Against sovereignty'.

141 Alfred, 'Sovereignty', 467.

142 Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*, 104.

143 Alfred, 'Sovereignty: an inappropriate concept', 323.

144 Alfred, 'Sovereignty', 471.

145 Wildcat and De Leon, 'Creative sovereignty'.

146 Picq, *Vernacular Sovereignties*, 23.

147 Tapia, 'El estado en condiciones de abigaramiento', 101.

148 Svampa, 'Consenso de los commodities', 20.

149 Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms of the Pachakuti*, 176–8.

150 Salazar-Lohman, 'The anticommunalism of the plurinational state'.

151 Postero, *The Indigenous State*.

152 Rivera Cusicanqui, *Un mundo ch'ixi es posible*, 15.

153 Arze and Gómez, 'Bolivia', 159.

154 Hesketh, 'Indigenous resistance'; Radhuber and Radcliffe, 'Contested sovereignties', 557.

155 Garcia Linera, *Forma valor y forma comunidad*, 23.

156 García Linera, *Hacia el Gran Ayllu Universal*, 226, 316.

157 García Linera, 'El estado en transición'.

158 García Linera, 'Empate catastrófico'.

159 García Linera, 'El estado en transición', 32, emphasis added.

160 García Linera, *Hacia el Gran Ayllu Universal*, 316.

161 García Linera, *Forma valor y forma comunidad*, 46.

162 Moreton-Robinson, 'Incommensurable sovereignties', 264.

163 Laing, 'Resource sovereignties', 151.

164 García Linera, *Geopolítica de la Amazonía*, 60.

165 Gutiérrez-Aguilar, 'Statisation of the social'.

166 Anthias, *Limits to Decolonization*, 143; Hesketh, 'Indigenous resistance'.

167 Gustafson, *Bolivia in the Age of Gas*, 174.

168 Rivera Cusicanqui, 'Liberal democracy and *ayllu* democracy', 103.

169 Merino, 'Reimagining the nation-state', 792.

170 Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretative Essays*.

171 Doyle, 'Can states be decolonized?'.

172 Tapia, 'El estado en condiciones de abigaramiento', 119.

173 Tapia, 'Una reflexión', 60.

174 Bjork-James, '"We are MAS 2.0"', 10.
175 Lefebvre, *The Survival of Capitalism*, 125.
176 Riofrancos, *Resource Radicals*, 14.
177 Rivera Cusicanqui, 'Indigenous peoples and women in Bolivia'.
178 Garcés, 'The domestication of indigenous autonomies', 56; Rivera Cusicanqui, *Un mundo ch'ixi es posible*, 24; Tapia, *El estado*.
179 Katz, 'On the grounds of globalization'.

Funding

Acknowledgements

Declarations and conflicts of interest

Research ethics statement

Not applicable to this article.

Consent for publication statement

Not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of interest statement

The author declares no conflict of interest with this work. All efforts to sufficiently anonymise the author during peer review of this article have been made. The author declares no further conflicts with this article.

References

Albó, X. 'El retorno del indio', *Revista Andina* 9, no. 2 (1991): 299–366.
Alderman, J. 'Indigenous autonomy and the legacy of neoliberal decentralization in plurinational Bolivia', *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 13, no. 1 (2018): 1–21. [CrossRef]
Alfred, A. 'Sovereignty'. In *A Companion to American Indian History*, edited by P. Deloria and N. Salisbury, 460–74. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
Alfred, T. 'Sovereignty: an inappropriate concept'. In *The Indigenous Experience: Global perspectives*, edited by R. Maaka and C. Anderson, 322–36. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2006.
Andreucci, D. and I. M. Radhuber. 'Limits to "counter-neoliberal" reform: Mining expansion and the marginalisation of post-extractivist forces in Evo Morales's Bolivia', *Geoforum* 84 (2017): 280–91. [CrossRef]
Angosto-Ferrández, L. F. 'Reframing resource nationalism: Social forces and the politics of extractivism in Latin America's pink tide'. In *Latin American Extractivism: Dependency, resource nationalism, and resistance in broad perspective*, edited by S. Ellner, 105–28. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2021.
Anthias, P. *Limits to Decolonization: Indigeneity, territory, and hydrocarbon politics in the Bolivian Chaco.* London: Cornell University Press, 2018.
Anthias, P. 'The pluri-extractivist state: Regional autonomy and the limits of indigenous representation in Bolivia's Gran Chaco Province', *Journal of Latin American Studies* 54, no. 1 (2022): 125–54. [CrossRef]

Arce, L. A. 'El nuevo modelo económico, social, comunitario y productivo', *Economía Plural* 1, no. 1 (2011): 1–14.

Arze, C. and J. Gómez. 'Bolivia: ¿El "proceso de cambio" nos conduce al Vivir Bien?'. In *Promesas en su laberinto: cambios y continuidades en los gobiernos progresistas de América Latina*, edited by C. Arze, J. Gómez, P. Ospina and V. Álvarez, 45–176. La Paz: IEE/CEDLA/CIM, 2013.

Augsburger, A. and P. Haber. 'Constructing indigenous autonomy in plurinational Bolivia: Possibilities and ambiguities', *Latin American Perspectives* 45, no. 6 (2018): 53–67. [CrossRef]

Bjork-James, C. '"We are MAS 2.0." Returning to power a year after the coup against Evo Morales, Bolivia's MAS party must tackle steep challenges while rebuilding relationships with its grassroots base', *NACLA Report on the Americas* 53, no. 1 (2021): 7–11. [CrossRef]

Bolivia. 'Bolivia (Plurinational State of) 2009'. 2009. Accessed 4 June 2024. https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Bolivia_2009.

Brenner, N. and N. Theodore. 'Cities and the geographies of "actually-existing neoliberalism"', *Antipode* 34, no. 3 (2002): 349–79. [CrossRef]

Burguete Cal Y Mayor, A. 'Autonomía: la emergencia de un nuevo paradigma en las luchas por la descolonización en América Latina'. In *La autonomía a debate. Autogobierno indígena y Estado plurinacional en América Latina*, edited by M. González, A. Burguete Cal y Mayor and P. Ortiz, 117–36. Quito: FLASCO, 2010.

Cameron, J. and W. Plata. 'Indigenous autonomy in Bolivia: From great expectations to faded dreams'. In *Indigenous Territorial Autonomy and Self-Government in the Diverse Americas*, edited by M. González, R. Funaki, A. Burguete Cal y Mayor and J. Marimán, 127–44. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2023.

Castro, J. and M. L. Picq. 'Stateness as landgrab', *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 791–9. [CrossRef]

Choque, M. E. and C. Mamani, 'Reconstitución del ayllu y derechos de los pueblos indígenas: el movimiento indio en los Andes de Bolivia', *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 6, no. 1 (2001): 202–24. [CrossRef]

Cordero Ponce, S. *La Plurinacionalidad desde abajo: autogobierno indígena en Boliiva y Ecuador*. Quito: FLASCO, 2018.

Coulthard, S. G. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. London: University of Minneapolis Press, 2014.

Cox, L. and A. Nilsen. *We Make Our Own History: Marxism and social movements in the twilights of neoliberalism*. London: Pluto, 2014.

Dangl, B. *The Five Hundred Year Rebellion: Indigenous movements and the decolonisation of history in Bolivia*. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2019.

Dinerstein, A. C. *The Politics of Autonomy in Latin America: The art of organising hope*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Doyle, M. 'Can states be decolonized? Indigenous peoples and radical constitutional reform in Bolivia', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 51, no. 1 (2023): 166–84. [CrossRef]

Doyle, M. 'What does it mean to "live well"? The contentious politics of *vivir bien* as alternative development', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 1–18, 2024. [CrossRef]

Elwood, S., P. Bond, C. M. Novo and S. Radcliffe. 'Learning from postneoliberalisms', *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 5 (2017): 676–95. [CrossRef]

Escobar, A. 'Thinking-feeling with the earth: Territorial struggles and the ontological dimension of the epistemologies of the South'. In *Knowledges Born in the Struggle: Constructing the epistemologies of the Global South*, edited by B. de Sousa Santos and M. P. Meneses, 41–57. New York: Routledge, 2020.

Fabricant, N. and B. Gustafson. 'Introduction: New cartographies of knowledge and struggle'. In *Remapping Bolivia: Resources, territory and Indigeneity in a plurinational state*, edited by N. Fabricant and B. Gustafson, 1–25. Sante Fe: SAR Press, 2011.

Garcés, F. 'The domestication of indigenous autonomies in Bolivia'. In *Remapping Bolivia: Resources, territory and Indigeneity in a plurinational state*, edited by N. Fabricant and B. Gustafson, 46–67. Santa Fe: SAR Press, 2011.

García Linera Á. 'Empate catastrófico y punto de bifurcación'. *Crítica y emancipación* 1, no. 1 (2008): 23–33.

García Linera, Á. 'El estado en transición. Bloque de poder y punto de bifurcación'. In *El estado: campo de la lucha*, edited by Á. García Linera, R. Prada, L. Tapia and O. V. Camacho, 9–42. La Paz: Muela del Diablo Editores, 2010a.

García Linera, Á. *Socialismo comunitario: Un aporte de Bolivia al mundo*. La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional, 2010b.

García Linera, Á. *Las tensiones creativas de la Revolución: la quinta fase del proceso de cambio*. La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional, 2011.

García Linera, Á. *Geopolítica de la Amazonía: poder hacendal-patrimonial y acumulación capitalista*. La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional, 2012.

García Linera, Á. *Forma valor y forma comunidad*. Madrid: Traficantes de sueños, 2015a.

García Linera, Á. *Hacia el Gran Ayllu Universal*. México: Biblioteca Indígena, 2015b.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. *A Post-capitalist Politics*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

González, M. 'Autonomías territoriales indígenas y regímenes autonómicos (desde el Estado) en América Latina'. In *La autonomía a debate. Autogobierno indígena y Estado plurinacional en América Latina*, edited by M. González, A. Burguete Cal y Mayor and P. Ortiz, 35–62. Quito: FLASCO, 2010.

Goodale, M. and N. Postero (eds). *Neoliberalism Interrupted: Social change and contested governance in contemporary Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.

Gramsci, A. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.

Grandin, G. *Empire's Workshop: Latin America, the United States and the rise of the new imperialism*. New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt, 2007.

Gudynas, E. 'Diez tesis urgentes sobre el nuevo extractivismo: contextos y demandas bajo el progresismo sudamericano actual'. In *Extractivismo, política, y Sociedad*, edited by Centro Andino de Acción Popular and Centro Latino Americano de Ecología Social, 187–225. Quito: Centro Andino de Acción Popular y Centro Latino Americano de Ecología Social, 2009.

Gudynas, E. and A. Acosta. 'La renovación de la crítica al desarrollo y el buen vivir como alternativa', *Utopía y praxis latinoamericana* 16, no. 53 (2011): 71–83.

Gustafson, B. *Bolivia in the Age of Gas*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2020.

Gutiérrez Aguilar, R. *Rhythms of the Pachakuti: Indigenous uprising and state power in Bolivia*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.

Gutiérrez Aguilar, R. 'Bolivia: Statisation of the social, destruction of the communitarian', *Postcolonial Studies* 22, no. 3 (2019): 283–92. [CrossRef]

Hale, C. 'Rethinking Indigenous politics in the era of the "Indio permitido"', *NACLA Report on the Americas* 38, no. 2 (2004): 16–21. [CrossRef]

Hale, C. 'Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America', *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28, no. 1 (2005): 10–28. [CrossRef]

Hamilton, N. *The Limits of State Autonomy: Post-revolutionary Mexico*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Hesketh, C. *Spaces of Capital/Spaces of Resistance: Mexico and the global political economy*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2017.

Hesketh, C. 'Between Pachakuti and passive revolution: The search for post-colonial sovereignty in Bolivia', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 33, no. 4 (2020): 567–86. [CrossRef]

Hesketh, C. 'Finding space in the modes of production debate: The value of Latin America', *Environment and Planning F* 1–19 (2023). [CrossRef]

Hesketh, C. 'Indigenous resistance at the frontiers of accumulation: Challenging the coloniality of space in international relations', *Review of International Studies* 51, no. 1 (2025): 64–83. [CrossRef]

Hesketh, C. and A. D. Morton. 'Spaces of uneven development and class struggle in Bolivia: Transformation or *trasformismo*?', *Antipode* 46, no. 1 (2014): 149–69. [CrossRef]

Holloway, J. and S. Picciotto. 'Capital, crisis and the state', *Capital and Class* 1, no. 2 (1977): 76–101. [CrossRef]

Jameson, K. P. 'The Indigenous movement in Ecuador: The struggle for a plurinational state', *Latin American Perspectives* 38, no. 1 (2011): 63–73. [CrossRef]

Jessop, B. *State Theory: Putting the capitalist state in its place*. Oxford: Polity, 1990.

Katz, C. 'On the grounds of globalization: A topography for feminist political engagement', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26, no. 4 (2001): 1213–34. [CrossRef]

Keating, M. *Plurinational Democracy: Stateless nations in a post-sovereignty era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Küçük, B. and C. Özselçuk. 'The Rojava experience: Possibilities and challenges of building a democratic life', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 115, no. 1 (2016): 184–96. [CrossRef]

Laing, A. F. 'Resource sovereignties in Bolivia: Re-conceptualising the relationship between Indigenous identities and the environment during the TIPNIS conflict', *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 34,

no. 2 (2015): 149–66. [CrossRef]

Lefebvre, H. *The Survival of Capitalism: Reproduction of the relations of production*, translated by F. Bryant. London: Allison and Busby, 1976.

Lefebvre, H. 'Space and state'. In *State, Space, World: Selected essays*, edited by N. Brenner and S. Elden, 223–53. London: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Lightfoot, S. R. 'Decolonizing self-determination: Haudenosaunee passports and negotiated sovereignty', *European Journal of International Relations* 27, no. 4 (2021): 971–94. [CrossRef]

Lupien, P. 'The incorporation of Indigenous concepts of plurinationality into the new constitutions of Ecuador and Bolivia', *Democratization* 18, no. 3 (2011): 774–96. [CrossRef]

Mariátegui, J. C. *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality*, translated by M. Urquidi. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971.

Marmani Ramirez, P. 'Cartographies of indigenous power: Identity and territoriality in Bolivia'. In *Remapping Bolivia: Resources, territory and Indigeneity in a plurinational state*, edited by N. Fabricant and B. Gustafson, 30–45. Sante Fe: SAR Press, 2011.

Marston, A. and A. Kennemore. 'Extraction, revolution, plurinationalism: Rethinking extractivism from Bolivia', *Latin American Perspectives* 46, no. 2 (2019): 141–60. [CrossRef]

Marx, K. 'The civil war in France'. In *Karl Marx: Selected writings*, edited by D. McLellan, 584–603. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000a.

Marx, K. 'On the Jewish question'. In *Karl Marx: Selected writings*, edited by D. McLellan, 46–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000b.

Merino, R. 'Reimagining the nation-state: Indigenous peoples and the making of plurinationalism in Latin America', *Leiden Journal of International Law* 31, no. 4 (2018): 773–92. [CrossRef]

Mignolo, W. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

McNelly, A. 'Neostructuralism and its class character in the political economy of Bolivia under Evo Morales', *New Political Economy* 25, no. 3 (2020): 419–38. [CrossRef]

Moreton-Robinson, A. 'Incommensurable sovereignties: Indigenous ontology matters'. In *Handbook of Critical Indigenous Studies*, edited by B. Hokowhitu, A. Moreton-Robinson, L. Tuhiwai-Smith, C. Andersen and S. Larkin, 257–68. London: Routledge, 2021.

Morton, A. D. *Revolution and the State in Modern Mexico: The political economy of uneven development*, 2nd edn. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2013.

Negri, A. *Insurgencies: Constituent power and the modern states*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Observatorio Social de América Latina (OSAL). 'Propuesta de las organizaciones indígenas, originarias, campesinas y de colonizadores hacia la Asamblea Constituyente', *Observatorio Social de América Latina* 8, no. 22 (2007): 165–82.

Oksanen, A. A. 'The rise of Indigenous (pluri-)nationalism: The case of the Sámi people', *Sociology* 54, no. 6 (2020): 1141–58. [CrossRef]

Peck, J., N. Theodore and N. Brenner. 'Postneoliberalism and its malcontents'. In *The Point is to Change It: Geographies of hope and survival in an age of crisis*, edited by N. Castree, P. A. Chatterton, N. Heynen, W. Larner and M. W. Wright, 94–116. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Perreault, T. and G. Valdivia. 'Hydrocarbons, popular protest and national imaginaries: Ecuador and Bolivia in comparative context', *Geoforum* 41, no. 5 (2010): 689–99. [CrossRef]

Picq, M. L. *Vernacular Sovereignties: Indigenous women challenging world politics*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018.

Postero, N. *The Indigenous State: Race, politics and performance in plurinational Bolivia*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2019.

Postero, N. and N. Fabricant. 'Indigenous sovereignty and the new developmentalism in plurinational Bolivia', *Anthropological Theory* 19, no. 1 (2019): 95–119. [CrossRef]

Poulantzas, N. *State, Power, Socialism*. London: NLB, 1978.

Prada, R. 'Entrevista a Raúl Prada'. In *Perspectivas Intelectuales en el primer gobierno de Evo Morales*, edited by M. Svampa, P. Stefanoni and B. Fornillo, 33–76. La Paz: Le monde diplomatique–Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2010.

Radhuber, I. M. 'Indigenous struggles for a plurinational state: An analysis of Indigenous rights and competences in Bolivia', *Journal of Latin American Geography* (2012): 167–93. [CrossRef]

Radhuber, I. M. and S. A. Radcliffe. 'Contested sovereignties: Indigenous disputes over plurinational resource governance', *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 6, no. 1 (2023), 556–77. [CrossRef]

Ravindran, T. 'Geographies of Indigenous identity: Spatial imaginaries and racialised power struggles in Bolivia', *Antipode* 51, no. 3 (2019): 949–67. [CrossRef]

Reinaga, F. *La Revolución India.* El Alto: Ediciones Fundación Amaútica Fausto Reinaga, 1970.

Riofrancos, T. *Resource Radicals: From petro-nationalism to post-extractivism in Ecuador.* London: Duke University Press, 2020.

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. 'Liberal democracy and *ayllu* democracy in Bolivia: The case of northern Potosí', *Journal of Development Studies* 26, no. 4 (1990): 97–121. [CrossRef]

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. 'The notion of "rights" and the paradoxes of postcolonial modernity: Indigenous peoples and women in Bolivia', *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences* 18, no. 2 (2010): 29–54. [CrossRef]

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. *Mito y desarollo en Bolivia. El giro colonial del gobierno de MAS.* La Paz: Piedra Rota/Plural, 2015.

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. *Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization*, translated by M. Geidel. Cambridge: Polity, 2020.

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. *Un mundo ch'ixi es posible. Ensayos desde un presente en crisis.* Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón, 2018.

Salazar Lohman, H. 'Revisiting Bolivian "progressivism": The anticommunalism of the plurinational state', *Latin American Perspectives* 47, no. 5, (2020): 148–62. [CrossRef]

Salgado, P. 'Against sovereignty: The colonial limits of modern politics', *Millennium* 52, no. 1 (2023): 85–108. [CrossRef]

Simpson, A. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states.* London: Duke University Press, 2014.

Simpson, L. B. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous freedom through radical resistance.* London: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Solón, P. 'Vivir Bien: Old Cosmovisions and New Paradigms, Great Transition Initiative', February 2018. Accessed 6 April 2024. https://greattransition.org/publication/vivir-bien.

Svampa, M. 'Movimientos Sociales, matrices socio-políticos y nuevos escenarios en América Latina', *One World Perspectives* 1 (2010). Accessed 30 April 2024. https://biblioteca-repositorio.clacso.edu.ar/bitstream/CLACSO/5036/1/pdf_1110.pdf.

Svampa, M. 'Consenso de los commodities, giro ecoterritorial y pensamiento crítico en América Latina', *Observatorio Social de América Latina* 13, no. 3 (2012): 15–38.

Tapia, L. 'Una reflexión sobre la idea de Estado plurinacional', *Observatorio Social de América Latina* 8, no. 22 (2007): 47–64.

Tapia, L. 'El estado en condiciones de abigarramiento'. In *El estado: campo de la lucha*, edited by Á. García Linera, R. Prada, L. Tapia and O. V. Camacho, 95–125. La Paz: Muela del Diablo Editores, 2010.

Tapia, L. *El estado de derecho como tiranía.* La Paz: cides/umsa, 2011.

Tapia, L. *La sustitución del pueblo.* La Paz: Autoderminación, 2014.

Tapia, L. *El horizonte plurinacional.* La Paz: Autoderminación, 2015.

Tockman, J. 'Decentralisation, socio-territoriality and the exercise of Indigenous self-governance in Bolivia', *Third World Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (2016): 153–71. [CrossRef]

Tockman, J. and J. Cameron. 'Indigenous autonomy and the contradictions of plurinationalism in Bolivia', *Latin American Politics and Society* 56, no. 3 (2014): 46–69. [CrossRef]

Tuathail, G. Ó. and J. Agnew. 'Geopolitics and discourse: Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy', *Political Geography* 11, no. 2 (1992): 190–204. [CrossRef]

Veltmeyer, H. 'Bolivia: Between voluntarist developmentalism and pragmatic extractivism'. In *The New Extractivism: A post-neoliberal development model or imperialism of the twenty-first century*, edited by H. Veltmeyer and J. Petras, 8–113. London: Zed, 2014.

Webber, J. R. *From Rebellion to Reform in Bolivia: Class struggle, Indigenous liberation, and the politics of Evo Morales.* Chicago: Haymarket, 2011.

Webber, J. *Red October: Left-Indigenous struggles in modern Bolivia.* Chicago: Haymarket, 2012.

Webber, J. R. 'Evo Morales, *transformismo*, and the consolidation of agrarian capitalism in Bolivia', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 17, no. 2 (2017): 330–47. [CrossRef]

Wildcat, M. and J. De Leon. 'Creative sovereignty: The in-between space. Indigenous sovereignties in creative and comparative perspective', *Borderlands* 19, no. 2 (2020): 1–28. [CrossRef]

Zavaleta Mercado, R. 'El estado en América Latina'. In *La autodeterminación de las masas*, edited by L. Tapia, 321–55. Bogotá, Colombia: CLASCO, 2009.

Zavaleta Mercado, R. 'Las masses en Noviembre'. In *La autodeterminación de las masas*, edited by L. Tapia, 207–62. Bogotá: CLASCO, 2009.

Zavaleta Mercado, R. *Towards a History of the National Popular in Bolivia*, translated by A. Freeland. Pennsylvania: Seagull Books, 2018.

Zibechi, R. *Dispersing Power: Social movements as anti-state forces*, translated by R. Ryan. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2010.

Zuazo, M. '¿Los movimientos sociales en el poder? El gobierno del MAS en Bolivia', *Nueva Sociedad* 227 (2010): 120–35.