

between the US policy-making machinery in distant Washington in the first two chapters and the reality of Putumayense life in the third and fourth chapter. The book would have benefitted though from looking beyond what almost appears as a dichotomy between Washington and Putumayo. The ripple effects on the neighbouring department of Nariño, for example, which Tate mentions briefly, are considerable. Nariño became a centre of gravity of the conflict only after Plan Colombia pushed coca cultivations and armed actors westwards. It also could have included a more detailed explanation of why other neglected Colombian regions, such as Catatumbo, were not the focus of Plan Colombia.

Similarly, understanding how various actors tried to shape Plan Colombia requires accounting for Ecuador, which has been affected by and influenced the aid package's implementation. Not only did Plan Colombia entail toxic spraying on Ecuadorean soil, which, as Tate mentions, resulted in the prohibition by Quito of fumigations close to the border, but it also triggered massive refugee flows, producing a humanitarian crisis in the Ecuadorean northern border zone; an increase in violence resulting from the presence of Colombian (state and non-state) armed groups in the Ecuadorean border provinces; and a strain on the government's budget as funds were used to stem the spill-over effects. This included not only the border zone's militarisation, but also policies to improve civilian infrastructure. This developmental 'Plan Ecuador' was framed as a 'Peace Plan' in response to Colombia's 'War Plan'.

Overall, the book is a crucial contribution to the discussion of how the US shaped Colombia's security landscape. It provides valuable insights for scholars interested in applying ethnographic methods to policy matters, and for policy-makers, allowing them to put into perspective their own influence and its unintended consequences on the ground. It is a must-read for those who aim to avoid Colombia's violent history repeating itself.

*University of Oxford*

ANNETTE IDLER

*J. Lat. Amer. Stud.* 49 (2017). doi:10.1017/S0022216X16002066

Erin Fitz-Henry, *US Military Bases and Anti-Military Organizing: An Ethnography of an Air Force Base in Ecuador* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. xvi + 231, £65.00, hb.

Rafael Correa famously proclaimed after taking office as president in 2007 that if foreign military bases were not a concern then the United States should have no problem with his country of Ecuador establishing a military base in the US. At issue was a Forward Operating Location (FOL) that the US military maintained at the Eloy Alfaro airbase in Manta. In 1999, former president Jamil Mahuad had signed a ten-year lease for US use of the base, purportedly to halt drug trafficking in neighbouring Colombia. Critics charged that the presence of US troops in Manta dragged Ecuador into a growing regional conflict, and that the mission had expanded into other unrelated activities – especially that of providing surveillance of Colombia's internal political conflicts. Opponents considered the lease to be unconstitutional and a violation of national sovereignty, and Correa refused to renew it when it came due two years later.

Correa's request for an Ecuadorian base in Miami highlighted the fundamentally unequal nature of international relations and the hypocrisy of US pressure on other governments to host such institutions. The peaceful departure of an occupying

force from a foreign military base reflected the success of a well-organised social movement, as well as the election of a sympathetic president who was willing to implement their demands. That feat joined a growing list of successes of a global movement against foreign military bases, and that movement in turn has given rise to a robust literature by David Vine, Katherine McCaffrey, Lesley Gill and others on anti-base movements.

Given that history and context, a reader perhaps could be forgiven for assuming that a book entitled *US Military Bases and Anti-Military Organizing* would be part of a scholar/activist literature on social movement opposition to US imperialism. That is not the case, however, and the book is mistitled. This is not an ethnography of the anti-base movement, but instead of local conservative politicians and the propertied class who for their own economic reasons supported the presence of the US troops and opposed the closing of the FOL. Anthropologist Erin Fitz-Henry explicitly situates herself as wanting to give equal attention to all parties in the debate around foreign military bases. And there is a debate. Opponents claim issues of sovereignty and advocate for alternative economic development models. Proponents contend that military bases contribute to economic growth. And as an author Fitz-Henry does have a position in this debate, and it is not in favour of the anti-base movement.

Fitz-Henry's entry point to the study, and in fact a key event that provides a core of her work as well as most of the photos that illustrate the book, was an International Conference for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases held in Quito, Ecuador in March 2007. Hundreds of activists from around the world gathered in common concern for the proliferation of military bases, primarily those the United States operated outside of its own territory. Fitz-Henry complains that the conference organisers did not want to talk to her, as if the priority of social movement leaders were to take time out of their busy schedules to talk to academics who have an antagonistic attitude toward their goals. It is not entirely without foundation that anti-base activists were suspicious of Fitz-Henry's interest in the subject, and accused her of being a CIA stooge. The conference culminated in a march on the Manta base. Fitz-Henry describes how she struggled to explain to local inhabitants what these 'outside agitators' were doing in their city, and why they wished for the base to leave.

Without access to anti-base organisers, Fitz-Henry spends almost all of her time with US military personnel and those who favour the base's presence. There is, of course, no inherent problem with writing an ethnography of an imperialist occupying force, and of domestic support for that force. In fact, such studies can be very useful and insightful. The problem, rather, is presenting as 'objective' and 'even-handed' a study that purports to communicate 'both' sides of a debate (even though debates always have more than just two sides), but then indeed taking a position and presenting that as normative.

At one point in her ethnography, Fitz-Henry states that she 'just happened' to be in a vehicle travelling through Manta with US military personnel. How does an ethnographer 'just happen' to accept a ride with an occupying force? Again, there is nothing inherently wrong with that if it were part of the research design. Anthropologist Brian Selmeski, for example, engaged in a remarkable ethnography of training with Indigenous conscripts in the highland town of Riobamba in Ecuador. That, however, was an intentional part of his research design, not an activity presented as incidental. And Selmeski's participant observation was definitely not part of a work that was mislabelled as a study of anti-military organising.

Fitz-Henry is not alone in taking a pro-military base perspective in her work. Another notable example is Andrew Yeo's equally mistitled *Activists, Alliances, and Anti-U.S. Base Protests* (Cambridge University Press, 2011). Yeo openly admits that he is not an activist/scholar, acknowledges that he disagrees with anti-base activists, and admits that he does not understand why anti-US protests take place in countries such as Ecuador with pro-US governments. Fitz-Henry claims to write a 'balanced' account of anti- and pro-base movements, and Yeo takes one step further to assert his commitment to academic objectivity. A key question, though, is why activist/scholars are disparaged with 'bias', while those who essentially function as stenographers to power (in Noam Chomsky's phrasing) claim objectivity? Is it not more honest, following Howard Zinn's lead, for a progressive scholar to acknowledge openly a political viewpoint than for a conservative counterpart to claim objectivity even while channeling the perspective of empire?

*Truman State University*

MARC BECKER

*J. Lat. Amer. Stud.* 49 (2017). doi:10.1017/S0022216X16002078

Ulla D. Berg, *Mobile Selves: Race, Migration, and Belonging in Peru and the U.S.* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2015), pp. xv + 304, £35.00, hb.

Ulla D. Berg's *Mobile Selves* serves as a splendid – and important – anthropological study examining how migrants are defined and define themselves through the experience of global migration. Migration from Peru is not as large as from many other Latin American countries, is a relatively recent phenomenon that began in large numbers in the 1980s, and relies more on air travel than overland or sea routes. However, it is these factors that interest Berg, who has set out to investigate how the economics, politics and technology of our globalised and neoliberal era have influenced the processes of migrant identity and formation.

Berg divides her book into three larger sections each containing chapters analysing the refashioning of the migrant self. The first, 'Cosmopolitan Desires', uses two chapters to explore what makes migrants want to travel outside of Peru and how they must redefine their identity to take such measures. In this section, Berg exemplifies the use of transnational analysis by looking beyond and within the national boundary by tracing the long historical legacy of racialised divisions between the urban and rural in Peru as well as that of the transgressive figure of the *cholo* who both dares and is forced to operate in both spheres. Berg argues that the decision to migrate is not just a question of economics, but a historical, social and cultural desire of migrants to escape such definitions. To do so, Berg analyses how migrants re-make themselves to orient and often subvert the maze of post-9/11 policies designed precisely to exercise state power over the flow of people. Berg is careful to balance the theme of agency in this process, noting how migrants successfully refashion their identity while reminding us of the larger, often restrictive, state forces in which they must act.

The second section of the book, 'Transnational Socialites', traces the links that migrants maintain between Peru and the United States. Berg examines the paradoxical nature of modern technology that has made communication easier yet simultaneously uneasy in the globalised era. Although videos, cell phones, DVD, and Skype have made communication more constant, Berg documents that the same questions of reciprocity, estrangement and the affective become more fraught. What can now be