THE PRODUCTION OF OTHER KNOWLEDGES AND ITS TENSIONS: FROM ANDEANIST ANTHROPOLOGY TO INTERCULTURALIDAD?

Marisol de la Cadena*

In a recent volume, anthropologist-politician Carlos Iván Degregori described anthropology in Peru—his country and mine—as having developed an inward looking analytical viewpoint that lacks comparative perspective. This situation, he explains, contrasts with research conditions in the Northern Hemisphere where access to bibliographic and funding resources provide scholars with a broader view that, nonetheless, features an inward looking tradition of its own. While resources allow them to compare and contrast anthropological knowledge about Andean countries, they generally do so with information published in English, mostly by US scholars. As an example of this parochialism (which, however, is not generally considered such given the authority of North America as an academic center) he mentions an article by a US colleague devoted to a balance of Andean anthropology in which "out of sixty two titles mentioned in the bibliography, only two are by Peruvian scholars, and one of them is in English, and written by a Peruvian woman teaching in the US." Yet, suggesting the complex geo-politics of knowledge/power relations, he admits that his own balance of Peruvian anthropology excluded, or at the very least subordinated, knowledge produced in provincial universities (Degregori, 2000:17-18).

The hegemony of Euro-American knowledge emerges from apparently innocuous disciplinary interactions. As Degregori's self criticism alerts us, even critical dispositions may prove insufficient to shelter us from this hegemony; we need to, at the very least, disrupt the silence in which it thrives. Universal in appearance, Western forms of knowledge and its practices are not confined to Europe or the United States—they have exceeded those territories for almost six centuries now. Articulated by a vocation to spread reason, the modern geo-politics of knowledge both established *a* center (the North Atlantic) and surpassed it, thus constituting regional academic (and intellectual) formations with their centers (where the institutions of reason accrued) and peripheries where rational logic had a weaker established presence. These regional formations constitute a complex configuration of multiple, hierarchically organized centers, some of which are "peripheral", in relation to other "more central" ones. Running through this configuration, layered and many-directional relations of domination and subordination contribute to shaping what eventually is considered universal *knowledge* and what remains considered local *information*--both worldwide and in specific countries. Indeed, this "universal" and this "local" are also relative within the configuration; how far local knowledge makes it, depends-- we believe hegemonically--on its "theoretical strength", and this is problematic if by that we mean a knowledge process that *extracts* general ideas out of specific meanings, *and ignores the specificity* in so doing.

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

To illustrate the hegemony of Euro-American forms of knowledge, most specifically the process through which it is achieved, this paper attempts a genealogical and dialogical discussion of that aspect of Latin American anthropology known as Andeanism. I follow Andeanism as it connected with academic formations in the United States, as well as with political-intellectual discussions within Latin America and Peru, specifically with debates about *mestizaje* and *interculturalidad*.[1] I start my story early in the twentieth century, when anthropology had not coalesced as a discipline. Yet, discussions about "culture" fueled nationalist projects promoted by a regional network of intellectuals that, under the rubric of mestizaje, eventually contributed to the emergence and articulation of Latin America as a geo-political region of sorts. Significantly, the discussion was also marked by what sociologist Aníbal Quijano (1997) labeled "the coloniality of power" a historical geo-political condition that de-legitimizes nonwestern forms of making sense of the world, temporalizes them as pre-modern, and thus sets them up for non co-eval (cf. Fabian, 1983) representations.[2] In the third section I describe the emergence of another network: that of indigenous intellectuals. An oxymoronic identity at the turn of the 20th century—when Indians were unthinkable as rational beings, let alone intellectuals—acting nationally and internationally this network rebukes the homogenizing narrative of mestizaje, and proposes instead *interculturalidad,* a social relation able to produce a political community that indigenous intellectuals imagine through ethnic-cultural (even ontological) diversity.

The second section interrupts what could have otherwise been a sequence (i.e. from mestizaje to anti-mestizaje, and from traditional to grassroots intellectuals-politicians.) In this section I use the life and works of Peruvian literary writer and anthropologist José María Arguedas to illustrate how Peruvian social scientists contributed to the hegemony of universal knowledge in a peripheral center (Lima) as they disqualified Arguedas' attempts (visionary in the 1960s) at re-directing mestizaje into interculturalidad, and promoting the diversity that indigenous intellectuals currently champion. A controversial Peruvian intellectual, Arguedas's life and works were situated at several highly unusual crossroads. He was a non-indigenous intellectual *and* an indigenous Quechua individual, an ethnographer and a literary writer whose work resists a binary classification as *either* fiction *or* ethnography. While this may be commonsensical to post-colonial sensibilities, in the modernizing 1960s Arguedas's life and work defied the limits of certified sociological- anthropological knowledge and the political projects this knowledge sustained. Arguedas self-identified as "a civilized man that has not stopped being at the core, an indigenous Peruvian" (Dorfman, 1970, 45). This idea, also impersonated by the characters of his stories, challenged the nationalist teleology of mestizaje: the idea that Indians would be included in the Peruvian nation as mestizos only once they completed requirements for civilization. Arguedas' self-identification, as well as his work, strived against the "coloniality of power" (cf. Quijano, 1997) that supported images of indigenous Andeans as 'inferior' and the ideological historicism that legitimized this perception. And by historicism I mean the conceptualization of historical time as a measure of the "cultural" distance that exists between co-existing Western and the non-Western formations (cf. Chakrabarty, 2000). Intriguingly, and towards the construction of World Anthropologies, Arguedas's work disrupted the silent hegemony of western forms of knowledge.

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

The Inter-American Hub of Peruvian Anthropology

Andeanism (as a set of academic ideas and fieldwork practices) emerged in dialogue with anthropology in the United States and, in an apparent paradox, with Latin American debates about mestizaje. An important actor in both networks was John Victor Murra (a Romanian) who in the 1970s—while teaching anthropology at Cornell was one of Arguedas's most intense interlocutors. Yet, Murra's participation in the US-Latin American network predates this friendship. I have traced it back to 1952 when he went to Jamaica as a Ph. D. student hired by Sidney Mintz, an anthropologist from the United States, then working in Puerto Rico sponsored by Julian Steward. From Jamaica, Murra went to Cuba where he met Fernando Ortiz, the author of *Cuban Counterpoint. Tobacco and Sugar* (1995[1947]), perhaps the earliest historical ethnography produced by a Latin American intellectual, the first edition of which had a prologue by Bronislaw Malinowski. Ortiz coined the term *transculturación*, with which he rebuked the notion of "acculturation" and joined the discussion on mestizaje, if perhaps only implicitly. From Cuba, Murra took a boat to Yucatán, and then a plane to Mexico City where he met Angel Palerm, a Spanish anthropologist who fled Francisco Franco's fascism, and took refuge in Mexico (Castro et.al (eds) 2000:43). The friendship later included the Mexican Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, (a crucial interlocutor in the mestizaje dialogue) who had studied anthropology at Northwestern University with Melville Herskovitz and was, like Ortiz, interested in *Africanía*. This dense network of friendships, collegiality, chance, and political emotions connecting at least the United States, Cuba, Mexico, and Spain, underwrites the complexity of anthropological conceptual itineraries across the Americas, and belies simple unidirectional flows of knowledge from North to South. It also suggests a regional Latin American intellectual formation existing beyond the boundaries of specific countries, and genealogically connected with an earlier network, one that existed before the creation of anthropology in Latin America.

Articulated by a regionalist-cum-nationalist political emotion, since the late nineteenth century, this network grouped intellectuals around the idea of Indo-América, a sub-continental community that intellectuals imagined emerging from their common cultural pre-Columbian and Hispanic pasts.[3] Witnessing, participating, and opposing a number of political events—like the Mexican Revolution, and the increasing expansionist ventures of the US in Latin America, particularly the 1920s Marines invasion of Nicaragua—the leaders of Indo-América knew of each other, and some even worked together. [4] Generally, Indo-Americanistas (commonly known as Indigenistas) were provincial intellectuals (mostly lawyers) familiar with their surroundings: archaeological remains, folklore, colonial writings, vernacular languages and indigenous ways of living. As anthropology consolidated in the United States, Indigenistas traveled North both to share their local knowledge with their US counterparts, and to have it academically certified. From Peru Julio C. Tello, an archaeologist, acquired an honorary degree at Harvard in the early 1920s, and the Mexican Manuel Gamio obtained his degree in Columbia where he was one of Franz Boas' students. Luis E. Valcárcel, the head of the Museum of History (created in 1930, in Lima) toured several universities in the United States where he was "impressed with the Boasian, Smithsonian, and Harvard institutions." (Salomon, 1985:89; Valcárcel, 1981). The US academia, however, did not exhaust Indigenistas' intellectual interest, for Indo-Americanismo was a political doctrine—and anti-Imperialist at such. Mexico was an important ideological hub in the network, the space of a successful revolution, and a source of ideas of *mestizaje*.

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

Mestizaje was a population-making tool that promised to uplift the indigenous population by draining off their backwardness. It represented the condition of possibility of Latin America as a future par of its Northern neighbor, while accepting the inferiority of the region in its current stage of evolution. Navigating the political-academic network that connected both Americas, Latin American nationalist discussions about mestizaje encountered the conceptualization of "acculturation"—it might have even influenced it, as Ralph Beals (1953) seems to suggest. [5] Resuming Paul Radin's (1913) discussions about the influence of whites on indigenous cultures in the United States, in 1936 the American Anthropological Association included "acculturation studies" as a legitimate field for anthropological studies and defined it as "the investigation of the cultures of natives that participate in civilized life."[6] It was preceded by the Social Science Research Council, which in 1935 established a sub-committee to promote investigations on "acculturation studies" (Sartori 1998, Patterson 2000, Beals 1953). That same year the ACLS created a Committee on Latin American Studies that years later became an ACLS-SSRC joint committee. These associations were to coordinate research and resources with policy needs of the US government as indicated by the Office of Inter-American Affairs, where the coordinator was Nelson Rockefeller. With funds from this institution, the North American John Collier joined Mexican anthropologists in the foundation, in the 1940s, of the *Instituto Indigenista Inter-Americano*. Its mission: "to carry out research on "Indian problems" in countries in the Western Hemisphere" (Patterson 2001: 95). Through these and other connections "acculturation" entered the Indo-Americanista network where it encountered adherents and opponents.[7]

Starting in this period research funds (particularly from the United States) became a crucial component of Latin American/ist anthropology and its politics for collaborative research.[8] The *Handbook of South American Indians* (1947-1959) is an icon of this relationship. Produced under the auspices of the Office of Inter American Affairs and led by archaeologist Wendell Bennet and material-ecologist Julian Steward, the collaboration between southerners and northerners must have been fraught with academic hierarchies. "The North American creators of the *Handbook* and the French ethnologists of the Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos, took as *apprentices* a large number of Peruvian *students*" wrote Frank Salomon (1985:90, my emphasis). Yet the 'Peruvian students' were prominent Indigenistas, salient participants in the regional mestizaje network and influential 'local' intellectual-politicians and lawmakers in Peru. Their apprenticeship was specific to the discipline of anthropology then emerging from the Indo American network—politically influential in the South, yet academically subordinated to North Atlantic centers of knowledge, particularly to the United States and (to a lesser degree) France.

Concerned with the creation of Peru as a modern nation, intertwined with official politics, and boasting Inca legacy, Peruvian anthropology chose past and present Andean "indigenous cultures" as its object of study and political representation. Sponsored by the Peruvian state, the first institutions were Museums, the *Instituto de Etnología y Arqueología*, and the Peruvian chapter of the Instituto Indigenista Interamericano created in 1945 (and linked to the central III in Mexico). Over the next fifteen years, anthropology became an established discipline in Peru, and as the epicenter of a "culture area" of its own it turned into the center of US Andean anthropology, rivaling Mexican anthropology and shadowing the development

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

of Andeanism in neighboring Bolivia, Ecuador, Chile, Argentina, and Colombia. In striking contrast with Mexico, the economic support of the Peruvian state to anthropology weakened by the 1960s and the discipline came to depend (almost totally) on public and private funds from the United States and Europe. As in the rest of the world, the historical linear narrative proposed by modernization theory—in both its rightist and leftist versions—weighed heavily in Peru during this period.

In Peru the prevalence of modernization paradigms meant reinforcing the teleology of *mestizaje*. However, the earlier Indigenista culture-history nationalist rhetoric was replaced by an economicist discourse distinctly colored by the polarized political ideologies then prevalent. Conservative proposals envisioned Indians becoming "farmers" or normalized as urban mestizos; from the other end, revolutionary projects required "peasants" or "wage earners" rather than superstitious Indians immersed in subsistence economies. Proponents of "dependency theory" shared this view. *"Dependentistas,"* as they were known, represented a left-inclined conceptual alternative to modernization theories that emerged from Latin America, and that argued that the lack of industrial development of the region was a result of historical colonial relations of domination and contemporary capitalist economic exploitation. From this viewpoint came a proposal about mestizaje as *cholificación*. The idea was proposed in the 1960s by a highly influential Peruvian intellectual, Aníbal Quijano, currently working on notions of "coloniality of power" that I use in this paper, and mentioned earlier.

Thoroughly interdisciplinary and transpiring politics, in the 1960s anthropology thrived in Peru as discursive fields like "peasants" and "the countryside" proliferated in intellectual discussions in connection with relatively successful rural social mobilizations. Accordingly, social scientists evaluated (accepted or rejected) foreign theoretical influences using a value scale measured by their ongoing political projects. For example: anthropologists working with the State, welcomed "applied anthropology"; adherents to dependency theory followed the work of Eric Wolf and Maurice Godelier, and Clifford Geertz and Lévi Strauss had marginal impact. "Culture" became the concern of a few and marginal anthropologists (whom modernizing Marxists usually considered conservatives) under the leadership of John Murra. In dialogue with Jose María Arguedas, Murra popularized the term "lo Andino" a notion that swiftly interlocked in the Peruvian Indigenista network. In the years to come this notion was to spur an interesting controversy in the United States. It was stimulated by the criticism of Orin Starn, a US anthropologist who blamed Andeanists of political blindness as they had "missed the revolution" that the Shining Path activists organized even in the villages where some of them worked (Starn 1991). While discussion around US Andeanism was not prominent in Peru, the controversy around Arguedas's work has long survived his death in 1968. Identified as the instigator of "lo Andino"—a notion that Lima intellectuals wrongly identified as a-historical—while Arguedas's anthropology was never important (and is currently totally ignored) his literary work continues to be contentious among social scientists and politicians alike.

***All the Bloods*: Arguedas as an Unthinkable Epistemological Revolution**

The controversy that Arguedas's work would eventually provoke came to fruition around his novel *Todas las Sangres,* All the Bloods. In the late 1960s, in a renowned think-tank in Lima, gathered around a round table, a group of prominent social scientists and lite-

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

rary critics discussed the novel for many hours. [9] After a bitter discussion (that was taped, transcribed and published as a booklet in the 1980s) they arrived at the conclusion that the novel proposed an unfeasible political project, one that could even be harmful to the country. The meeting has become legendary in Peruvian academic mythology—it represents a foundational moment of "lo Andino" and of its scientific rejection.

The publication of the novel (in the 1960s) coincided with a period of intense conflict between large landowners and indigenous agriculturalists, known as "peasants" or "Indians." Inspired by a combination of orthodox Marxism, dependency theory, and indigenous politics the movement was successfully seizing hacienda lands.[10] *Todas las Sangres,* while sympathetic to the indigenous struggle, contradicted the leftist intellectuals'-politicians' script. The script (common to Marxist insurgence in Latin America in the 1960s) indicated that the teachings of political activists (the revolutionary vanguard) —as well as activism itself—would transform Indians into peasants. Illuminated by 'class consciousness' these would leave superstition behind to become a part of modern history. (*Compañeros*—partners--was the Spanish term for this political incorporation). *Todas las Sangres* disputed this destiny; it therefore touched a highly sensitive political nerve of progressive intellectuals. Even more significant (and unacceptable!) Arguedas's novel posed an epistemological challenge to the hegemony of the singular modern subject proposed by leftist and conservative projects alike.

Staged in the Andean highlands, the novel describes a bitter dispute between two brothers (Don Fermín and Don Bruno Aragón de Peralta—supreme lords of an Andean region). Fermín incarnates capitalism, progress and reason and wants to modernize Peru. His regional project is to develop a mine. Bruno, instead, is a traditional hacendado; in Arguedas's words, "he considers modernization to be a danger to the sanctity of the spirit" (1965:15). Flanked by both brothers stands Demetrio Rendón Willka, a supervisor of the Indian workers in the novel, and the core of the controversy at the round table. An Indian recently returned from several years in Lima, following the dominant mestizaje-acculturation script, this character should have been purged of superstitious beliefs, and become an ex-Indian, an urbanized *cholo*, scornful of things indigenous. Yet Willka belies the script. Formal education and urbanization had not transformed him (as proposed by the nationalist projects and state policies) for he alternated urban and rural Indian garb with ease and self-identified as "a *literate* comunero; yet *always* a comunero" (ibid: 33). Willka's urban experience had taught him about the power of modern technology, yet he also acknowledged the might of the sun. Rather than the normal hybrid on its way towards modernity, Willka impersonated an oxymoronic hybridity that refused consistency, and was able to think-act in modern and non-modern terms—much like Arguedas himself revealed he did. By the end of the novel Willka's inconsistency crosses the tolerable threshold as it enters the political sphere to organize an unprecedented group of indigenous leaders who, like himself, recognize the power of mountains and rivers. Together they lead a successful insurrection moved both by magic and reason alike. It is reminiscent of the 1855 Santal rebellion in India as Guha (1983) has represented it. Ultimately, *Todas las Sangres* proposed an alternative indigenous social movement, a critical ally of the modern left—yet with an a-modern hybrid logic of its own. Literacy and modern politics were important, yet they had to be selectively used and translated, rather than eradicating, indigenous ways. As in the following quote:

> "In jail one learns a lot. There is a school there. You have to listen to the politicians [political prisoners]. The world is very big. But you do not have to follow what the politicians say. *We have to learn what they teach according to our understanding*— nuestra

> *conciencia. They are different. Nobody knows us*. You will see!! They are going to take you to prison. […]You already know how to sign. In jail you will learn to read. Let them take you to Lima!!" (my emphasis) (1964:307).

In his analysis of the Haitian revolution, historian Michel Ralph Trouillot explained that until recently, the idea of black slaves fighting for the Independence of Haiti was an *unthinkable* event: identified as pre-rational, the idea of black individuals (let alone slaves) defying power, and in their own terms, exceeded historically defined conceptual and political categories (Trouillot, 1992). Similarly, in the 1960s minds of central Limeño intellectuals—many of them earnest socialists, and prominent proponents of dependency theory—there was no conceptual or political place for Rendón Willka. Aníbal Quijano's eloquence in this respect has become legendary in Peruvian social science circles. About Rendón Willka he said:

> "this character is extremely equivocal. I had the impression that he returned from Lima, totally cholificado, and that he was going to proceed in a supremely astute and Machiavellian way, to assume *the political* leadership in the process of peasant insurrection, and therefore he appeared a little in disguise amongst his own. But the next impression, particularly at the end of the novel, suggests that Rendón reintegrates—not totally, not in a fully conscious way, but in some sense he reintegrates—*back* into the indigenous traditional (world)." (IEP, [1968] 2000:59, my emphasis)

The indigenous world and its animated landscape were not the secular arena that modern political organization required. In apparent paradox then, class analysis worked as a "prose of counterinsurgency" (cf. Guha 1988) for even as rural upheavals took place under the leadership of indigenous politicians (probably like Rendón Willka) they were not deemed *indigenous political* movements; they were—for better or worse—only an aspect of the revolutionary struggle led by urban politicians. Hadn't Eric Hobsbawm defined peasants as pre-political actors in an analysis that included Peruvian rural movements in his sample? (Hobsbawm1971[1959]). The notion of "change" promoted by modernizing premises (including those of dependency theory and class analysis) was specific: it moved forward from "past to future," from "superstition" to "historical consciousness." Untamed by this narrative Willka represented the "indianization of politics," a historical impossibility for the sociologists who imagined a different kind of leader:

> "I am currently working in a research on peasant leadership, and last year I traveled to several areas affected by the peasant movement. In every peasant union I have visited, I have found only one indigenous leader. *Indigenous leadership does not exist today* within the peasant movement; it appears as an exception and in isolated fashion, the Indian leader is himself going through a process of cholificación. Thus, I do not think that an indigenous solution to the peasant problem would be feasible." (IEP, [1968] 2000:59-60)

These words-- Anibal Quijano's once again—were the last ones transcribed from the recording of the bitter session. Albeit simplified—given the tension of the session—they refer to a more complex argument published the same year as *Todas Las Sangres,* and soon to become famous as *cholificación*. It described the transformation of Indians into 'cholos', their de-indianization *and* incomplete integration to western ways of being and knowing.[11] Not-

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

withstanding, cholos represented a hopeful national future. They indicated —according to Quijano— "the *emergence* of an *incipient* mestizo culture, the *embryo* of the *future* Peruvian nation if the *tendency* continues." (1965:61). [12]

Even a cursory contextualization of the debate makes clear that Quijano's position was not unique— even though he might have been Arguedas' most articulate and vocal opponent. They were friends and intense mutual interlocutors, thus the discussion was embedded in previous unresolved conversations, the details of which I am not aware of. [13] This does not cancel, however, the conspicuously historicist lexicon Quijano used to define "cholos"—I have italicized the future-oriented words—and which prevailed over the academic and political logic of the period. [14] It saturated the imagination to the point of seducing brilliant intellectuals to irrational historical oblivion: they disregarded that "cholos" (albeit with different labels) had existed (historically "in between" rather than "moving forward") for almost five hundred years (i.e. since the Spanish invasion of the Andes to the 1960s). From the historicist perspective, Demetrio Rendón Willka was not only a contradiction—he was not possible. He emerged from the genealogy of mestizaje only to belie its teleology as it proposed that indigenous ways of being (rather than assuming the forward moving history of modernity or simply 'persisting') had a historicity of its own-- the undeniable power of industrial capitalism notwithstanding. More significantly, Willka's political leadership implied the inclusion of indigenous forms of knowledge in nation-wide projects, and thus challenged the knowledge/power premise of socialism which (as secular communalism) required the "cooperation of rational beings emancipated from gods and magic." [15] Socialist liberating politics required the supremacy of reason and *Todas las Sangres,* perhaps prematurely, opposed this fundamentalism. Arguedas explained: "socialist theory gave a course to my whole future, to all my energy, it gave me a destiny and charged it with might by the direction it gave it. How much did I understand socialism? I do not really know. *But it did not kill the magic in me--Pero no mató en mí lo mágico.* (1971[1968]: 283).

From my viewpoint Arguedas' effort coincides to a large extent—albeit thirty years earlier—with Dipesh Chakrabarty's project to "provincialize Europe." (Chakrabarty 2000) Suggesting that European thought is *indispensable* yet *inadequate* to explore questions of political modernity in the Third World, "provincializing Europe" is a project to explore the possibilities of renewing and transforming currently hegemonic forms of knowing from the margins of modernity. Similarly, Arguedas's public persona (as indicated by his work and testimonials of his life) proposed an alternative politics of knowledge, one that saw the *necessity* of western reason and its *incapacity* to translate, let alone capture or replace, Andean ways of being. Rather than a multi-culturalism tolerant of *all bloods,*[16]--as his politics has been interpreted (Karp 2000)—I want to read Arguedas as proposing multi-ontologism, and a nationalism capable of being general and singular, articulated by reason and magic, both on equal standing, and socialist at that. [17] Beyond prevalent economicist explanations, he exposed that capitalism derived its power from the will of modern epistemologies to replace non-western ontologies with modern forms of consciousness. Thus he unveiled what Quijano (perhaps moved by this encounter, yet almost thirty years after it happened) has theorized as "the coloniality of power," the concept that I explained earlier. In the late 1960s however, with the exception of one, (a linguist called Alberto Escobar) all participants in the *mesa redonda* derided Arguedas's project.

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

The author of *Todas las Sangres* was as complex as the characters he had created (he was like Rendón Willka, he disclosed to one of his colleagues[18]) --and as 'unthinkable' (in Trouillot's terms) for his intellectual interlocutors of the sixties and seventies. The son of a provincial lawyer, and prey of a wicked stepmother, Arguedas was raised by indigenous men and women (Arguedas 1965). In 1969, he told Ariel Dorfman: "For someone who first learned how to speak in Quechua—[as was his case] there is nothing that is not a part on the self." And this ontology equipped him with a way of knowing, he continued in the same interview:

> "I was purely Quechua until my adolescence. I will probably never be able to let go of… my initial conceptualizations of the world. For a monolingual Quechua speaker the world is alive; there is not much difference between a mountain, an insect, a huge stone, and a human being. There are, therefore, no boundaries between the "marvelous" and the "real" … there is neither much difference between the religious, the magical, and the objective worlds. A mountain is god, a river is god, and centipedes have supernatural virtues.""(Dorfman 1970:45)

Similarly, yet on a different occasion, conspicuously rebuking the directionality of mestizaje, he declared: "I am not acculturated," and he reiterated his pleasure at being indigenous and non-indigenous simultaneously: "I am a Peruvian that proudly, like a joyous devil, speaks in Christian and in Indian, in Spanish and in Quechua." (Arguedas 1971:282). The speech has become famous amongst Latin American/ist literary critics who usually see in it a confession of the author's dramatically singular life trajectory, even an explanation of his death by suicide, the evidence of the impossibility of his way of being.

Canonical social sciences would have not tolerated Arguedas's assertions, except probably as someone's beliefs, an object of study of anthropology. Contained by literature [19]—up until *Todas las Sangres* at least—the writer's depictions were considered "magical realism," the literary genre where 'the uncanny' ceases to be such and becomes ordinary. And in Arguedas's life the uncanny was ordinary, not quite an object of study, but part of his subjectivity. "*I know Peru through life*," he used to say (1996 [1965]: 50).With *life* as a source of knowledge and literature as his expressive genre he blurred the distinction between "reality" and "fiction". As such, he described the stories he heard and used as inspiration as: "Absolutely true, and absolutely imagined. Flesh and bones, and pure illusion"(1971: 22). Anthropology would have disagreed: the animated landscape and 'magical' insects belonged to the realm of indigenous beliefs, and as such they were distant objects of study, and vanishing at that. The discipline was politically at odds with Arguedas's views. He wrote in a letter to John V. Murra on November 3, 1967 :

> "Development projects to integrate the indigenous population have become instruments that aim to categorically uproot Indians from their own traditions, … famous anthropologists… preach with scientific terminology about … the inexistence of a Quechua culture, they say that Peru is not bi-cultural, and that indigenous communities have a subculture that will be difficult to uplift to the level of national culture," (Murra and López Baralt 1996:162).

Amidst the modernizing will and the rigid political economy positions that had colored the controversial "Round Table" and that continued to characterize academic thought in the following decades, the concern for Andean cultural aspects eventually fit the label of "lo Andino;" the intellectual community scornfully confined it to anthropology and ethno-history, the sciences of the past; sociologists and economists devoted themselves to the stu-

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

dy of the present. As "lo Andino" circulated in the US and became Andeanism, Arguedas's political suggestion for an alternative form of knowing—which he phrased as the demand for "magic" to be considered on a par with reason, and for "informants" to become subjects of knowledge--disappeared. Through a combination of French structuralism, British functionalism, and US Andean ethno-history, indigenous knowledge eventually became "Andean thought" the object of attention of theoretical explanations that translated the singularities of Andean ways of being into the universal languages of "structures" and "systems." The label described a type of anthropology interested in the *cultural* specificities of the region, the genealogy of which connects with Kroeber's notion of "culture area" and Indigenista political views. Controversial since its inception, "lo Andino" also connected with the pre-existing inter-American mestizaje network in as much as it endorsed Indoamérica as a peculiar cultural-political entity. (Rama 1982) Additionally, it promoted a specifically regional formation that interlocked anthropologies from Ecuador, Colombia, Bolivia, and northern Chile and Argentina.

Indigenous Politics and the End of Mestizaje: *Interculturalidad* or Knowledge as Dialogic Relationship

> "… the gods and other agents inhabiting practices of so-called superstition have not died anywhere. I take gods and the spirits to be existentially coeval with the human, and think from the assumption that the question of being human involves the question of being with gods and the spirits." (Chakrabarty 2000: 16)

I have been told that the discussion that took place at the Round Table did not have immediate repercussions; the tapes where were lost and unearthed several years later, as a consequence of a cleaning spree at the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos. [20] Yet, it was not an ephemeral and isolated incident involving the relationship between two intellectuals. Once the transcription was published as a pamphlet (that has had several editions) the event became a topic of conversations in Peruvian and international academic circles. From my viewpoint, the controversy featured a double, intertwined symbolism. [21] Epistemologically, the discussion expressed the tension between a widespread analytical tradition that "tends to evacuate the local by assimilating it to some abstract universal; and a hermeneutic tradition that finds thought intimately tied to places and to particular forms of life (Chakrabarty 2000: 18). Politically, the discussions in the *Mesa Redonda* were a prelude to the intense disputes that pitted "*campesinista*" (or "*clasista*") political leaders against their "*indianista*" counterparts and that took place all over Latin America in the last decades of the 20th century. (Hale 1994; Yashar 1998) These were part of a process that some have labeled "the return of the Indian" (Albó 1991; Ramón 1993; Wearne 1996), a reference to the increasing political significance of social movements that articulate their demands around indigenous issues and ethnic claims—and that in one way or another challenge simplistic universalizing analytical viewpoints.

Emerging in the early 1970s, organizations like the Colombian CRIC *(Consejo Regional Indígena del Cauca)*, *ECUARUNARI* in Ecuador, the AIDESEP in Peru, and in Bolivia the *Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Katari,* insurged in the political picture of their countries demanding and enacting indigenous citizenship. Since their inception the movements have

proposed projects that defy the teleology of mestizaje. Accordingly, by the 1980s (albeit, like any political organization pervaded by internal ideological conflicts) they managed to install a new nationalist (yet highly heteroglossic) vocabulary. Words like "pluri-ethnic" "pluri-cultural," "pluri-national" reflected their demands for respect of their ethnic singularities. More significant, the new terminology—its very heteroglossia-- challenged the homogeneity that sustained nationalist ideals, and the State formation that implemented them. Indigenous political organizations acquired steadiness and jumped to center stage in the 1990s, coinciding with the 500th anniversary of the arrival of Columbus to the Americas as a symbolic landmark. Perhaps the most unexpected and spectacular event in this respect was the Ecuadoran *Levantamiento Indígena* (the Indigenous Uprising) that shook the country and occupied its capital, Quito, in June 1990. According to Ecuadoran historian Galo Ramón, the Levantamiento "removed the dam that the dominant project for a national State, had created since 1830" (Ramón, 1993: 2).

Predictably (although surprisingly, and still inadmissibly, to some) the political mobilization—the return of the Indian—also meant an "uprising of knowledges" (cf. Foucault, 1980:81-87), the insurrection of ways of knowing defined by science as local, disqualified and illegitimate. Reminiscent of Arguedas´ character Rendón Willka, the original leaders of the movement were indigenous individuals who combined rural and urban experience, as did the movement, as it deftly appropriated modern practices and transformed their logic. Illustrative of this, and since the very beginning, the political demonstrations of the movement boasted Andean ritual iconography and enactments, thus de-secularizing politics, as in Arguedas's novel. Intended as "acts of memory" (cf. Bal 1999) the de-secularized political rituals also defy official nationalist histories, introducing into the political pantheon the presence and ideas of indigenous activists. In Bolivia, for example, as the memory of Tupac Katari was revitalized and politicized, his phrase "I will return transformed into thousands" became central to the indigenous social movement. Túpac Katari was an indigenous insurgent who led an anti-colonial struggle at the end of the eighteenth century; his very memory demanded the restoration of indigenous actions and knowledges in history-- the de-colonization of history. Urged by this need, the social movements produced their own organic intellectuals, indigenous university students and professors decided to "recover and re-elaborate the indigenous past and its forms of historical knowledge" (Ticona 2000: 12). They also established Non Governmental Organizations, like THOA—*Taller de Historia Oral Andina*—which functions in La Paz, (Bolivia) since 1983-1984 and works to "investigate, disseminate, and revitalize the culture, history, and identity of indigenous peoples." (http://www.aymaranet.org/thoa7.html)

Ideologically fragmented into divergent tendencies, the process of re-writing indigenous histories and transforming the political habitus in Andean countries is no panacea. As with any political process, this one has been fraught with power struggles, expressed in essentialisms, factionalisms, and the production of universalizing meta-narratives of its own. (Warren 1998; Ticona 2000; Albó 1994; Van Cott 2000) However, it has certainly burst open evolutionary narratives of indigeneity and advanced a politics of indigenous heterogeneity. Within this novel narrative, Guatemalan-Maya historian Edgar Esquit explains: "Mayaness is what Mayas do, provided that other Mayas recognize it as such" (2000). More importantly, the public (and at times highly influential) presence of indigenous intellectuals has made obvious the possibility for an epistemic border (cf. Mignolo, 2000) where, at ease or awkwardly, rational knowledge cohabits with non-rational knowledge. Organized in social movements, this blend sustains political projects that have as an important ambition to transform the modern State. The most widespread expression

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

of this attempt is currently phrased as *interculturalidad,* a political project through which the indigenous social movement in Ecuador, for example, proposes to create "a plurinational State, that recognizes the diversity of its peoples" (Yumbay 2001:14).

Sustained and produced by political organizations frequently opposed to the neo-liberal policies that states have attempted to implement since the 1980s, (Selverston-Scher 2001) *interculturalidad* belongs to the genealogy of *mestizaje*, yet it works against the coloniality of power/knowledge and the stage-ist narrative of history that sustained the former. Like mestizaje, it produces and is produced by a dialogic academic-political intellectual Latin American network; yet the current network (enhanced by the world wide web) includes indigenous intellectuals/politicians and global institutions-- ranging from funding agencies (like Oxfam America, or the GTZ) to multilateral organizations (the World Bank, for example.) Emerging in the 1970s from discussions about bilingual education programs for elementary schools in Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia, *interculturalidad* (again, like *mestizaje*) is a highly heteroglossic notion. The most widespread Peruvian version is a State-project defined as a "dialogue among cultures" (Godenzzi 2002); still a bio-political attempt to "improve Indians," it revolves around bilingual education (Quechua and Spanish). In Bolivia, the PROEIB Andes, a college for bilingual education teachers in Cochabamba, features a similar mission since 1996 when it was established. In both countries, the main activities are administered and funded by the State through the Ministry of Education, and the participation of indigenous organizations is marginal. Yet *interculturalidad* has also an ambitious version that aims at forging nations—and ultimately a world--characterized by "pacific cohabitation among peoples and cultures, based on justice and equality for all" (Menchú 1998:13). Towards that goal, in Ecuador, "the indigenous movement has had as one of its main political and ideological objectives the construction of *interculturalidad* as a principle that articulates demands to a monocultural State, and that aims at transforming the very conceptualization of the State itself" (Walsh 2002: 115) Its greatest challenge then is to become *a new social relationship* that along with feminisms, environmentalisms, and indigenous social movements can confront former social hierarchies of reason, property, gender, and sexuality and produce a democratic State that "does not hold cultural renunciation as a condition for citizenship" (Tubino 2002).

Seemingly then, in one of its most consequential versions, *interculturalidad* is a novel (and, I would say, deeply subversive) State-making technology *and* an epistemological site for the production of a different kind of knowledge. Related to this, (as well as to the urgency to re-write national history, and to produce histories) the creation of alternative centers of knowledge has been a central concern of indigenous social movements. In Ecuador, the Universidad Intercultural represents such an effort. A document stating its goals describes it as a plural space, (i.e. not exclusively indigenous, or for the production of "indigenous knowledge") "for the creation of novel conceptual and analytical frameworks, able to produce new categories and notions that have '*interculturalidad*' as their epistemological framework." (Istituto Cientifico de Culturas Indigenas, Editorial 2000) The same editorial criticizes modern science as having emerged from a monologue and building self-referential categories "that did not allow the inclusion of "the strange" and "different" within the borders of knowledge." Intriguingly, it concludes with a series of questions:

> "If modern science has been monologic, and if the conditions for knowing are always implicated in the conditions of power, then how can we generate the con-

> ditions for a dialogue? How do we articulate interculturalidad *within the limits of epistemology* and the conditions of knowledge production? How do we contribute to the adventure of knowledge from different sources? *(¿Como aportar a la aventura del conocimiento desde nuevas fuentes?)*" (ibid).

I want to bring these stimulating questions to the arena of anthropology—which the Universidad Intercultural rightly criticizes as having constituted itself by creating and maintaining indigenous peoples as others, and moreover, by excluding their possibility self-understanding. Thus, in finalizing this section, I want to use the opportunity of the questions as a call for an anthropology (most specifically for an ethnographic production) articulated by what I call "relational epistemologies." Inspired by Arturo Yumbay an Ecuadorian politician who described the role of the anthropologists who work with the indigenous social movement as one of *acompañantes* (companions in a dialogic sense—see Yumbay 2001), I see relational epistemologies as a situated knowledge position (cf. Haraway 1991). That position assumes the historical contingency of universal categories and uses them in dialogic process with local thought, while paying relentless and critical attention to processes of translation between both, thus rendering local knowledge visible. Relational epistemologies cancel subject-object positions, and upon interacting with its others as selves who speak, think and know, (cf. Salmond, 1995) they have the potential to create the conditions for the emergence of anthropology in the plural—skilled enough to overcome its Western singularity and become a multiple world discipline. Eventually, beyond its disciplinary boundaries, World Anthropologies could communicate between Western disciplines and other knowledges, *considered as such in their own right.*

Concluding Remarks

At the beginning of this paper I said I would use Arguedas to illustrate the politics of knowledge production as they emerged within the Peruvian intellectual-political community. Yet, I did not mean to present a polarized situation with Arguedas on one side, and recalcitrant rationalists on the other one. This is not how hegemony works—and the hegemony of Western knowledge practices are also apparent in José María Arguedas' work. For in spite of the epistemological challenge that his literature represented, the process through which this writer crafted his anthropology was full of intriguing tensions that reveal his compliance to reason, science, and to the social-academic hierarchies that structured Latin American society in the 1960s and linger today. In his correspondence with anthropologists he repeatedly regretted his "ignorance of theory" and subordinated local anthropology to metropolitan centers of knowledge: "Only those that have been seriously trained abroad can teach here, can conduct scholarly institutions (…) The rest, like me, can do a little in art but in the sciences we're pathetically dead, and some of us accept to remain in our positions because there is no one better yet" he wrote in a letter in1966. [22]

This opinion belongs to the genealogy of knowledge against which *interculturalidad* has insurged. Yet the dynamics and hierarchies of hegemonic knowledge continue to pervade its production. Pamela Calla, a Bolivian anthropologist describes some of the conflicts at the Bolivian PROEIB College where she teaches. Students, she tells us, have coined labels that attest to different forms of being indigenous, which, however, highlight the tensions of being "inferior" in a modern sense, i.e. less educated or less masculine. For example, on one occasion the students classified themselves into "academics" and "fundamentalists." Not surprisingly, the "academics" self-position as a superior group in the tension and is challenged by the "fundamentalists" self-identification as "more indigenous" and therefore

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

more masculine (Calla 2002). Although the latter interpretation challenges dominant stereotypes, whereby "women are more Indian" (De la Cadena 1991) they continue to abide by modern gender hierarchies. Similarly, pressures to be modern *and* indigenous are complex—as in the following quote, by an indigenous leader, whose name I will keep anonymous:

> "Sometimes I feel I am going crazy because I cannot think like an Indian anymore. I fight for Indians among whites, and therefore I have to think like them. I represent indigenous interests within State institutions, but I have not been back in my village for three years. I travel all over the place, and I know I am an Indian. But what kind of an Indian?" (Oliart 2002)

As becomes obvious through these quotes, *interculturalidad* is not a smooth, let alone simply successful, process. Moreover it has not eliminated images of liberal Andeanism in the region. A consequential example should suffice to illustrate the way it thrives in Peru. In 1984, caught in war between the Shining Path and the Peruvian Army, indigenous peasants from the village of Uchuraccay (located in the region called Ayacucho, the epicenter of the violence) collectively killed six journalists who were investigating another massacre that had taken place weeks earlier in a nearby area. Reactions to the event included colonial anti-Indian fears as well as paternalistic pro-Indian attitudes. The Government responded by nominating a commission to investigate the massacre. Led by the internationally famous Mario Vargas Llosa, since the assassins were Indians (not modern Peruvian citizens) the key members of the official group were two anthropologists, rather than lawyers as would correspond to a criminal investigation. Removing the killers from history, the anthropologists explained that the Indians had killed the journalists moved by a combination of ancestral fears and cultural principles.[23] The anthropologists who authored the report are currently key advisors to a governmental effort to transform Peru into a multicultural nation compatible with the economic mission of neo-liberalism. From this perspective, Andeanist multiculturalism continues the legacy of earlier acculturation theories. Indians can successfully become modernized cholos. The current President, Alejandro Toledo—commonly called "el Cholo Toledo" in Peru--represents this possibility, for he is "an ex-Indian with no complexes, and the cool calculating mind of a Stanford, and Harvard academic" with the ability to "understand life from a viewpoint rooted in analytic rigor and scientific information."(Llosa 2000:20). It may be only a coincidence, but the author of the quote is Alvaro Vargas Llosa, the son of Mario Vargas Llosa, the authority in the aforementioned report. (He is also the author of a book entitled *La Utopía Arcaica* in which he discussed Arguedas's work as an anachronistic desire, a reversal of History—and thus not only Utopia, but archaic at that.)

In the 1960s-1970s historicist class analysis worked as a "prose of counterinsurgency" that excluded indigenous revolts from the academically defined field of politics. At the turn of the twenty first century, liberal multiculturalism can work as an "anti-politics machine" (cf. Ferguson 1990) by including within the hegemony of liberalism—or neo-liberalism in this case--circumstances that could reveal and thus politicize everyday narratives of "cultural" or "ethnic" exclusion. The inclusive yet de-politicizing work of multiculturalism works through normalizing education. In Peru, for example, the scandal that would otherwise represent the image of a *cholo* as President of the country, is canceled –or at the very least soothed --by references to Alejandro Toledo's training in the centers of reason, an indication of his adequacy as a modern politician. Arguedas through his intricately fictional

Rendón Willka—and through his own life—questioned normalization through education. He thus rejected the everyday habits of thought of his peers and provoked an intellectual-political scandal that the counterinsurgent prose of modernity could not control. Similarly scandalous are discussions of *interculturalidad* and the presence of indigenous intellectuals in countries like Guatemala, Ecuador—let alone Peru. Siding with the scandalous (for they challenge the simplicity of modernity) and inspired by Arguedas, I want to propose that in as much as indigenous social movements articulate an alternative to modern politics—and the nation-states they sustain--they have the potential to transform the liberal empirical notion of "diversity" currently tolerated in liberal multi-culturalisms into political demands for the citizenship of plural ontologies and their forms of knowledge. As a western social science enabled by non-western locations, anthropology is in the condition to contribute to the visibility of other forms of knowledge. In order to do that, an awareness of anthropological knowledge as a dialogic process of translation—between the local and the universal, between histories and History, between the singular and the general—is in order.

Notes

* Department of Anthropology, University of California at Davis.

1. I use Bakhtin´s notion of dialogue with Foucault´s genealogical perspective to avoid the linear historical narrative that naturalizes the current geo-politics of knowledge.

2. To formulate this notion Quijano (1997) explains that an intertwinement exists between Euro-centric forms of knowledge and current forms of domination throughout the world. The roots of this power formation can be traced back to the sixteenth century when beliefs in the superiority of Christian faith vis-à-vis "paganism," enabled Europe to constitute itself as the epicenter of modernity allegedly the most advanced Historical moment of humanity. Supported by a Euro-centered notion of linear time, the power that supported the Conquest of the Americas and connected the "new" and "old" worlds conditioned a production of knowledge according to which Americans occupied the past and lacked what Europeans had: most specifically, civilization and reason. Installed in the discipline of History, this conceptual alchemy that relentlessly and pervasively reproduced the image that Europe was the future of non-European populations has survived de-colonizing movements, and continues to inform dominant ways of knowing.

3. Influenced by readings of Spengler's *The Decline of the West* (which reached Latin American readers through the Spanish Ortega y Gasset's *Revista de Occidente* (Valcárcel, 1981) Indo-Americanistas proposed that their "ideological and philosophical liberation from trans-Atlantic domination" was to be epistemologically inspired by "a spiritual attitude sympathetic of the past." (García, 1931:33)

4. The most prominent proponent of this regional cum nationalist community is José Vasconcelos accredited as the inventor of the *Raza Cósmica*--the leading slogan of the Mexican nation-building project specifically known as *mestizaje*. The Peruvian Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre founded the *Acción Revolucionaria Americana* (later to become the APRA, an important populist Peruvian party) while in Mexico in 1924, where he worked as a personal aid to Vasconcelos, then Minister of Education. In turn, Haya de la Torre was a conspicuous supporter of the anti-imperial struggles of César Augusto Sandino in Nicaragua, and both subscribed Vasconcelos's brainchild, *Indoamérica*. Similarly, from the other end of the continent the Argentinian Ricardo Rojas crafted the image of *Eurindia*, suggesting a regional identity built from the encounter between indigenous American and

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

European traditions, imported to Argentina by colonial Spaniards, and by Italians, Spanish, and English immigrants in the early 20th century.

5. According to Ralph Beals (1953) Robert Redfield—then at the University of Chicago—coined the term after his visits to Mexico in the 1920s. Similarly, Melville Herskovitz (another of Boas's student and like him interested in American-African population) used "acculturation" upon returning from fieldwork in Surinam (where he might have become in contact with Caribbean notions of *métissage* and *negritude*.) He was working with Redfield at Chicago at that time (Beals, 1953).

6. Also in 1936, Redfield, Herskovitz and Linton wrote "A Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation." (Beals, 1953)

7. Among the first to contest the notion was Fernando Ortiz. Acculturation, he opined, simplified the complex cultural give and take that characterized Latin American society since the arrival of the Spaniards. The mixture was *transcultural*—it operated in multiple directions as the Latin American indigenous, Spanish, and black cultures changed interdependently. (Ortiz, 1940; Rama, 197?; Coronil, 1995). While some literary critics use the notion of *transculturación* to conceptualize Arguedas's position, Ortiz's concept maintains "the notion of levels of cultural development" (Coronil, 1995: xix) that Arguedas's experience and writings oppose.

8. Also a consequence of "culture area," (and illustrative of the international influence of the notion) the Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos was funded in 1948, with Alfred Métraux as an important authority.

9. The think-tank was the *Instituto de Estudios Peruanos*. Created in the early 1960s, by a group of elite sociologists, anthropologists, historians, philosophers, and economists it was among the first institutions to actively seek and receive private funding. It was peculiar in that it combined the legacy of Indigenismo with cutting edge dependency theorists. The elite social position of its members, along with their leftist penchant made the Institute an influential organization, central in the developement of the social sciences in Peru. Luis E. Valcárcel, John Murra, José Matos Mar—all figures related to the Mexican hub of inter-American anthropology—were members of the Instituto.

10. To control the turmoil—and modernize the countryside—the State responded with development plans to "integrate the indigenous population" and in which anthropologists—foreign and local--profusely participated. The best-known efforts were the Cornell-Vicos project, and the *Plan de Integracion de la Poblacion Aborigen*. With the participation of anthropologists from the United States and Peru, they functioned in the 1950s and 1960s.

11. In 1964 Anibal Quijano published "La Emergencia del Grupo Cholo y usus Implicaciones en la Sociedad Peruana (Esquema de Enfoque Aproximativo). It was published in 1980 as "Lo Cholo y el Conflicto Cultural en el Perú" in an edited volume. *Dominación y Cultura* Cited by Guillermo Rochabrún ed. 2000.

12. In "El Movimineto Campesino del Peru y sus Lideres, In 1979 it was published in *Problema Agrario y Movimientos Campesinos*. Cited by Guillermo Rochabrún ed. 2000

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1):13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

13. Aníbal Quijano, personal conversation, August 2003.

14. From similar evolutionary mind frames, some historians and sociologist denied "nationalist consciousness" to peasants. See for example, Heraclio Bonilla "The War of the Pacific and the National and Colonial Problem in Peru," in *Past and Present* 81: 92-118 and Henri Favre "Remarques sur la Lutte des Classes pendant la Guerre du Pacifique" in *Litérature et Societé au Pérou du XIX eme siécle a nos Jours.* (Grenoble, pp. 55-81,1975).

15. The words belong to Enrique Bravo Bresani, an engineer attending the Mesa Redonda, and soon to become an ideologue of the Revolutionary Military Government that in 1968 issued an Agrarian Reform aimed at halting the rural turmoil.

16. Among critics that have commented on the phrase are: Rowe, Escajadillo, Cornejo Polar, Escobar, Lienhard, Spitta, Rama, Larsen, Lambright, Moreiras, Devine

17. The Uruguayan Angel Rama, for example, has likened Arguedas's denial of acculturation to Ortiz's earlier "transculturation"—I presented it in the first section. But Arguedas's testimonial suggestions transcend the bi-directional cultural mixture that Ortiz defined as transculturation. While this notion altered the linearity of acculturation and argued for the cultural specificity of Cuba, it yielded to the superiority of Western civilization. Moreover, it was conceived from a Western way of being and knowing.

18. Interview by Tomás Escajadillo in *Cultura y Pueblo* Año II, No. 7-8, 1965, Lima (quoted in Tomás Escajadillo in *Revista Peruana de Culture, 113-14, 1970 pp.93—94)*

19. In this—and probably other features—Arguedas's work is comparable Zora Neale Hurston's production.

20. David Sobrevilla, personal communication. August, 2003.

21. According to Carmen María Pinilla, the attendants were prey of "a scientificist" position that prevented them from offering a "more open" viewpoint and attitude. The two most prominent opponents of Arguedas were considered among the "most serious" among the nascent social sciences. (107) "En ellos sobre todo el de Quijano sobre cholificaci"on, se apreciaba el uso cretivo y ejemplar de la teoria sociologica para explicar proceses de cambio en el peru, anotando regularidades y haciendo generalizaciones." (107)

22. The letter was addressed to his dear friend, Alejandro Ortiz Rescaniere, who was studying in Paris under the direction of Claude Lévi Strauss, an almost unknown figure in the 1960s Peruvian anthropology circles. (Ortiz Rescaniere, 1996: 209).

23. That these "timeless Indians" were seasonal laborers in coffee plantations, that they went on weekly trips to nearby towns to purchase rice, sugar, kerosene, and cigarettes, that their sons and daughters were servants in the city, and that they were unfortunate actors in the war between the State and the Shining Path were absent in the report.

Journal of the World Anthropology Network 2005, (1): 13-33
http://www.ram-wan.org/e-journal

References cited

Arguedas, José María. 1965. "Voy a hacerles una confesión…". Intervención de José María

Arguedas en el Primer Encuentro de Narradores Peruanos. in Antonio Cornejo Polar's *José María Arguedas Antología Comentada*. Lima: Biblioteca Nacional del Perú. 1996 :47-52.

Arguedas, José María. 1971. *El Zorro de arriba y el zorro de abajo*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada.

Arguedas, José María. 1978. *Deep Rivers*. Frances Horning Barraclough (trans). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Arguedas, José María. 1981. *Formación de una Cultura Nacional Indo Americana* (prólogo de Ángel Rama). México D.F.: Siglo XXI

Albó, Xavier. 1991. "El retorno del indio". *Revista Andina* 9. N°2:299-366

Albó, Xavier. 1994. "And from Kataristas to MNRistas? The surprising and bold alliance between Aymaras and Neo-liberals in Bolivia" in Donna Lee Van Cott (ed), *Indigenous peoples and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Saint Martin's Press. (55-81)

Bakhtin, M. M.1981. *The dialogic imagination: four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bal, Mieke. 1999. *Acts of memory: cultural recall in the present*. Hanover: Dartmouth College/University Press of New England.

Beals, Ralph. 1995. "Acculturation" in Alfred L. Kroeber (ed), *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.**

Calla, Pamela (unpublished). *Negotiating Fundamentalisms: The officialization of Intecultural ans Bilingual Education in Bolivia*. (unpublished manuscript)

Castro, Victoria; Aldunate, Carlos; and Hidalgo, Jorge. 2000. *Nispa Ninchis. Conversaciones con John Murra*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos/Institute of Andean Research.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Coronil, Fernando. 1995. "Introduction. Transculturation and the Politics of Theory: Countering the Center, Cuban Counterpoint" in Fernando Ortiz: *Cuban Counterpoint. Tobacco and Sugar*. Durham: Duke University Press. [1947]

Cornejo Polar, Antonio. 1973. *Los Universos Narrativos de José María Arguedas*.Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada.

Cornejo Polar, Antonio. 1996. *José María Arguedas Antología Comentada*. Lima: Biblioteca Nacional del Perú.

Degregori, Carlos Iván. 2000. *No hay país más diverso. Compendio de Antropología Peruana*. Lima: Red para el Desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Perú.

De la Cadena, Marisol. 1991. "Las mujeres son más indias: Etnicidad y género en una comunidad del Cusco" *Revista Andina* 9, N° 1: 7-29.

De la Cadena, Marisol. 2000. *Indigenous Mestizos: the politics of race and culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919-1991*. Durham: Duke University Press.

De La Peña, Guillermo. 2000. "Mexican Anthropology and the Debate on Indigenous Rights. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropology Association, Washington D.C.

Dorfman, Ariel. 1970. "Conversación con José María Arguedas" *Revista "Coral"* N° 13:43-46.

Esquit, Edgar. (unpublished). *Las Rutas que nos Ofrecen el Pasado y el Presente: Activismo Político, Historia y Pueblo Maya* (unpublished manuscript)

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fardon, Richard (ed.) 1995. *Counterworks. Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London/New York: Routledge

Ferguson, James. 1990. *The Anti-Politics Machine. "Development," Depoliticization and Beaurocratic Power in Lesotho* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972- 1977*. Colin Gordon (ed). Brighton/Sussex: Harvester Press.

Fuller, Norma. 2002. *Interculturalidad y Política. Desafíos y Posibilidades*: Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

Garcia, Uriel. 1937. *El nuevo indio.* 2da edicion. Cuzco: H. G. Rozas. [1930].

Guha, Ranajit. 1983. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India,* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Guha, Ranajit. 1988. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial Indian" in Ranajit Guha and Gayatri C. Spivak (eds), *Selected Subaltern Readings*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (45-86).

Godenzzi, Juan Carlos (com.) 1996. *Educación, e Interculturalidad en los Andes y la Amazonía*. Cusco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas".

Hale, Charles. 1994. "Between Che Guevara and the Pachamama. Mestizos: Indians and Identity Politics in the Anti- Quincentenary Campaign" *Critique of Anthropology* 14 (I): 41-68.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, cyborgs and women: the reinvention of nature*. London: Free Association.

Quijano, Aníbal. 1997. "Colonialidad del poder, cultura y conocimiento en América Latina". En: *Anuario Mariateguiano* vol. IX, N°. 9.

Quijano, Aníbal. 2000. "Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina.En: Edgardo Lander (com.). *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO. 201-246

Radin, Paul. 1913. "The Influence of the Whites on Winnebago Culture" proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 137-45.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1960. *Social bandits and primitive rebels; studies in archaic forms of social movement in the 19th and 20th centuries*, Glencoe: Free Press [1960, c1959]

Instituto Cientifico de Culturas. 2000. Editorial, Boletín ICCI Rimay, Año 2, No. 19, Octubre.http://icci.nativeweb.org/boletin/19/editorial.html

López, Luis. 1996. "No más danzas de ratones grises. Sobre interculturalidad, democracia y educación" in Juan Carlos Godenzzi (ed), *Interculturalidad y educación en los Andes y Amazonia*. Cusco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Lucas, Kintto. 2000. *La Rebelión de los Indios*. Quito: Docutech.

Menchú, Rigoberta. 1998. "La Interculturalidad como Utopía". *Pentukun,* N° 8:11-14

Mignolo, Walter. 2000. *Local histories/global designs: coloniality, subaltern knowledges and border thinking*. Princenton: Princenton University Press.

Murra, John; López-Baralt, Mercedes. 1996. *Las cartas de Arguedas*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad del Perú.

Ortiz, Alejandro. 1996. *José María Arguedas, recuerdos de una amistad*. Lima: PUCP.

Ortiz, Fernando. 1995. *Cuban Counterpoint. Tobacco and Sugar*. Durham: Duke University Press. [1947]

Osterling, Jorge; Martínez, Hector. 1983. "Notes for a History of Peruvian Social Anthropology, 1940-1980" *Current Anthropology* 24(3) 1983:343-350

Patterson, Thomas. 2001. *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, Berg Publishers.

Pinilla, Carmen. 1994. *Arguedas. Conocimiento y Vida*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

Poole, Deborah. 1992. "Antropología e historia andinas en los EE.UU.: Buscando un Reencuentro" *Revista Andina,* N.1, Julio 1992:209-245.

Rama, Ángel. 1982. *Transculturación Narrativa en América Latina,* México D.F.: Siglo XXI.

Ramón, Galo. 1993. *El Regreso de los Runas. La potencialidad del Proyecto Indio en el Ecuador Contemporáneo*. Quito: Comunidec-Fundación InterAmericana.

Rochabrún, Guillermo (ed). 2000. La Mesa Redonda sobre "Todas las Sangres" del 23 de junio de 1965. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú/Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Salmond, Anne. 1995. "Self and Other in Contemporary Anthropology" in Richard Fardon (ed), *Counterworks. Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London: Routledge. (23-48).

Salomon, Frank. 1985. "The Historical Development of Andean Ethnology". *Mountain Research and Development*. Vol 5, N°1, 1985:79-98.

Sartori, Andew. 1998. "Robert Redfiled's Comparative Civilizations Project and the Political Imagination of Postwar America" *Positions* (6)1: 33-65

Selverston-Scher, Melina. 2001. *Ethnopolitics in Ecuador: indigenous rights and the strhegthening of democracy*. Coral Gables, Fla: North-South Center Press at the University of Miami.

Starn, Orin. 1991. "Missing the Revolution: Anthropologists and the War in Peru" in *Cultural Anthropology,* Vol 6 N° 3: 63-91,

Starn, Orin. 1994. "Rethinking the Politics of Anthropology. The Case of the Andes" *Current Anthropology,* Vol 35 N° :13-38,

Ticona, Esteban. 2000. *Organización y liderazgo de aymara 1979-1996*. La Paz: AGRUCO Agroecología Universidad Cochabamba.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past. Power and the Production of History.* Massachusetts: Beacon Press books.

Tubino, Fidel. 2002. "Entre el Multiculturalismo y la interculturalidad: Más allá de la discriminación positiva". In Norma Fuller (ed), *Interculturalidad y Política. Desafíos y Posibilidades*. Lima: Red para el desarrollo de las ciencias sociales (51-75).

Van Cott, Donna. 2000. *The friendly Liquidation of the Past: politics of diversity in Latin America*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Vargas Llosa, Alvaro. 2000. in ABC de Madrid, 17 May 2000: 20.

Vargas Llosa, Mario. 1996. *La utopía arcaica: José María Arguedas y las ficciones del indigenismo*. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Walsh, Catherine. 2002. "(De) Construir la Interculturalidad. Consideraciones críticas desde la política, la colonialidad y los movimientos indígenas y negros del Ecuador". in Norma Fuller (ed), *Interculturalidad y Política. Desafíos y Posibilidades*. Lima: Red para el desarrollo de las ciencias sociales (115-142).

Walsh, Catherine (Forthcoming). "Las geopolíticas del conocimiento y colonialidad del poder. Entrevista a Walter Mignolo". in C. Walsh, F. Schiwy and S. Castro-Gómez (eds), *Indisciplinar las Ciencias Sociales, Geopolíticas del Conocimiento y Colonialidad del Poder* (Quito: UASB/Abya Yala, en imprenta)

Warren, Kay. 1998. *Indigenous Movements and their critics: Pan-Maya activism in Guatemala*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Wearne, Phillip. 1996. *Return of the Indian: conquest and revival in the Ameritas*. London: Cassell, in association with Latin America Bureau (Research and Action) Ltd.

Yashar, Deborah. 1998. "Contesting Citizenship: Indigenous Movements and Democracy in Latin America." *Comparative Politics*, 31(1): 23-42.

Yumbay, Arturo. 2001. "La CONAIE: Referente de Nuestros Pueblos del Ecuador" in Foro Indígena *El Movimiento Indígena como Actor Político: Realidad Sueños y Desafíos* Lima: Coppip-Conacami (11-17).