

The production of other knowledges and its tensions: From Andeanist Anthropology to Interculturalidad?

Marisol de la Cadena
Department of Anthropology
University of California-Davis

What am I? I am a civilized man that has not stopped being, at the core, an indigenous Peruvian. Indigenous, not Indian.

José María Arguedas
(interview with Dorfman, 44)

If anthropology is to become a world, rather than just a western discipline, it must define its 'others' differently, as selves who also speak, think and know.

Anne Salmond, (1995:45)

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 bibliography and funding resources provides 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. To illustrate this Northern characteristic, he mentions an article by a US anthropologist devoted to a balance of Andeanism in which "out of 62 titles mentioned in the bibliography, only two are by Peruvian anthropologists." Degregori critically describes this situation as a *triángulo sin base* (a bottomless triangle), an image according to which knowledge clusters in the top and does not exist in the base. [1] Yet, suggesting that there are many tops to many nested bottomless triangles, 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)

This paper discusses, genealogically, the complex trajectory of an aspect of Latin American anthropology known as Andeanism, and its past and present connections with *mestizaje* and *interculturalidad* respectively. Degregori's claim about the uneven relations between Southern Andeanist Anthropology and its Northern-mainly US-counterpart, motivates my account. Yet, I am more interested in exploring the tensions internal to the Latin American and Peruvian intellectual-political formation. The main contention of this paper is that country based relations of domination and subordination of diverse forms of local knowledges-including (but not limited to) non-western forms of knowledge-are among the conditions that make possible the intellectual hegemony of Euro-American academic-economic formations. Multiple and shifting centers and peripheries, and the ensuing multiple and layered relations of domination and subordination influence what, in time, becomes visible as [universal] anthropological knowledge and what remains invisible as [local] information, both worldwide and in specific countries.

Articulated by a universalist vocation to spread reason and to "assimilate" the non- Historical into History, the modern geo-politics of knowledge both established a center (Euro-America) and exceeded it, thus constituting regional academic formations with their centers (where the institutions of reason accrued) and peripheries where rational logic had a weaker established presence. Consequently, successive and nested power relations among multiple and hierarchically layered formations of local knowledge (western and non-western) organize the conditions of possibility for the intellectual hegemony of an academic-economic core, usually located in the Northern Hemisphere, and considered centers of universal knowledge. Illustrative of this process, in this paper I present a discussion of the genealogical and dialogical trajectory of what became Andeanist anthropology, and its aftermath as liberal multiculturalism and radical *interculturalidad*. [2] Related to a racialized notion of "culture" that enabled elite politicians to discuss the right of Latin American nations to exist as such (de la Cadena, 2000), anthropology in the region emerged entangled with population-making institutions and supported by the state. Significantly, anthropology in the Andes 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 qua knowledge, locates them as pre-modern, and thus sets them up for non co-eval

(cf. Fabian, 1983) forms of inquiry. [3]

I start my story early in the century, when anthropology had not coalesced as a discipline. Then, discussions about "culture" (which had not yet been pulled apart from "race") 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. I end the first section in the 1970s as the notion of "lo Andino" or "Andeanism" emerges. Institutionally linked to "area studies"-and to the US originated anthropological concept of "culture area"-Andeanism has been criticized (in the US and in Peru) as an Orientalist representation of Andean culture, devoid of history and politics and replete with "deep structural thought." (Starn, 1991 and 1994; De la Cadena, 1991) 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*, as a means to produce a national community imagined in all its 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 the internal conflicts that controlled the production of knowledge among Peruvian social scientists. A controversial Peruvian intellectual-and an icon of Andeanism-- Arguedas's life and works were situated at several, highly unusual, crossroads. He was a non-indigenous intellectual and an indigenous Quechua individual, and 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's will to combine civilization with indigeneity (illustrated in the above quote) represented an ontological disagreement with the totalizing power of modernity-its will to homogeneity. Politically, it challenged hegemonic nationalist programs sustained upon the teleology of *mestizaje*: the idea that Indians would be included in the Peruvian nations as *mestizos*, only once they completed requirements for civilization. Theoretically, Arguedas' self-identification can be inscribed as a rejection of historicism, (cf. Chakrabarty, 2000) the conceptualization of historical time as a measure of the "cultural" distance that exists between co-existing Western and the non-Western formations-and in the case of Peru between the Spanish-Christian and the Andean populations. But, most intriguing, and towards the construction of World Anthropologies Arguedas's declared subjectivity represented the search for a different kind of knowledge-one that defined "its others" as selves who speak, think, and know, as urged by Anne Salmond, (in the second introductory quote) and as proposed, more than thirty years later, by indigenous social movements who demand *interculturalidad*, a notion that like Arguedas, rejects both the linear historicities and dominant *mestizaje* projects and installs narratives for the existence of many nations under one (different) state.

The Inter-American Hub of Peruvian Anthropology

Along with José María Arguedas, John Murra (a Rumanian) was another instigator of Andeanism. In 1952, while still a Ph. D. student in Chicago, he went to Jamaica hired by his friend 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. About Ortiz, Murra wrote, "A respectable old guy. We visited the palace where he lived. He wrote very good things. [...] This guy, before the [Cuban] revolution-this was 1952--was already 60 years old. But he was a posthumous hero of the Revolution because he was the first to write about Afro Cuban things. A very good friend of Herskovitz, of Aguirre Beltrán." From Cuba, Murra took a boat to Yucatán, and then a plane to Mexico City where he met the Spanish Angel Palerm, another anthropologist. They spent time talking about "anthropology and the revolution". (Castro et.al ed. 2000:43) The friendship later included the Mexican Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, 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 the United States , Cuba , Mexico , Spain (even Rumania !) underwrites the complexity of anthropological conceptual itineraries between North and South America . It also suggests a regional Latin American intellectual formation existing beyond the boundaries of specific countries. Genealogically, this regional formation connects with an earlier intellectual network that predated anthropology as a discipline.

Articulated by a regionalist-cum-nationalist political emotion, since the late 19th century, this network grouped intellectuals around the idea of Indo-América, an imagined sub-continental community that emerged from a common past, shaped by pre-Columbian and Hispanic religious traditions. [4] 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, some even worked together. [5] 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 in Harvard in the early 1920s, and the Mexican Manuel Gamio obtained his degree in Columbia where he was one of Franz Boas's 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 Boasian, Smithsonian, and Harvard institutions." (Salomon, 198?p.; 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.

Mestizaje was 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. It is not difficult to imagine that navigating the political-academic network that connected both Americas , Latin American nationalist beliefs in mestizaje influenced the conceptualization of "acculturation." [6] Connected to earlier discussions about the influence of "whites" on indigenous cultures in the United States (see P. Radin, 1913), 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." [7] Legitimized as "acculturation" the Latin American political notion of mestizaje made its way to US academia and its research funding policies; similarly, "acculturation" entered the Indigenista network where it encountered adherents and opponents. [8] In the United States the official conceptualization of "acculturation" by the AAA and the creation of Latin American Studies as a field of expertise in the US academia might have influenced each other, as both events occurred almost simultaneously. In 1935, the Social Science Research Council established a sub-committee that promoted investigations on "acculturation studies" (Sartori, 1998, Patterson 2000; Beals, 1953). That same year the ACLS created a Committee on Latin American Studies, which years later became an ACLS-SSRC joint committee. These associations were to coordinate research and resources with the 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, 1941:95)

Starting in this period research funds-particularly from the United States--became a crucial component of Latin American/ist anthropology and of the politics of collaborative research. [9] 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 (and I emphasized the subordinating nouns) to describe the relationship (1985:90). Yet, the 'Peruvian students' were prominent Indigenistas, salient participants in the mestizaje network and influential local politicians and lawmakers in Peru . Their apprenticeship was

specific to the discipline of anthropology then emerging from the Indo American network under the leadership of Luis E. Valcárcel, an Indigenista politician who like the Mexican Vasconcelos was Minister of Education (in 1945).

Concerned with the creation of Peru as a modern nation, connected to a large Latin American political-intellectual network, 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. In 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 with Mexican anthropology and shadowing the development of the discipline 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; in that same decade private institutions from the United States and Europe started funding important think tanks, political-academic interdisciplinary institutions where anthropology had an important say. Like in the rest of the world at this time, the historical linear narrative proposed by modernization theory-in both its rightist and leftist versions--weighed heavily in Peru .

For local anthropological theorization, 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. The latter view was shared by proponents of "dependency theory," the Left-inclined conceptual alternative to modernization theories that substituted "underdevelopment" with an interpretation of Latin America as a regional economic formation, in a "dependent" relationship vis-à-vis Europe and North America that resulted, historically, from colonial relations of domination and capitalist economic exploitation. From this viewpoint came a proposal to label mestizaje with a peculiar local adjective: cholificación.

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 (considered conservatives then) 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 stimulated by a criticism that Orin Starn, a US anthropologist 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 (by suicide) in 1968. Identified as the instigator of "lo Andino"-a notion discredited as romantic Indigenismo--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 a re-known think tank in Lima , gathered in a Round Table, a group of prominent social scientists and literary critics discussed the novel during many hours. [10] After a bitter discussion (that was taped, transcribed and published as a booklet) they arrived to 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 both as 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. [11] *Todas las Sangres*, while sympathetic to the indigenous struggle, contradicted the leftist intellectual-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. Yet 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 described 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 is a feudal hacendado, imbued with mysticism and spiteful of the modernizing inclinations of his brother, especially his mining project. He wants Peru to remain traditional because-in Arguedas's words-"he considers modernization to be a danger to the sanctity of the spirit." (1965:15) Flanked by both brothers stood 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 belied 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 (p. 33)." His urban experience had taught him that modern technology could subdue nature, yet as an indigenous individual, he communicated his conviction to a horse in a conversation where he also acknowledged the might of the sun. [12] Rather than the normal hybrid on its way towards modernity, Willka impersonated an oxymoronic hybridity that refused consistency, and thus was able to think-act in modern and non-modern terms. By the end of the novel Willka's inconsistency had crossed the tolerable threshold, as it entered the political sphere to organize an unprecedented group of indigenous leaders who, like himself, believed in the power of mountains and rivers and led a successful insurrection moved both by magic and reason alike-and thus reminiscent of Guha's analysis of the Santal rebellion (1855) in India. (Guha, 1988) 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 into, rather than eradicate, 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)

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 socialist, 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).

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. Even Eric Hobsbawm-the foreign authority in "rebellions" in those days--had recently deemed peasants as pre-political actors in an analysis that included Peruvian rural movements in his sample. (Hobsbawm, 1971). The notion of "change" promoted by modernizing premises-including those of dependency theory-was replete with historicism: change moved from "past to future." (Accordingly, indigenous leaders 'changed' when they left "superstition" behind and entered political organizations. [13]) Untamed by this narrative Willka was retrograde, it represented the "indianization of politics," a historical impossible 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, 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:??)

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 thesis published in the same year that *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. [14] Notwithstanding, 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." [15]

Even a cursory contextualization of the debate makes clear that Quijano 's position was not unique-he might have been Arguedas' most articulate and vocal opponent. He was also his friend and, although this was not obvious to the reader of the transcribed tapes, the discussion was embedded in previous unresolved conversations. [16] This does not cancel, however, the conspicuously historicist vocabulary Quijano used to define "cholos"-I have italicized the future-oriented words-and which prevailed over the academic and political logic of the period. [17] 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 four hundred years (i.e. since the Spanish invasion of the Andes). 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 national 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." [18] 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. (October, 1968, in *El Zorro*, p. 283).

From my viewpoint Arguedas' effort coincides to a large extent-albeit thirty years earlier-with the project to that Dipesh Chakrabarty has labeled to "provincialize Europe ." (Chakrabarty, 2000) Suggesting the European thought is indispensable yet inadequate to explore questions of political modernity in the Third World, "provincializing Europe " is 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, [19] --as his politics has been interpreted-I want to read Arguedas as proposing multi-ontologism, and a

nationalism capable of being universal and singular, articulated by reason and magic, both on equal standing, and socialist at that. [20] 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. Prey of depression since his youth, Arguedas committed suicide a few years after the Round Table episode. Some pundits identified the discussion as the cause of the writer's suicide.

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 [21]) --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. (1965 [1970] In 1969, he told master writer 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." 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." (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 [22] -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. Shortly before his dead, and referring to the controversy he explained his reasons to write the novel: "I know Peru through life, and hence I tried to write a novel that would show all its (social) hierarchies, to show all its promise, all its burden" (p.50). With life as a source of knowledge, literature allowed him to blur the distinction between "reality" and "fiction," and so he described his work as: "Absolutely true, and absolutely imagined. Flesh and bones, and pure illusion." (*Los Zorros*, p. 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: "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," he wrote in a letter to his then mentor, John V. Murra on November 3, 1967. (Murra and López Baralt, 1996:162) To counteract the anti-culturalist bent dominant among socialist intellectuals Arguedas actively engaged in disseminating (in Lima) Andean indigenous music, and art craft-the study and collection of which he had pursued under the name of "folklore" since the 1940s, when he was an elementary school teacher in a provincial highland town. His very last anthropological project was to compile a country-wide encyclopedia of "Andean folklore" in collaboration with Alejandro Ortiz and John Murra.

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 ethnohistory, the sciences of the past; sociologists and economists devoted themselves to the study 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 it endorsed Indoamérica as a peculiar cultural-political entity. (Rama, 19??) 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: ????)

A shaman blesses the indigenous capture of the Congress [building], and drives the evil spirits away, makes an offer with ayahuasca [a ritual allucin.], and when he finishes the ceremony he flies mentally to remember that a few months ago, five shamans of the Amazon went to the United States to demand the President to revoke the patent for the use of this product. (Lucas, 2000: 114)

I have been told that the discussion that took place at the Round Table did not have immediate repercussion; the tapes where were lost and unearthed several years later, as a consequence of a cleaning spree at the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos. [23] Yet, it was not an ephemeral and isolated incident between two intellectuals. Once the transcription was published as a pamphlet (that has had several editions) the event became a matter of conversations in Peruvian and international academic circles. From my viewpoint, the controversy featured a double, intertwined symbolism. [24] Epistemologically, the discussion expressed the tension between a widespread analytical tradition that "tends to evacuate the local by assimilating it to some abstract universal; [even if it does it in empirical idioms] and an hermeneutic tradition that finds thought intimately tied to places and to particular forms of life. (p.18) (cf. Chakrabarty: 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, 19??; 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 AIDSEP 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 proposed projects that defied the teleology of mestizaje. Accordingly, by the 1980s (albeit pervaded by internal ideological conflicts, like any political organization) 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) In the words of one of its main actors, Luis Macas, former Presidents of CONAIE (Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador), and

the strongest in the country,[25]

Una de las cosas que logró el movimiento indígena fue el reconocimiento de que el Ecuador no estaba habitado solamente por blancos como se había dicho, el resto de la población no existíamos simplemente, o no contábamos para nada. El movimiento indígena del 90 cambió toda la correlación social que había en el país, transformó la percepción que tenía la sociedad sobre lo indígena y se impulsó el reconocimiento de la identidad de los diferentes grupos sociales, los mestizos, los indios, los negros. (Luis Macas, *Cómo se forjó la Universidad Intercultural?* <http://uinpi.nativeweb.org/docs/docs.html>)

Predictably (although surprisingly and still inadmissible 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's character Rendón Willka, the original leaders of the movement were indigenous individuals who combined rural and urban experience-and so 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. In fact, the above quote describes a ceremony that took place in January 2000, in Quito, (Ecuador) and confronted the traditional political class with the idea that modern politics and the gods can go together, like in Chakrabarty's above quote-and in Arguedas's novel. Intended as "acts of memory" (cf. Bal, 1999) the de-secularized political rituals also defied official nationalist histories, reintroducing in 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 18th 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 "recuperar y relaborar el conocimiento histórico del pasado indio ." (Ticona, 2000). 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>)

Politically and ideologically fragmented into divergent tendencies, the process of re-writing indigenous histories has confronted essentialisms and the production of universalizing meta-narratives of its own. (Warren, 1999?; Ticona, 2000; Albó 1994; Van Cott,) However, it has also burst open universal images of indigeness and exposed local forms of being indigenous. Not only specific identity categories (like Maya, Aymara, Mapuche, Ashaninka, Qichua, Shuar, Kayapo) gradually replace the generic "Indian" label. Moreover, individual histories also unveil multiple ways of being Ashaninka or Aymara for example. Within this novel narrative Guatemalan-Maya historian Edgar Esquit (in press) explains: "Mayaness is what Mayas do, provided that other Mayas recognize it as such."

The image of indigenous intellectuals-oxymoronic from the teleology of mestizaje-became frequent in national and international circles, and indeed changed the meaning of both nouns 'indigenous' and 'intellectual'-even beyond the Gramscian sense of "every person is an intellectual." Although still not obvious (and maybe uncomfortable to accept) the notion "indigenous intellectuals," has rebuked ideas of natural opposition between science and magic, reason and non-reason, tradition and modernity, and all others that have sustained conventional modernization projects. Like Arguedas, "indigenous intellectuals" embody epistemic borders (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, along with the homogenizing Universal History that produced it. The most widespread expression of this attempt to produce a different state 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." (Arturo Yumbay, *Conaie-sin fecha*, in *Foro Indígena. El Movimiento Indígena como Actor Político*. -Coppip-Conacami, Peru, p. 14).

Sustained and produced by political organizations that oppose the neo-liberal policies that states attempt 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 stagiist 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, 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 refers to a "dialogue among cultures" (Godenzzi, 2002) and 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." (Rigoberta Menchú, 1998:13) Its greatest challenge is to go beyond traditional understandings of "education" -a population-making technology aimed at "uplifting indigenous groups"-and become interculturalidad para todos, "inter-culturalism for everybody" (López, 1996). 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 the demands they pose to a monocultural state, and that aims at transforming the very conceptualization of the state itself." (Walsh, 2002) 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." (Fidel Tubino, 2002).

Seemingly then, in one of its most consequential versions, interculturalidad is a State-making technology and an epistemological site for the production a different kind of knowledge. Re-structuring the old State requires recalling the Liberal consensus that sustained it and the social order (based on colonial gendered hierarchies of civilization and income) that it maintained. Eventually, the most ambitious account of interculturalidad requires recalling the institutions of knowledge that created and sustained the Liberal, modern consensus. Related to the earlier urgency to re-write national History, 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." (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 conditions 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?) (Editorial, 2000)

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, on 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 Ecuadoran 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 assumes the historical contingency of universal categories and uses them in dialogic process with local thought, while paying relentless critical attention to processes of translation between both, thus rendering local knowledge visible. [26] 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 gave 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 1966. [27]

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 is challenged by the "fundamentalists" self-identification as "more indigenous" and therefore 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:

A veces siento que enloquezco porque ya no logro pensar mas como indio ! Lucho por los indios entre los blancos, entonces tengo que pensar como blanco. Represento los intereses indigenas en organismos del estado, pero hace tres años que no vuelvo a mi aldea. Viajo por todos lados, y yo se que soy indio. Pero que indio ? (Oliart, 2002)

As becomes obvious through these quotes, interculturalidad is not a smooth, let alone simply successful, process. Moreover it has not canceled 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. [28] 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." 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 21st century, liberal multiculturalism can work as an "anti-politics machine" (cf. Ferguson 1990) by including within the hegemony of liberalism-or neoliberalism 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 soothed at the very least--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.

Bibliography

- Arguedas José María, No soy un aculturado pp. 281-283 en *El Zorro de ARRIBA Y EL Zorro De Abajo*, Editorial Losada, Bs. As. Argentina
- Intervención de José María Arguedas. Primer Encuentro de Narradores Peruanos. (1965) In *Revista Peruana de Cultura*. Casa de la Cultura del Peru, vol 13-14. pp. 9-16, 1970)
- Deep Rivers. Translated by Frances Horning Barraclough University of Texas Press. Austin Texas.
- Formación de una Cultura Nacional Indo Americana -prólogo de Angel Rama. Buenos Aires, Siglo XXI,
- El Zorro de Arriba y el Zorro de Abajo Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1971
- Albó Xavier "And from Kataristas to MNRistas? The surprising and bold alliance between Aymaras and Neo-liberals in Bolivia" In *Indigenous peoples and Democracy in Latin America* , Donna Lee Van Cott, ed. 55-81, New York: Saint Martin's Press
- Beals, Ralph "Acculturation" *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory* Edited by Alfred L. Kroeber, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955
- Chakrabarty Dipesh, *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 2000)
- Coronil Fernando "Introduction to the Duke University Press Edition, Transculturation and the Politics of Theory: Countering the Center, Cuban Counterpoint" in Fernando
- Ortiz Cuban Counterpoint. *Tobacco and Sugar* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995 [1947])
- Cornejo Polar Antonio *Los Universos Narrativos de José María Arguedas* en Editorial Losada Buenos Aires.
- Degregori Carlos Iván *No hay país más diverso. Compendio de Antropología Peruana* (Lima: Red para el desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Perú, 200)
- Dorfman Ariel "Conversación con José María Arguedas" en *Coral-Valparaíso*, no 13, Oct. 1970 pp. 43-46
- Fardon R. ed. *Counterworks. Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. (London: Routledge, 1996)
- Ferguson James *The Anti-Politics Machine. "Development," Depoliticization and Beauocratic Power in Lesotho* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990
- Foro Indígena *El Movimiento Indígena como Actor Político: Realidad Sueños y Desafíos* Lima : Coppip-Conacami, 2002
- Foucault Michel *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* Sussex harvester Press, Ltd. (1980)
- Fuller Norma *Interculturalidad y Póitica. Desafíos y Posibilidades* (Lima, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2002)

La Universidad Intercultural. In Editorial Boletín ICCI-RIMAI 19 (2000) <http://icci.nativeweb.org/boletin/19/editorial.html>

Lucas Kintto La Rebelión de los Indios (Quito; Docutech, 2000)

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

Ortiz R. Alejandro José María Arguedas, recuerdos de una amistad-PUC, 1996

Osterling Jorge P. and Héctor Martínez Notes for a History of Peruvian Social Anthropology, 1940-1980 in Current Anthropology 24(3) 1983 pp. 343-350

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

Pinilla, Carmen María Arguedas Conocimiento y Vida. PUC

Quijano Aníbal "Colonialidad del poder, cultura y conocimiento en América Latina" in Anuario Mariateguiano vol. IX, no. 9, 1997

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

Rama Angel Transculturación Narrativa en América Latina, Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1982

Ramón Galo El Regreso de los Runas. (Quito Comunidec-Fundación InterAmericana, 1993).

Revista de Cultura Peruana 13-14. Homenaje a José María Arguedas. Casa de la Cultura, Lima

Salmund Anne. "Self and Other in Contemporary Anthropology" pp. 23-48 in Counterworks. Managing the Diversity of Knowledge Richard Fardon ed. (London: Routledge, 1996)

Salomon Frank "The Historical Development of Andean Ethnology" in Mountain Research and Development 5(1): 79-98, 1985

Sartori Andrew "Robert Redfield's Comparative Civilizations Project and the Political Imagination of Postwar America in Positions 6:1 1998, pp. 33-65

Starn Orin "Missing the Revolution: Anthropologists and the War in Peru" in Cultural Anthropology 6(3): 63-91, 1991

Starn Orin "Rethinking the Politics of Anthropology. The Case of the Andes" Current Anthropology 35(1):13-38, 1994

Tubino Fidel " Entre el Multiculturalismo y la interculturalidad: Más allá de la discriminación positiva" en Fuller Norma Interculturalidad y Política. Desafíos y Posibilidades (Lima, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2002)

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

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

Yumbay Arturo "La CONAIE: Referente de Nuestros Pueblos del Ecuador" in Foro Indígena El Movimiento Indígena como Actor Político: Realidad Sueños y Desafíos Lima: Coppip-Conacami, 2002 pp.11-17

[1]	Julio Cotler-a political analyst well known in Latin American circles-- introduced the idea of "baseless triangle" to the Latin American debates known as dependency theory in the 1960s. It described a situation in which political participation in matters of the state, happened only among official representatives-the top of the triangle-while subaltern groups remained indifferent to it. (Cotler, 196?)
[2]	I use a Bakhtin's notion of dialogue with Foucault's genealogical perspective to avoid the linear historical narrative that naturalizes the current geo-politics of knowledge
[3]	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 16th century when beliefs in the superiority of Christian faith vis-à-vis "paganism," enabled Europe to constitute itself as the epicenter 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.
[4]	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)

[5]	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 European traditions, imported to Argentina by colonial Spaniards, and by Italians, Spanish, and English immigrants in the early 20th century.
[6]	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).
[7]	Also in 1936, Redfield, Herskovitz and Linton wrote "A Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation." (Beals, 1953)
[8]	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, 1977; 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.
[9]	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.
[10]	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 development 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.
[11]	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 Integración de la Población Aborigen. With the participation of anthropologists from the United States and Peru , they functioned in the 1950s and 1960s.
[12]	In a conversation with his boss's horse, 'Lucero' Rendón declares: "Lucero! (.) The truck will bury you. Yikes "Lucero!" He is more powerful than you and than man, for the man has made it. Man is winning. Lucero, you better say good-bye. The sun prefers you, makes you big, but it is useless." (p. 120).
[13]	Political instruction was to eradicate Indianness. Arguedas was familiar with this narrative. In the novel Don Fermín--the modernizing brother--explains Willka's irrational behavior: "He has not received political instruction in Lima . He continues to be superstitious, and Indian still" (p.100)
[14]	In 1964 Aníbal Quijano published "La Emergencia del Grupo Cholo y sus 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.
[15]	In "El Movimiento Campesino del Peru y sus Lideres, (1965 p. 61) In 1979 it was published in Problema Agrario y Movimientos Campesinos. Cited by Guillermo Rochabrún ed. 2000
[16]	Aníbal Quijano, personal conversation, August 2003.
[17]	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 Littérature et Société au Pérou du XIX ^{eme} siècle a nos Jours. (Grenoble, pp. 55-81, 1975).
[18]	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.
[19]	Among critics that have commented the phrase are: Rowe, Escajadillo, Cornejo Polar, Escobar, Lienhard, Spitta, Rama, Larsen, Lambright, Moreiras, Devine
[20]	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.

[21]]	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)
[22]]	In this-and probably other features-Arguedas's work is comparable Zora Neale Hurston's production.
[23]]	David Sobrevilla, personal communication. August, 2003.
[24]]	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. (p.107) "En ellos sobre todo el de Quijano sobre cholificaci"on, se apreciaba el uso creativo y ejemplar de la teoría sociologica para explicar procesos de cambio en el peru, anotando regularidades y haciendo generalizaciones." (p.107)
[25]]	Conaie replaced the former ECUARUNARI in the 1980s.
[26]]	For an example of relational epistemologies see Galo Ramón El Regreso de los Runas. (Quito Comunidec-Fundación InterAmericana, 1993). The book consists of a series of articles that the author produced in complex dialogue with participants in the indigenous social movement in Ecuador .
[27]]	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).
[28]]	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.

Fuente: Construyendo nuestra interculturalidad http://interculturalidad.org/numero03/2_04.htm#ftn025