Detail from *Piedras Negras* Relief 2, Classic Maya, Guatemala. The stone sculpture, on display in “Encounters with the Americas,” uses both the more precise Long Count and the cyclical Calendar Round to record dates. Here, a text using the Calendar Round.
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Uses of History

ROSEMARY A. JOYCE

Rosemary A. Joyce is Associate Professor of Anthropology at Harvard and Assistant Curator of Precolumbian Archaeology in the Peabody Museum. A cum laude graduate of Cornell University (1978), she received the Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana in 1985. Prof. Joyce was a Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology, University of Illinois, Urbana before coming to Harvard as Assistant Curator of Precolumbian Archaeology in 1985. She was appointed Assistant Director of the Peabody Museum the next year and held that position until joining the faculty as Assistant Professor in 1989. She became Associate Professor in 1991. Professor Joyce is the author of Cerro Palenque: Power and Identity on the Maya Periphery (Univ. of Texas Press, 1991), based on fieldwork she conducted in the Uluá Valley of Honduras from 1979-1983, and the editor of Tatiana Proskouriakoff’s Maya History (Univ. of Texas Press, 1993). She is currently directing field research in both the Uluá and Cuyampa Valleys in Honduras. During the 1992-93 academic year she was a Fellow at the Bunting Institute, Radcliffe College, writing about relations between men and women in Prehispanic Mesoamerica. The book, Ambiguity and Difference: Gender and Power in Prehispanic Mesoamerica, will be published by the Univ. of Texas Press, Austin.

History and historical narratives

“Year 13-Rabbit. The Spaniards were sighted off the coast. Year 1-Reed. The Spaniards came to the palace at Tlayacac. When the Captain arrived at the palace, Motecuzoma sent the Cuetlaxteca to greet him and to bring him two suns as gifts. One of these suns was made of the yellow metal, the other of the white. The Cuetlaxteca also brought him a mirror to be hung on his person, a gold collar, a great gold collar, a great gold pitcher, fans and ornaments of quetzal feathers and a shield inlaid with mother-of-pearl.”

The Mexican scholar, Miguel Leon-Portilla, has described the document from which this passage comes as possibly the earliest native account of the events of the Spanish conquest of Tenochtitlan, written in the native Nahuatl within a decade of the surrender of the Aztec capital to Cortes (1962: 154-155). This document initiated a vigorous tradition of native writing, using the newly introduced European writing system, in which Aztec and Maya presented their own understandings of the events leading to the new sixteenth-century society in which they lived.

These documents have served generations of students of Mesoamerican culture as sources for historical reconstruction. But serious difficulties have been noted in attempting to reconcile the events and chronology provided in multiple sources. Attempts at reconciliation have involved discrediting some accounts in favor of others (Gillespie 1989:xxi). Aztec scholar Nigel Davies (1987:37) has said, “To deny the right to adopt at times a selective approach is really to deny the right to contemporary scholars to seek any reconstructions at all of Mesoamerican history.” But what is meant here by history? I take as my beginning point the problematic status of the use of a concept of history from the European tradition which rests uneasily in the Mesoamerican post-hispanic and pre-hispanic documentary traditions.

‘History’ is a concept with at least dual significance even in the European tradition. Taken at face value, history might be defined as the flow of events in a chronological sequence. But at the same time, histories are written documents of a particular type. Roland Barthes (1967) has drawn attention to the basic rhetorical status of historical documents, as narratives in which the signifier—the text itself—is fused with the signified—the events to which it apparently points. The historical text is the reality with which we have to contend, since it is impossible to return to the past and directly witness the events it describes.

That historical texts, as stories, are narratives with literary qualities is acknowledged by contemporary historians. Hayden White (1978) argues that the incontestable literary nature of historical texts—as the products of particular authors, whether anonymous or known—creates a necessary kinship between these narratives and others usually conceived of as purely literary. The distinction between historical and literary narratives is not, in fact, the apparently common-sensical one of truth and fiction, assumed and pursued by Mesoamerican scholars working with Aztec and Maya texts. Rather, historical narratives emphasize sequence in a particularly powerful way, highlighting events earlier on the time stream as causes of those placed later in time (Gossman 1978). Historical narratives, in short, are the prime means of explaining the present as a logical outgrowth of what has come before, providing grounding for the actions of today in tradition.

History and time

In Mesoamerica, the sources scholars have are historical narratives, texts
that associate selected events as cause and effect by linking them in time. Shifting the emphasis from events to their written representation requires more attention to the way that time and action are presented in Mesoamerican documents regarded as historical. In the sixteenth-century florescence of Central Mexican writing that followed the fall of the Aztec empire, two distinct approaches took form. In one, spatial images—maps—were annotated with brief captions describing actions, linked together by paths of footprints. These *mapas* present a single, simultaneous presence of multiple actions related as a sequence of movement through space. The second major category of 'historical' texts were annals, like the selection from the *Anales historicos de la nacion mexicana* with which I began.

These accounts, whether pictographic or European-style texts, list selected actions year-by-year, employing native calendars and occasionally relating them to the common era introduced by the Spanish.

These two forms of historical documents both manifest aspects of native chronological understanding, in which cycles of time continually recur, and the character of events at each moment is linked fundamentally to previous and future recurrence of the cyclical moment. There is no single movement from a determined beginning point to an end in Mesoamerican cyclical time. A kind of simultaneity, represented spatially in *mapas* by the visibility of all actions at once, is implied. As Susan Gillespie (1989:xxiii) notes, "Since cyclical time is reversible and repeatable, in the Aztec worldview, history belonged to the past and also to the future." She goes on to argue that the histories produced in the sixteenth century took as their concern the grounding of the dramatic changes introduced by the Spanish Conquest in cycles of destruction and recreation of native rulership, crafted retrospectively to create relationships of likeness between the Spanish actors and indigenous counterparts. The most widely known outcome of this creation of history is the identification of Cortes with the divinity Quetzalcoatl, which Gillespie (1989:201-207) shows took place through a process of post-conquest writing extending throughout the sixteenth century. The placement of the Spanish Conquest as an event in
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unbroken cycles of Mesoamerican time through the creation of written accounts using the European alphabet and native languages was not limited to Central Mexico.

Time in Colonial Maya histories

"This is enough about the being of Quiché, given that there is no longer a place to see it. There is the original book and ancient writing owned by the lords, now lost, but even so, everything has been completed here concerning Quiché, which is now named Santa Cruz (Tedlock 1985:227)."

So ends a colonial Maya manuscript, the Popol Vuh. Held by Quiché Maya in Chichicastenango, highland Guatemala, it was copied just after 1700 by a Spanish cleric. Dennis Tedlock (1983) has demonstrated the importance in the text of the Popol Vuh of a series of terms that refer to the writing itself, such as "Ancient word", spatially situated in "this place called Quiché", embodying the content of an earlier "book" described as being carried by the lords from the point where the sun rises—the spatial and temporal origin par excellence. Tedlock notes that the authority claimed for the Ancient Word is manifest in "signs", physically present now while "giving evidence of past or future events". Not the chronological sequence of causation, but the atemporal existence of phenomena, support the reality of what the book relates.

In the Popol Vuh, time is marked by the dawn of the true sun, by the movements through the world of the ancestors of the Quiché, and by the generations of Quiché Lords:

"Three Deer and Nine Dog, in the twelfth generation of lords... were ruling when Tonatiuh arrived. They were hanged by the Castilian people. Tecum and Tepepul were tributary to the Castilian people. They had already been begotten as the thirteenth generation of lords, Don Juan de Rojas and don Juan Cortes, in the fourteenth generation of lords, are the sons of Tecum and Tepepul (Tedlock 1985:224)."

The narrative moves through and past the Conquest by incorporating events in individual lives. The time of the Popol Vuh is what Michael Herzfeld (1991:10) calls "social time, the grist of everyday experience. It is above all the kind of time in which events cannot be predicted but in which every effort can be made to influence them. It is the time that gives events their reality, because it encounters each as one of a kind."

The Books of Chilam Balam, parallel posthispanic narratives written in Yucatec Maya and held in Maya communities, extend their record of events into the nineteenth century. They employ both the Maya cyclical calendar of the katun, periods of roughly 20 years, combined to form a cycle of about 256 years, and the introduced Christian calendar. The manuscript from Tizimin, collected by a parish priest, ends with calendrical tables relating European and Maya calendars through to 1809. It begins with the record of the years from 1593 to 1596, and the orderly continuation of the Maya calendar: "On 13 Kan, the first of Pop, the plate of the katun 5 Ahau was taken (Edmonson 1982:69-70)."2 The actions that took place during each cycle are subordinated to prophecy and notation of the character of time periods. The time frame of the Books of Chilam Balam approximates what Michael Herzfeld (1991:10) calls monumental time, which

"is reductive and generic. It encounters events as realizations of some supreme destiny, and it reduces social experience to collective predictability. Its main focus is on the past—a past constituted by categories and stereotypes."

What is predictable in the Books of Chilam Balam is the repetition in the past of certain kinds of events which in turn provide models for the expected events of the future. The inevitability associated with prophecies for each katun period presents even the great disruptions of the sixteenth century as encompassed within a body of politically controlled knowledge. This monumental time, the "bureaucratic measure of history" "is no less managed than social time, and its proprieties are no less contingent on access to sources of power; but it has the power to conceal the props of its management and to insist on the rightness of its results (Herzfeld 1991:7-9)."

Each of these posthispanic Maya texts is the product of dialogue between Mesoamerican and European concepts. A fundamental intertwining of native and European time frames, and presumably concepts of time and history, is evident. Nowhere is this more dramatically illustrated than in a parallel text to the Popol Vuh, in which origin myths featuring a creative feathered serpent and Hero Twins are replaced by the following creation account:

"This is the second chapter of the great story, called the Earthly Paradise of the yellow and green earth. Listen, now I will tell you what the Earthly Paradise was like. In the first chapter, I am going to say only how the order of the days was determined in which were accomplished the works of the Great Lord God. The first of these is Sunday. On it, the Great Lord God created a great light (Carmack and Mondloch 1983:167)."3

Composed, on internal evidence, around 1554, first revealed by the Maya of Totonicapan in 1834 during a court case, the surviving manuscript is dated to approximately 1650-1725. It proceeds, following a retelling of the Biblical creation, to the same tales of the wanderings of Quiché rulers that end the Popol Vuh. Both books functioned in the colonial environment to place contemporary society in a secure sequence extending inevitably from creation, creating through historical narrative an impression that current political action was the consequence of these pasts.
Page from the "Titles of Ebtun," 176th c. Yucatan. This is a schematic map from a book of land titles. Labels for direction (chikin, west, at top; and nohol, south, at extreme left) and for parcels of land (u kax, his woods) are written in Yucatan Maya using the Roman alphabet.

Time and history among the Classic Maya

Can we begin to approach an understanding of Mesoamerican notions of time and narrative action before their encounter with European concepts in the sixteenth century? Interpretations of Classic Maya texts over the past 30 years have yielded material that has recently been hailed as the grounds for understanding Classic Maya history: “the Classic inscriptions dealt with real people in historical time... as a result, outline biographies of named individuals can now be elucidated and dynastic histories constructed for a number of sites (Hammond 1991:1).” I turn now to a consideration of just how those Classic texts present time and people’s actions, to attempt to better understand what the concept of history might mean when applied to prehispanic peoples of Mesoamerica. The focus of Classic Maya texts is creation of a time framework, into which notation of event is inserted⁴. The most precise time and space parameters apply to the creation of texts and the monuments that carry them, not to the actions of individuals, which often float in cyclic time. The elaboration of dates on Classic Maya monuments reflects the deliberate manipulation of different concepts of chronology, all cyclic, but some providing such large cycles that they effectively create the linear time scale needed to present events as causes and effects. This apparently linear scale, the Long Count, combines katuns to form periods of roughly 400 years, the baktuns, that were numbered and counted from an arbitrary starting date. The opening dates on monuments often record not only this scale, but the placement of the day in the cyclical solar year, 260-day divinatory cycle, lunar cycle, and as many as three other counts of days or nights. The overdetermination of these opening dates in up to half a dozen cycles dominates texts and dominated scholarship for most of the twentieth century. The actions commonly recorded following this elaborate dates primarily refer to the dedication of the monument itself.

The Classic Maya made monumental time a literal reality. In contrast, within texts, human actions that made up social time are tied to the shorter

Continued on page 7
Featured in "Encounters with the Americas", these models present changing Maya public architecture. The building from Classic Period Rio Bec, above, uses effigies of temples as towers on a single-story palace or administrative building, invoking the authority of religion in the service of politics. The coastal site of Tulum, below, was still inhabited when the Spanish arrived and continued to be an important ritual site for Maya into the twentieth century.
cycles of the solar year, 260-day divinatory calendar, and the Calendar Round based on their combination. Any date in the Calendar Round recurs every 52 years. Calendar Round dates at best determine placement of an event within a single life-span. The particularity of Calendar Round events is provided by the names of the actors, the locations of their actions, and incidental notation of kinship and political relations between individuals.

An example illustrates the effects of Classic Maya time scales on historical narratives. A long text on the top of Copan's Altar Q has been read as recording with Calendar Round dates actions by two lords of Copan (Schele and Freidel 1990:310-312, 484). Because the initial dates are not tied to the Long Count calendar, their references float, collapsing the distinction between the lifetime of what modern scholars believe is a man from the fifth century, and the ruler whose presence in monumental time is fixed in the ninth-century through a reference to the cycle of katuns. The actions recorded for one man become precedents for the other only with the resolution of the social time of the Calendar Round with the monumental time of the katuns. This resolution is effected by the images on the side of this monument. On the main face, two figures face each other, seated on the names of the lords mentioned in the text. The left figure extends a hand holding a baton toward the right figure, the ninth-century lord. The left-hand figure acts as the earlier cause of the right-hand figure's assumption of authority in this visual narrative.

By omitting the fixed Long Count dates for the earlier ruler, the monument incorporates cyclicity in history as precedent. The two men are shown interacting, as if contemporaries, not separated by irreversible chronological time flow. Repeatedly in Classic Maya monuments, events acceptable as the actions of living humans and those requiring supernatural ability are presented together, living and dead or supernatural individuals are depicted acting in concert, and the identity of human and supernational actors is blurred through the repetition—the cycling—of both time and space coordinates. Time continually unfolds in repetitive cycles. These instants are firmly anchored in time and space as monuments, denying the impossibility of anchorage of particular action. Human and supernatural actions cited in Classic Maya texts accrete to the time cycle and spatial location materialized in the monument, adding to its specific character. By association with the Long Count, used beyond the bounds of Maya society and across different Maya polities, the character created by the encapsulatization of social time within monumental time not only could transcend the individual Maya city-state, but Classic Maya culture itself.

**History Today**

The post-hispanic production of documents which both Spanish and natives viewed as histories attempted to bridge the gap between two understandings of human action in time. Mesoamerican people brought to this attempt a long tradition of conscious manipulation of different kinds of time in the creation of historical narratives. The task of creating causality out of the debris of particular events of the Spanish Conquest entailed the production of new forms, the mapas and lienzos, unlike any of the documents for which we have prehispanic evidence. Like prehispanic historical texts, they represent order as an outgrowth of cycles of time.

The authors of colonial Maya and Central Mexican texts began traditions which continue to this day. Paul Sullivan (1989:205), writing of his experience among the contemporary descendants of the politically independent Maya who occupied eastern Yucatan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, describes the importance to one man of a book called the "History of God", wherein are told how the world will end and what signs will announce the Final Days... a small notebook now lacking the deerskin covers it once had, filled with a continuous hand-written text... I recognized it as the so-called Chilam Balam of Tuzik." The owner of this manuscript remembered his father reading aloud to him from the book. Like all the posthispanic writings of Mesoamerican authors, it combines Christian and indigenous elements in a new whole in an utterly new cultural tradition that changed and continues to change as necessary to ensure survival.
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Library in Paris, as presented by Miguel Leon Portilla (1962:128). I have changed 'Canestalk' in this translation to 'Reed', the term more commonly used to translate the Nahuatl day name.

I have adapted the translation, simplifying the grammar. My references to beginning and ending are to the original manuscript, which the translator rearranges in this edition to form a more linear story.

My translation from the Spanish text.


This section of an eighth-century stairway from Copan, Honduras, is part of the longest Classic Maya inscription recovered to date. Built following a military defeat, the stairway included statues of earlier rulers, each dressed as a successful warrior, and recounted the tradition of long lineage of the site’s rulers.

The Boston Globe said “Encounters with the Americas” is “...a splendid and intriguing exhibit” Far from limiting its scope to the time of Columbus’ voyages, “Encounters” explores features of unique civilizations that developed before 1492 exemplified by the Classic Maya and Postclassic Aztec, and presents the continuing struggle of contemporary Maya, Panamanian Kuna, and Amazonian native groups to maintain their values and autonomy. Assoc. Prof. Rosemary Joyce was the curator of the exhibition and Richard Ricco was the designer. “Encounters” opened in December 1992.
Begona Aretxaga has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology. A native of San Sebastian, Basque Country (Spain), she earned a B.A. (1983) in Philosophy and Psychology and an M.A. (1985) in Social Anthropology at the Universidad del Pais Vasco, Spain. She holds a second M.A. (1988) and the Ph.D. degree (1992) in Cultural Anthropology from Princeton University. Before coming to Harvard Prof. Aretxaga was a Lecturer at Princeton and taught at the Centro de Mujeres de Equia, San Sebastian, Basque Country.

Prof. Aretxaga’s research interests concern cultural and political conflict and violence and gender politics in Basque society and Northern Ireland. “Women and Death in Basque Culture: The Funerals of Radical Nationalism,” was the title of her M.A.

Carole A. Stein Mandryk has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology. A graduate of Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin (1976), she received the M.A. degree in Anthropology and Museum Training from George Washington University, Washington, D.C. (1981), and the Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada (1992). Prior to coming to Harvard Prof. Mandryk taught at Grant MacEwan Community College in Edmonton, at the Univ. of Edmonton, and at George Washington Univ. She was a Research Assistant at the Univ. of Alberta for the Project for the Study of Material Culture (1983-84) and the Paleoenvironmental Studies Laboratory (1984).

Prof. Mandryk has taken part in a number of research projects, both in
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Ofer Bar-Yosef, George Grant MacCurdy and Janet G.B. MacCurdy Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology, gave a paper entitled “The origins of agriculture – a global view," at a symposium at the School of American Research, Santa Fe, May 1992. At the Workshop on Pre-Pottery Neolithic Chipped Lithic Industries, held at Frei Univ., Berlin, Prof. Bar-Yosef gave a paper on “Form, function and numbers in the neolithic industries of the Levant," March 1993. “ Later Pleistocene art in the Near East – why so little?,” was the title of a paper presented at What Means This Art?, a symposium at the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, St. Louis, April 1993. Recent publications by Prof. Bar-Yosef include: “Mousterian adaptations – a global view,” Quaternaria Nova 1, Proceedings of the International Symposium “The Fossil Man of Monte Circeo – Fifty Years of Studies on the Neandertals in Latium,” A. Bietti and G. Manzi, eds. 1992; “The role of Western Asia in modern human origins,” in Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, London, 337, 1992; “The excavations in Kebara Cave, Mt. Carmel,” with B. Vandermeersch et al, in Current Anthropology 33, 1992; “Modern humans in the Levant,” with B. Vandermeersch, in Scientific American, 268, 1993; and The Lithic Assemblages of Ubeidiya – A Lower Paleolithic Site in the Jordan Valley, co-authored with N. Goren-Inbar,Qedem 34, Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew Univ., Jerusalem, 1993. Prof. Bar-Yosef writes of his current research, “The study of modern human origins, that according to the biological evidence probably came out of Africa some 300,000-60,000 years ago, led me to organize an archaeological excavation in a deep cave in Israel and take part in a Turkish project with the hope of reaching better dating for the archaeological remains and perhaps even to uncover additional fossils.” In the first (1992) season of excavations at Hayonim Cave in western Galilee, the team of Israeli, American, and French archaeologists exposed Mousterian layers more than 150,000 years old. At Ankara University, Prof. Bar-Yosef took part in the analysis of lithic assemblages recovered from Karain and Oluzuni, cave sites in southwestern Turkey. The results from Karain, a major paleolithic site, indicate that the Mousterian deposits are older than 100,000 years.


Assistant Professor Kenneth M. George has been awarded a grant from the Aga Khan Trust for Culture to conduct a collaborative research project on Islamic art in contemporary Indonesia. He began the project in January 1992 in Bandung, West Java, and will spend another five months in Indonesia during 1993-94. He discussed some of his research findings at the A.A.A. annual meeting in San Francisco in the panel on Syncretism. In March he took part in a conference on Other Indonesians: Regional Fates of the Language of State, sponsored by the Council on Southeast Asian Studies at Yale Univ. “Music-making, ritual, and gender on a Southeast Asian hill society,” was published in Ethnomusicology 37,1, 1993.

William W. Howells, Professor Emeritus, received the Charles Darwin Lifetime Achievement Award at the annual meeting of the American Assoc. of Physical Anthropologists in April. The Biological Anthropology Section of the A.A.A. established the W.W. Howells Prize for an outstanding book in physical anthropology in his honor. The first award will be made in 1993. Prof. Howells was a participant at the Discussion Meeting on The Origin of Modern Humans and the Impact of Science-based Dating held at The Royal Society, London, in February 1992. He is the author of Getting Here: The Story of Human Evolution, Compass Press, Washington, D.C., 1993, and is currently doing research on ethnic identification of crania from measurements with special reference to prehistoric cases.

Associate Professor Rosemary A. Joyce conducted excavations in Yoro, Honduras in June and July, 1993. Her previous field season (1992) produced the first series of radiocarbon dates for Middle to Late Formative (ca. 900 BC-AD 200) in Yoro. She was co-director of salvage excavations in Ulua Valley,

Professor Arthur Kleinman was elected Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, appointed Honorary Member of the Societa Italiana Medicina Psicosomatica, and elected Honorary Lifetime Fellow of the American Academy of Physicians and Patients. He delivered the keynote lecture at a meeting of the Mental Health Assoc. of Taiwan in December 1992. During the 1992-3 academic year he gave invited lectures at Columbia Univ., S.U.N.Y. at Stony Brook, McGill Univ., and the Univ. of Toronto. He delivered three lectures in May 1993, at the Univ. of Capetown, the Univ. of Florence, and at the annual meeting of the Societa Italiana Medicina Psicosomatica. Two of Prof. Kleinman's books have been translated into Japanese: Patients and Healers in the Context of Culture and The Illness Narrative. The latter will also be published in French. Chronic Fatigue Syndrome was published by the Ceba Foundation, Symposium #143, 1993, chaired by Prof. Kleinman and Stephen Strauss of N.I.H.

C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, Stephen Phillips Professor of Archaeology, and Dr. Fredrik T. Hiebert organized an archaeological project at the site of Anau in Turkmenistan. The excavations, which will take place over five years, represent the first collaboration between American and Turkmen archaeologists. Prof. Lamberg-Karlovsky continues his involvement in the excavation of Scythian tombs in the Altai Mountains of southern Siberia. A team from National Geographic visited the Altai this summer and is planning to produce a one hour television special and publish an article on the Scythians of the Altai. Ancient Civilizations, The Near East and Mesoamerica, co-authored with J.A. Sabloff was published in Russian by Nauka Press, Moscow.


Professor David Maybury-Lewis received an honorary Doctor of Science degree from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He was the recipient of the Rene Dubos Environmental Award from the Rene Dubos Center of New York in 1992. He and his wife received the A.A.A. Distinguished Service Award for having founded and built up Cultural Survival. "Civil society and the state in the postmodern world," was the title of an invited lecture at the Veerstichtung Foundation, Univ. of Leiden, 1992. At plenary sessions of the International Conference of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, held in July-August 1993 in Mexico City, he presented papers entitled "Societies, evolution and globalization," and "The anthropology of ethnicity." At a session organized for Cultural Survival he gave a paper on "The State against ethnic federalism in the Americas." Recent publications by Prof. Maybury-Lewis include: "Desenvolvimento e direitos humanos: a responsabilidade do antropologo," in Desenvolvimento e Direitos Humanos, Arantes, Ruben and Debert (eds.), Univ. Estadual de Campinas, Brazil,
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Professor Sally Falk Moore organized, introduced, and was a discussant on a panel on “Moralizing States,” at the American Ethnological Society meetings held in Memphis in March. Her research and consultations regarding economic development, democratization, state and civil society in the Sahelian states of West Africa, have resulted in participation in a number of conferences in Europe and Africa. She was in France in September as an invited consultant of the Club de Sahel in Paris, for a meeting on State and Civil Society in the Sahel, and participated in a conference on Institutional Economics and Agriculture at the Centre de cooperation internationale en recherche agronomique pour le developpement (CIRAD) in Montpellier. She attended a workshop in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, in connection with coordinating a field project among PNGT/CILSS/Club du Sahel, and was an invited consultant at a conference sponsored by OECD/OCDE/Club du Sahel on Preparer l’avenir du Sahel au sein de l’afrique de l’ouest, held in Berlin. Emerging Norms of Justified Intervention was the topic of a conference at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, at which Prof. Moore was a participating discussant. “Law and migration” was the title of the inaugural lecture she gave on the occasion of the opening of the Research Institute at the Faculty of Law of Erasmus Univ. in Rotterdam in October 1992. The title of an invited lecture delivered in October to the Department of Agrarian Law, Agricultural Univ. of Wageningen, The Netherlands, was “The ethnography of the present and the analysis of process.” “State and civil society: some questions about West Africa,” was the title of a guest lecture at the M.I.T. Special Program for Urban and Regional Studies of Developing Areas, April 1993. Recent publications by Prof. Moore include: “Treating law as knowledge: telling colonial officers what to say to Africans about running ‘their own’ Native Courts,” in Law and Society Review, Vol. 26, 1992; “Changing perspectives on a changing Africa: the work of anthropology,” in Africa and the Disciplines, R.H. Bates, ed., Univ. of Chicago Press, 1993; and “The ethnography of the present and the analysis of process,” in Assessing Cultural Anthropology, R. Borofsky, ed., McGraw Hill, New York, 1993. In January and February Prof. Moore made a field trip to Kilimanjaro, Tanzania to update longitudinal data and monitor demographic change, emigration from the mountain by the younger generation, shift of the political climate since the end of the cold war, and ongoing local village-community life.


David Pilbeam, Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences, and Director of the Peabody Museum, was elected a foreign Associate of the National Academy of Sciences in 1992. He was a discussant at the Symposium on Miocene Hominooids at the annual meeting of the American Assoc. of Physical Anthropologists held in Toronto in April. Recent publications by Prof. Pilbeam include: “A 16-Ma record of paleodiet using carbon and oxygen isotopes in fossil teeth from Pakistan,” with J. Barry, L. Flynn, M. Morgan, et al, in Chemical Geology, 94, 1992; “Preliminary correlation of continental sediments of the Kom basin, northern Cameroon,” with L. Flynn, in Aspects of Non marine Cretaceous Geology, 1992; The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Human Evolution, with co-editors, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992. Prof. Pilbeam’s field program in Pakistan is ongoing and future plans include projects in Uganda and Kenya.

Dr. Parker Shipton, an Institute Associate at the Harvard Institute for International Development and Lecturer in the Dept. of Anthropology, spent the summer of 1992 on field research in The Gambia. He continues his long-term research on economic and symbolic culture in western Kenya, focusing on entrenchment and obligation, including credit and debt, among agropastoral Luo-speakers and neighboring peoples. This historically oriented research explores how new financing involvements with the World Bank and other international agencies relates to older, and culturally more meaningful, ways of borrowing and lending. Many of these are nonmonetary and deeply embedded in kinship, involving exchanges that last longer than generations. In this and parallel research on The Gambia and other countries, Dr. Shipton is...

Nikolaas J. van der Merwe, Landon T. Clay Professor of Scientific Archaeology did fieldwork in the Orinoco delta, jointly with the Instituto Venezolanos de Investigaciones Científicas, on the isotopic ecology of mangrove forests. His multi-isotope technique of source tracing rhino horn continues at both Harvard and the Univ. of Capetown. “Carbon isotopes and the diet of fossil hominids at Swartkrans and Sterkfontein,” was the title of a paper delivered at the Third International Congress on Human Paleontology, held in Jerusalem in August 1992. Prof. van der Merwe organized a panel on The Origins and Dispersal of Maize in the Americas at the annual meeting of the American Assoc. for the Advancement of Science held in Boston in February. He delivered a paper entitled “Stable isotope measurements as evidence for maize consumption.” “Isotopic evidence for subsistence base of Formative cultures at Valdivia, Ecuador,” was the title of a paper given at the Society for American Archaeology in St. Louis in April. At the annual meeting of the Assoc. for the Study of Marble and Other Stones Used in Antiquity, May 1993, he gave a paper on “Isotopic source tracing of marble statues in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.” Recent publications by Prof. van der Merwe include: “Stable carbon isotope ratios of wood charcoal during the past 4000 years: anthropogenic and climatic influences,” with E. February, in South African Journal of Science, 88, 1992; and “Light stable isotopes and the reconstruction of prehistoric diets,” in Proceedings of the British Academy, 77, 1992.


John W. M. Whiting, Professor Emeritus and Prof. Beatrice Whiting were honored at a special session at the annual meeting of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research held in Santa Fe in February 1992. At a symposium organized by Ruth and Lee Munroe, twenty papers were presented by former students “...illustrating the influence of the Whiting tradition on their research. The large and diverse set of topics indicates something of the range of interests pursued by the Whitings over the past half century.”

Gordon R. Willey, Bowditch Professor of Central American and Mexican Archaeology and Ethnology, Emeritus, delivered a paper entitled “The segmented state and the Lowland Maya,” at a conference in Cleveland in October. In March he gave a lecture on “Some reflections on Maya archaeology” at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. The third edition of A History of American Archaeology, with J.A. Sabloff, was published in 1993. Prof. Willey is currently concerned with recent trends in American archaeology as these relate to the “Processual-Postprocessual debate.” One of this country’s most widely known and respected scholars, Prof. Willey’s prolific writings have reached a wide academic audience. His latest book, however, will not be found amongst archaeological or anthropological tomes. Just published by Walker and Company, New York, Selena is a novel! Ellen Nehr, author of Murder Ad Lib writes, “Selena is an amazingly well constructed first novel; the well-defined characters, plot twists and speed of action keep the tension level building.”

Visiting lecturers

Throughout the academic year a number of scholars from the U.S. and abroad gave lectures in the Department of Anthropology and at meetings of the Peabody Museum Association.

Prof. Isaac Gilead, Ben-Gurion Univ., delivered a lecture on “Gerar and the chalcolithic of southern Israel.” The feeding experiment,” was the title of a lecture by Dr. Stanley Ambrose, Univ. of Illinois. Dr. Naama Goren-Inbar, Hebrew Univ., Jerusalem, presented a lecture on “Gesher Benot-Yaacov: A waterlogged lower paleolithic site in the Jordan Valley.”

Prof. Andrew Laas, Mount Holyoke College, gave a lecture entitled “On the way to (Czech) history.” “Deferral of interests: industry and Islam,” was the title of a talk by Dr. G. G. Weiz, Boston Univ. Dr. Rafael Lopez-Valdes, Cuban Academy of Sciences, Havana, lectured on “African-based religions in Cuba.”

Dr. Robert Trivers, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz, gave a lecture on “Issues in sexual selection theory with an emphasis on fluctuating asymmetries.” Dr. Lucy Jacobs, Univ. of Utah, spoke on “Behavioral ecology and neurobiology of spatial learning.”

Prof. Deborah Lyons, Univ. of Rochester, spoke on “Toward an economics of gender in archaic Greece.”

Prof. James Howe, M.I.T., gave a lecture on “Carnival, devils, and foreign devils: ambivalence in Kuna revolutionary drama.” “The dream of Joseph: debates about identity among Paciﬁc artists,” was the title of a talk by Dr. Nicholas Thomas, The Australian National Univ., Canberra.

Dr. Valeri Gulaiev, Institute of Archaeology, Moscow, spoke on “Sytho-Sarmatian archaeology: new ﬁnds from south Russia.” Dr. Andrew Sillen, Univ. of Capetown, lectured on “Trace elements and isotopes in archaeology.” Dr. Gennadi Afenavsiiev, Institute of Archaeology, Moscow, gave a talk on “Russian studies on remote sensing in archaeology.”

“Archaeology and behavioral ecology of early hominid subsistence in the Olduvai Basin, Tanzania,” was the title of a lecture by Dr. Robert Blumenschine of Rutgers Univ. Prof. Robert Sharer, Univ. of Pennsylvania, was the Gordon R. Willey Lecturer. The title of his lecture was “The deﬁnition of sacred space at Copan, Honduras.”

Prof. Patti-Jo Watson, Washington Univ., gave a lecture titled “Current perspectives on archaeological method and theory.” “Cyclic, demographic and settlement processes in the highlands of the southern Levant,” was the topic of a talk given by Dr. Israel Finkelstein, Tel Aviv Univ.

Prof. Loring Brace, Univ. of Michigan, spoke on “The origins of modern human form: where, when, and why?”

Dr. Mariella Pandolfi, Univ. of Rome, lectured on “Rethinking Italian anthropology: the ideology and poetic of suffering in a southern Italian village.” “Child language acquisition: evolutionary precursors and psychological constraints,” was the title of a lecture by Dr. Anne Fernald, Stanford Univ.

Academician Anatoli Derev’anko, Institute of Archaeology, Novosibirsk, Siberia, lectured on “New archaeological research in Siberia.”

Dr. George Erdosy, Univ. of Toronto, lectured on “Archaeological survey in the desert oasis of the Kara Kum.” Dr. Ronnie Ellenblum, Hebrew Univ. spoke on “Frankish rural settlements in Crusader Palestine.” Dr. Yuri Bereznik, Institute of Archaeology, St. Petersburg, lectured on “New archaeological research in Turkmenistan: excavations at Ilgynally-depe.” “Anasazi Cannibalism” was the title of a lecture by Prof. Christy Turner, Arizona State Univ.

Dr. Bruno Frohlich, Smithsonian Institution, gave a talk on “The International Bering Strait Archaeological Project: 1973-1993.”

Dr. Begona Arexaga, Princeton Univ. gave a lecture titled “Dirty protest: symbolic overdetermination and gender transformation in Northern Ireland.” “Writing oral histories: the construction of textual and spoken authority among the Belga tribes of Jordan,” was the topic of a lecture by Dr. Andrew Shryock, Univ. of Michigan.

Dr. Catherine Cuthill, Univ. of Virginia, spoke on “Djibouti: a place in and out of time.” Dr. Eric Gable, Sweet Briar College, gave a lecture on “Women ancestors and alterity among the Manjaco of Guinea-Bissau.” Dr. Leon Abrahamian, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Academy of Sciences of Armenia, lectured on “National movements in the former USSR as festivals: an anthropological perspective.”

Prof. William Fash, Northern Illinois Univ., gave a lecture entitled “Archaeological perspectives on settlement and statecraft in ancient Mesoamerica.” “Dr. Moawiyah Ibrahim, Yarmouk Univ., Jordan, lectured on “Excavations at Sar el-Jisr, Bahrain;” Floyd Lounsbury, Professor Emeritus, Yale Univ. gave the Tatiana Proskouriakoff Memorial Lecture. The title of his lecture was “Interpretation of evidence bearing on the calendar-correlation question.”

Dr. Thomas Dowson, Univ. of Witwatersrand, South Africa, gave a talk on “Bushman rock art and changing perceptions of southern Africa’s past.” Dr. Marina Cords, Columbia Univ., spoke on “Reconciliation after aggression in nonhuman primates.” “On the brain bases of speech, syntax and some aspects of cognition: data from the study of Parkinson’s disease,” was the title of a talk by Dr. Philip Lieberman, Brown Univ.

Dr. Rafael Jose de Menezes Baston, The Federal Univ. of Santa Caterina, Brazil, gave a lecture on “Music in Lowland South America: The Upper Xingu – ideas for a comparative research project.” “Central problems of Inca Kinship,” was the title of a lecture by Prof. Thoms Zuidema, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Dr. Yosif Garfinkel, Univ. of Jerusalem, lectured on “Neolithic village site archaeology in Israel.”

Prof. David Grove, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, gave a lecture on “Sacred landscape and social identity at Chalcatzingo: is it Olmec?” The title of a lecture by Prof. Stephen Houston, Vanderbilt Univ., was “Deciphering Maya politics: evidence from archaeology and hieroglyphs.”

Dr. Lynette Norr, Univ. of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign, gave a talk on “Coastal adaptations in Lower Central America: settlement and subsistence from 5000 B.C. to A.D. 1500.”

**Dr. John Blitz,** Bowdoin College, delivered a lecture on “The ‘vacant’ ceremonial center: ancient Alabama and modern Educador.”

**Dr. Theodore Goebel,** Univ. of Alaska, Fairbanks, gave a lecture on “Peopling of the Americas: new views from the north.”

**Dr. Heidi Lennstrom,** Univ. of Minnesota, spoke on “Paleoecology: human variability of the ice-free corridor,” was the topic of a talk given by **Dr. Carole A. Stein Mandryk,** Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton.

**Prof. Michael Jackson,** Indiana Univ., delivered a lecture entitled “On anthropological knowledge.”

**Prof. R.A.L.H. Gunawardena,** Peradeniya Univ., Sri Lanka, gave a lecture on “Historiography in a time of ethnic conflict: constructions of Sri Lanka.”

**Prof. James Carrier,** Univ. of Virginia, gave a talk on “Occidentalism in Marcel Mauss: gift and commodity systems.”

**Museum curators and staff**

“The recently discovered Iceman” was the topic of a lecture by **Dr. Torstein Sjovold,** Univ. of Stockholm.

**Dr. John Parkington,** Univ. of Capetown, lectured on “More a stack than a sequence: reading deep cave deposits.” “Civilization and health,” was the title of a lecture by **Dr. Mark Cohen,** S.U.N.Y., Plattsburgh.

**Dr. Marie Jeanne (Monni) Adams,** Associate in the Peabody Museum, was an invited participant at the inaugural symposium, Secrecy in African Art, held in the new Museum for African Art in February in New York City. Recent publications include: “Didi Raffia cloth, Cite d’Ivoire,” in *African Arts*, Vol. 25, 3, 199. “Women’s art as a gender strategy among the We of Canton Bo, Ivory Coast,” in *African Arts*, 1993. Dr. Adams is researching small figure sculptures in the Peabody Museum’s African collections. She will spend several weeks during the summer in France in connection with her ongoing research and collecting of documents on the Wenion.

**Clemency Coggins,** Research Associate, is Adjunct Professor in the departments of Archaeology and Art History at Boston Univ. In July 1992 she was sent to Guatemala by the U.S. Cultural Property Advisory Committee to prepare a report on the status of archaeology and of archaeological sites in the state of Peten, in view of a current U.S. ban on the importation of antiquities from Peten. Prof. Coggins gave an invited lecture in honor of the work of George Kubler upon his receiving the George Silver Award at the Latin American Studies Assoc. meetings, Los Angeles, Sept. 1992. She presented a paper entitled “Metaforas para la mujer antigua Maya,” at the Association Tikal, Guatemala City, March 1993. Recent publications include: “Pure language and lapidary prose;” in *New Theories on the Ancient Maya*, Univ. Museum., Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1992; “The age of Teotihuacan and its mission abroad,” in *Teotihuacan, City of the Gods*, San Francisco Museums of Art, 1993.

**Genevieve Fisher,** Registrar, attended the mid-year meeting of the New England Registrars Assoc. held at the Rhode Island School of Design, Providence. A candidate for the Ph.D. degree from the Univ. of Pennsylvania, she is currently writing her dissertation on “Political Units and Archaeological Groupings: A Test Case from Early Anglo-Saxon England.”


**Barbara Isaac** organized a symposium, “The Dynamics of Museum Ethics: Native Peoples and Ethnographic Collections,” held at Harvard on April 30th. Her “Comments on O’Connell’s Review of Barbara Isaac’s ‘The Archaeology of Human Origins: Papers by Glynn Isaac’” appeared in the *Journal of Field Archaeology* 1992, Vol. 19. Mrs. Isaac was an invited speaker at the annual meeting of the American School of Oriental Research held in San Francisco in November. She gave a paper entitled “Plio-Pleistocene Archaeology in Georgia.” She was the recipient, with **Prof. Ofer Bar-Yosef,** of an L.S.B. Leakey Foundation grant entitled “Plio-Pleistocene Geology and Archaeology in Georgia” and will conduct a field survey in the former Soviet republic in August 1993.

**Doris Zemurray Stone,** Honorary Curator of Central American Archaeology and Ethnology, was one of three recipients of the 1993 Harvard Alumni Medal. The medals are given by the Alumni Association in recognition of extraordinary service to the University on
Commencement afternoon, June 10th. In announcing the awards the Harvard Gazette (4/30/93) wrote, “Doris Zemmurray Stone is a jewel in the crown of Radcliffe and Harvard. Her contributions to the University have been many, beginning with the establishment (with her brother) of the Samuel Zemmurray Jr. and Doris Zemmurray Stone Radcliffe Professorship, the first chair at Harvard designated for a woman professor in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Mrs. Stone has been honorary curator of Central American Archaeology and Ethnology at the Peabody Museum since 1989. In connection with the Museum she has authored scientific monographs and popular volumes. Her generosity has made exhibits possible for both the Mesoamerican and North American halls. Mrs. Stone has also served as a trustee of Radcliffe and a member of the advisory committee to the Bunting Institute. In 1982 she received the Radcliffe Alumnae Recognition Award.”

Dr. John Stubbs, Repatriation Staff, wrote Salvage Archaeology in Harvard Yard: Summer 1992, a Museum publication of excavations conducted last summer. The objects are now part of the Peabody Museum’s collections. He delivered a paper at the Mid-South Archaeological Conference in June 1992 on “Chickasaw settlement patterns in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.” He is currently conducting some archaeological salvage in Harvard Yard associated with the renovations of the freshman dormitories.


Aretxaga from page 9


Stuart, from page 9

Mr. Stuart has taken part in archaeological and/or epigraphical research at Copan in Honduras; at Arroyo de Piedra, Rio Azul, and Najtunich in Guatemala; at Lacantun and Usumacinta Rivers, Mexico and Guatemala; and at Palenque, Mexico.
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A New World Dilemma: The Indian Question in the Americas

DAVID H. P. MAYBURY-LEWIS

David H.P. Maybury-Lewis is Professor of Anthropology at Harvard and Curator of South American Ethnology in the Peabody Museum. Born in Hyderabad, India (modern day Pakistan), he grew up in England. He holds a B.A. in Languages and Literature from Cambridge University, an M.A. in Social Sciences from the University of Sao Paulo (Brazil), and a doctorate in Anthropology from Oxford. He came to Harvard in 1960.

Prof. Maybury-Lewis has had a long association with Latin America and particularly with Brazil. He and his wife, Pia, have made various field expeditions to the Indian peoples of Central Brazil and have carried out research on problems of social change and development in that country.

In 1972 Prof. Maybury-Lewis and his wife founded Cultural Survival, an organization that defends the rights of tribal and indigenous societies world wide. He served as president until this year. He continues to serve on the Board of Cultural Survival and as a Senior Fellow and the supervisor of the Center for Cultural Survival, which he also founded, the research arm of the organization.

Throughout his distinguished career Prof. Maybury-Lewis has written many scholarly articles. His books include: The Savage and the Innocent, Akwe-Shavante Society, Dialectical Societies, The Indian Peoples of Paraguay, The Prospects for Plural Societies, The Attraction of Opposites: Thought and Society in the Dualistic Mode, and Millennium: Tribal Wisdom and the Modern World, a companion volume to a ten-part television series of the same name which he hosted.

At the beginning of his remarkable quartet, Memories of Fire, the Uruguayan novelist Eduardo Galeano gives this vivid description of the invasion of the Americas:

He falls on his knees, weeps, kisses the earth. He steps forward, staggering because for more than a month he has hardly slept, and beheads some shrubs with his sword. Then he raises the flag. On one knee, eyes lifted to heaven, he pronounces three times the names of Isabella and Ferdinand. Beside him the scribe Rodrigo de Escobedo, a man slow of pen, draws up the document.

From today everything belongs to those remote monarchs: the coral sea, the beaches, the rocks all green with moss, the woods, the parrots, and these laurel-skinned people who don’t yet know about clothes, sin, or money and gaze dazedly at the scene. Luis de Torres translates Christopher Columbus’s questions into Hebrew:

“Do you know the kingdom of the Great Khan? Where does the gold you have in your noses and ears come from?”

Then he tries his Arabic, the little he knows of it: “Japan? China? Gold?”

The interpreter apologizes to Columbus in the language of Castile. Columbus curses in Genovese and throws to the ground his credentials, written in Latin and addressed to the Great Khan. The naked men watch the anger of the intruder with red hair and coarse skin, who wears a velvet cape and very shiny clothes.

This was arguably the most extraordinary meeting in the history of humankind. It reunited two portions of humanity that had been separated for forty thousand years, ever since the inhabitants of the Americas had lost touch with their Asiatic forebears. The world—both the New World and the Old World—was dramatically changed forever.

Clearly, the quincentenary of such an extraordinary event should be remembered and marked, but how? In my view the event deserves to be remembered as an occasion for sober reflection rather than celebration, much as the Holocaust in Nazi Europe is something we are constrained to remember without celebration. The analogy comes to mind because for more than a month the invaders set out to massacre the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas (sometimes they did, sometimes they did not) but because the immediate consequences of the European invasion constituted the greatest demographic disaster in human history.

We know that the Europeans brought with them a gold fever that astounded the Indians and a ruthlessness that many of the indigenous peoples discovered too late, but they also brought worse. They let pestilence loose in the Americas. In the words of a Maya chronicler, “Before... they [the Indians] had no sickness; they had no aching bones; they had no burning chest; they had no abdominal pain; they had no consumption; they had no headache. At that time the course of humanity was orderly. The foreigners made it otherwise when they arrived here.” The writer continues in despair, “Let us therefore die! Let us therefore perish! For our Gods are already dead!”

Many of the Indians did die. It is estimated that by the end of the sixteenth century the indigenous population of the Americas had been cut in half. The survivors faced a future of slavery, serfdom, or forced labor, unless they were remote enough to

Continued on next page
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defend themselves at the margins of European settlement.

The Spaniards were only the first of the European invaders to set about enslaving the Indians, and they did so with occasional misgivings. Bishop Bartolomé de las Casas was so appalled by the cruelties of the conquerors and the decimation of the indigenous populations that he devoted his life to the Indian cause. His monumental Historia de las Indias was a searing indictment of the conquerors and is often thought to have been the work that first exposed the leyenda negra, or black legend, of Spanish cruelty in the New World.

Many people feared that the quin-centenary of Columbus's arrival in the Americas would reopen the debate over the leyenda negra, with Spanish celebration of their heroic exploits being countered by indigenous insis-tence on the cruelties of the conquest. Fortunately, that debate has been largely avoided, and I do not propose to renew it here. I see little point in arguing over the relative cruelty of these as opposed to those conquerors. The whole process was shot through with cruelty and injustice, with suffering and, yes, heroism. That is what makes it so difficult to evaluate or even to treat dispassionately. Yet I have just called for sober reflection on the conquest, and this is what I shall try to give you.

It seems to me that an important and essential aspect of that reflection has to be a consideration of what has happened to the indigenous peoples of the Americas since 1492. They tend to be the forgotten peoples of the New World. How often are they mentioned in the news stories that most of us read? In all our current preoccupation with Mexico, how often do we read about the large indigenous population of that country? When the US administration was focusing on Central America, we learned little about the circumstances of the indigenous populations of the region. Even the indigenous majority in Peru received scant attention in our newspapers until it was mistakenly reported that the Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) movement was an Indian uprising.

Yet the treatment of indigenous peoples since the conquest is more than the Americas' original sin, which can now be conveniently forgotten. It is a matter of more consequence that has at times profoundly influenced the nature of modern American societies. At the very least it is intimately related to, and diagnostic of, the forces that have shaped those societies. Consider, for example, the colonial debates over the treatment of Indians. The Spanish and Portuguese monarchs occasional-ly passed laws protective of the Indians and their communities. Such laws usually resulted from a combination of factors. The arguments of people like Las Casas or the Marquess of Pombal, who sought to abolish Indian slavery in Portuguese America, were in the ascendant. At the same time the Iberian monarchs wanted to keep control of Indian communities and Indian labor. If these were controlled instead by powerful colonists, then a kind of feudalism was established on the other side of the Atlantic that challenged the power of the kings themselves. In fact, when the crown passed laws protective of the Indians, the colonists regularly flouted them. They could and did rebel if deprived of forced Indian labor. On one celebrated occasion, the Spanish colonists were so outraged by royal attempts to protect the Indians that the king's representative had to travel to New Spain in disguise in order to offer the royal compromise that averted outright rebellion. Similarly, when the Marquess of Pombal decreed the abolition of Indian slavery in Brazil, the colonists refused to comply. They did not see why the Jesuits should be allowed to gather Indians in their mission communities while the colonists were deprived of Indian slaves. The Marquess sent his brother to Brazil to enforce the edict, but his brother listened to the colonists and advised Pombal to abolish the Jesuits instead, which he duly did. This led to what Osvaldo Hurtado, a modern Ecuadorian writer and president of his country, referred to as the "institutionalized illegality of Spanish colonial society." It has much to do with a tradition that has bedeviled a number of Latin American countries: passing beautiful laws with little expectation that they will be enforced or observed.

This was arguably the most extraordinary meeting in the history of humankind... The world—both the New World and the Old World—was dramatically changed forever.

The independence movements of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries did not change this, nor did they do much for indigenous peoples. The constitutions adopted by the newly independent republics were eloquent about the rights of man but silent about the Indians. In countries with sparse indigenous populations, such as the United States, Indians were considered to have no place in the new nations. They were thought of as the peoples beyond the frontier, in "Indian territory," a notional territory that was pushed steadily westward until it was swallowed up altogether at the end of the nineteenth century. In countries with significant indigenous populations, conservatives and liberals fought civil wars over the length and breadth of the Western Hemisphere. Their clashing visions of the future paid scant attention to Indian concerns. The conservatives
demanded freedom from the mother country in order to manage their own affairs and to go on exploiting the Indians. The liberals demanded freedom for all, including the Indians, but what they meant by this for the Indians was the freedom to cease being Indian altogether. They considered *Indio* a derogatory word and Indianness a stigma—a kind of royalist, conservative, ecclesiastical device for maintaining indigenous peoples in a state of savagery. In the liberal vision of the future there would be no more Indians; the very word would be prohibited. The new constitutions therefore promised freedom and equality for all, with no mention of the Indians and no special provisions for them. It was assumed that they would disappear into the mainstream.

That hope was not fulfilled. In 1821 Simón Bolívar said at the Congress of Cúcuta that lands alienated from the Indians in Gran Colombia (corresponding roughly to modern Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador combined) during the tumultuous years leading up to independence should be returned to them “as soon as circumstances permit.” Circumstances never did, however, either in Gran Colombia or anywhere else. On the contrary, the nineteenth century was an era of such intense pressure on the indigenous peoples of the hemisphere that it could well be referred to as the time of the second conquest.

In countries with large indigenous populations, conservatives encroached on Indian lands and maintained Indian communities in poverty as a source of labor. Liberals, on the other hand, sought to break up traditional landholdings in the interest of modernization. They therefore moved to break up the estates of the great landowners and the Church. They also moved to break up the lands held by indigenous communities, hoping to force the Indians to abandon their traditional ways and to enter the modern labor market. Both policies placed heavy burdens on the Indians, who were treated as a less than fully human labor force.

The details are revealing. In Ecuador, for example, the new constitution adopted in 1852 excluded Indians (the majority of the population) from citizenship. In 1857 slavery was formally abolished, so that black Ecuadoreans were emancipated. At the same time the system of *concertaje* was institutionalized. This was the Ecuadorian version of a system that proliferated throughout the Americas. It enabled labor contractors to enter into a *concierto*, or arrangement (elsewhere referred to less euphemistically as the *enganche*, or hook) with Indians. Under this system Indians were tricked or forced into accepting contracts that they did not understand and often tried unsuccessfully to repudiate—contracts that obliged them to work for long periods of time for miserable wages or for payment in kind.

Peru relied less on such arrangements and more on taxes levied in cash and in labor directly on the indigenous population. Indians, for example, were required to work without payment to build roads and were then obliged to pay tolls to use them, although non-Indians could use the same roads at no charge. The government discovered that it could not manage the economy without exacting “the Indian tribute,” as it was called. The tribute was nevertheless abolished at regular intervals throughout the nineteenth century. It had to be abolished repeatedly because each abolition was more theoretical than real, and Indians went on being forced to pay.

In Guatemala and El Salvador, the countries with the largest indigenous populations of Central America, the modernization policies of liberal-party dictators at the end of the nineteenth century forced Indians to carry passbooks showing that they had performed the legally required number of days of labor. Indians were thus obliged to work for starvation wages on the coffee plantations. This system has continued almost to the present day in some places, and the effects of it on Indian individuals and families are harrowingly described in the story of her life as told by Rigoberta Menchú, winner of the 1992 Nobel Peace Prize.

The classic example of liberal legislation that was put into effect with modernizing intent and had extremely painful consequences for indigenous populations was the Reform Law in Mexico. This was enacted by President Juárez, himself part Indian and proud of it, in 1856. It aimed to break up the great *haciendas*, the large landholdings of the Church, and the communal landholdings of the Indians. Juárez’s intention was to modernize the country and especially to modernize Mexican agriculture. The result of his initiative, however, was that under Porfirio Díaz and his group of advisors, known as the *científicos* (scientists), these lands were reconcentrated in the hands of large agribusinesses, while the Indians and the rural poor sank deeply into poverty and peonage. The extraordinary concentration of land and the ever-widening gap between rich and poor were clearly two of the most important factors that caused the Mexican Revolution that broke out in 1910.

Throughout the nineteenth century, then, conservative policies squeezed the Indians, while liberal policies sought to destroy their communities. In fact, the Americas since the conquest have been a vast laboratory for the eradication of indigenous cultures. As one studies the record, one cannot help being struck by the effort and ingenuity devoted by the conquerors to this task. They attacked indigenous religions. They imposed forced labor of various kinds. They invented a whole series of ways to lure or trick those not already forced to work into peonage through debt (the debt could only be worked off—and...
...the Americas since the conquest have been a vast laboratory for the eradication of indigenous cultures.

lands in common. The Europeans considered that concept the very essence of savagery, for it departed from the ideas of private property and individual title to land that were considered central to Western civilization. It was thus with a convenient conviction of moral superiority that the invaders constantly tried to break up the communal landholdings of the Indians.

The relentless effort to destroy indigenous communities led to constant Indian rebellions throughout the hemisphere. The rebellions sometimes achieved considerable local success but, being local, were invariably defeated when the imperial power had gathered sufficient force to strike back at the locality. The colonists realized that the attack on indigenous landholding was a perennial and fostering source of discontent, but they persevered anyway. Thus, an edict issued in 1834 in Gran Colombia made it clear that “in no tribunal or court will complaints be heard, whose sole object is to request that Indian lands not be divided.”

Indigenous peoples, then as now, clung fiercely to their lands and communities. Their societies had been decapitated, so their communities constituted the basis of their culture and their dignity. The alternative that the enveloping society tried to force them to accept was not very attractive. They were urged to abandon their languages and cultures and to enter the mainstream of “civilization,” though in that mainstream they would be stigmatized and treated as slaves, serfs, directed workers, or peons. In the light of this history and of the five-hundred-year effort to eradicate the indigenous cultures of this hemisphere, their resilience is quite remarkable.

The effort to destroy these cultures (ethnocide) was sometimes accompanied by an attempt to destroy the indigenous populations themselves (genocide). This was an option only in the regions or countries with the sparsest indigenous populations. The classic example is Argentina, where Araucanian Indians, splendid horsemen with vast herds of cattle, dominated the pampas in the nineteenth century. In 1879-80 General Roca’s campaign, known in Argentine history books as the Conquest of the Desert, was expressly intended to annihilate the Araucanians and to seize and redistribute their lands. In fact, the Araucanians were not actually annihilated, but they were thought to be. They ceased to exist socially and culturally for nearly a century. Meanwhile, real genocide was committed in the far south, where small populations of nomadic Ona and Yaghan were hunted down and killed like animals by the local sheep farmers. Most of those farmers were British expatriates, which shows (if such a demonstration is still needed) that colonial brutality is not the special preserve of any one nationality. All of this was justified in the name of civilization, progress, and the manifest destiny of Argentina to extend its rule to the southern tip of the South American continent.

A similar push to the south in Chile at the same time and for the same reasons led to the final defeat of the Chilean Araucanians. These Indians, who had stopped the Spanish conquest at the Bio-Bio River and had retained their independence through the three subsequent centuries, were defeated by the army’s modern weaponry and reduced to penury and starvation. We rarely hear about them now, although there are one million of them in a total Chilean population of about fourteen million.

At the same time the United States was engaged in its own push to the West, in pursuit of its own vision of manifest destiny, and with similarly drastic consequences for the indigenous inhabitants of the “Indian territory” that was to be Indian no longer. In his book The Winning of the West, Teddy Roosevelt justified the conquest of the Indians in terms that probably represented the prevailing attitude of the invaders as they moved westward after the Civil War: “The settler and the pioneer have at bottom had justice on their side. This great continent could not have been kept as nothing but a playground for squallid savages.”

This attitude and this process were not peculiar to the Americas. All over the world indigenous peoples were being conquered and dispossessed in the name of civilization. Because this was held to be a matter of right triumphing over wrong, no accommodation with the conquered populations was thought to be desirable, and none was sought. At best they were to be corralled and made over as despised and counterfeit copies of their conquerors; at worst they were simply to be annihilated. Meanwhile, the evolutionism and racism of the conquerors made the whole process seem inevitable.

Similar attitudes persist in our own times. They lie behind the plausible falsehoods of conventional wisdom that are still subscribed to today by otherwise reasonable people. According to such views, “tribal” or “traditional” societies are obsolescent. They cannot adjust to the modern world. They are doomed by the march of progress and must inevitably disappear. These views conveniently conceal from us the facts that these societies have shown a remarkable tenacity and resilience, and that if they are destroyed, it is not by abstract laws of history or nature but by the political
choices of the powerful, by our willingness to overpower them, and by our unwillingness to live and let live.

In the Americas we, and particularly the Native Americans among us, are still coping with the consequences of the oldest European imperialism. These consequences can be seen in the contemporary circumstances and concerns of modern American states. Consider, for example, the contrasts between Mexico, Guatemala, and Peru, all countries with large indigenous populations.

In Mexico, after the revolution of 1910-20, an attempt was made to connect the Indians and the rural poor with the corporate state, to link them through the PRI (the Institutional Revolutionary Party) to the national life. An official ideology of indigenismo guided national policy toward indigenous peoples. The ideology is now much criticized by Mexican anthropologists for being paternalistic and assimilationist, something imposed by the state on the Indians. Nevertheless, in spite of its shortcomings, it produced a long period of comparative social stability in the Mexican countryside—a stability that is even more remarkable if we compare it with the experience of other American nations.

Peru, for example, had its own brand of indigenista ideology. Started in something like the spirit of Uncle Tom’s Cabin in writers who called attention to the sufferings of the Indians, it was given forceful expression by figures such as Jose Carlos Mariategui, the theorist of Peruvian socialism, and Haya de la Torre, the leader of the APRA party (the American Popular Revolutionary Alliance). They spoke of an indigenous future, not just for Peru but for the Americas. Their rhetoric was rejected and their party suppressed, while the indigenous bulk of Peru’s population continued to be systematically marginalized. This accounts for the extraordinary success of the Shining Path movement. It is successful not because it is an indigenous uprising (it is not) but because it has brought Peru to the brink of chaos, due to the fact that the country had never made a sustained effort at national mobilization.

Guatemala, on the other hand, has dealt with its Indian question in a different way: through repressive violence in defense of the status quo. This serves as an object lesson, showing what can happen in a country where there has been no social revolution and little social mobilization, and where the elites harbor a fear of the Indian masses, who must therefore be terrorized in order to be kept in their place.

What is the contemporary significance of the Indian question in countries where indigenous peoples are an insignificant fraction of the total population? Consider the case of Brazil, whose indigenous inhabitants live scattered throughout the interior and constitute less than 0.5 percent of the total population. Why are their concerns treated as a matter of national security? Ostensibly, the national security doctrine has been put forward by the military to protect Brazil’s extensive frontiers. We are asked to believe that peoples like the Yanomami, ten thousand strong and outnumbered and outgunned by the miners who have invaded their territory, might wish to link up with their less numerous brethren in Venezuela and form a separate state. Alternatively, the national security doctrine is said to be needed as a defense of Brazilian sovereignty because there has been wild talk in various places about internationalizing the Amazon in order to protect its ecology for the world.

In fact, the defense of indigenous rights is subversive in a different sense. When Indians protest about what is being done to them in the interior of the country, they are classed with smallholders, the landless poor, and other “troublemakers” who call into question the Brazilian model of development and call attention to the glaring injustices in Brazilian society. Meanwhile, the insistence of indigenous peoples on being allowed to maintain their own cultures is also considered subversive, for it undermines Brazil’s self-image as a melting pot. In effect, Brazil’s indigenous peoples are held to threaten and undermine the state simply by wishing to be themselves, by being reluctant to evaporate into the mainstream. It was therefore quite logical that until recently the Brazilian government had an official policy of “emancipating” the Indians. They were not held in servitude but were considered wards of the state. The only way the Indians could be emancipated, therefore, was if they legally gave up being considered Indian and were thus deprived of their indigenous identity.

It is one of the many ironies of the American experience that the invaders created the category of Indians, imposed it on the inhabitants of the New World, and have been trying to abolish it ever since. Brazil’s effort to “emancipate” its Indians is only the latest in a long line of measures devised to accomplish similar ends. In many countries it was decreed that Indians would no longer be referred to as Indios but would instead be called campesinos (peasants); Indianness was thus abolished by a stroke of the pen. In Chile, General Pinochet’s government tried to destroy the identity of the large Mapuche (Araucanian) minority by forcing them to divide their lands into privately owned lots. Even the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which is widely thought to be one of the more generous settlements made with indigenous peoples, was drafted to turn Indian communities into corporations and their members into stockholders. Future members of the community will not acquire stocks unless stocks are bequeathed to them by those who originally received them. Meanwhile, stocks can soon be given, willed, or sold to people who are not members of the communities. The effect of the act, if not its intention, is to provide a mechanism for phasing out the native communities altogether.

"The settler and the pioneer have at bottom had justice on their side. The great continent could not have been kept as nothing but a playground for squalid savages."

Teddy Roosevelt
to this vision presented by permitting cultural distinctiveness or local autonomy to indigenous peoples or ethnic groups. In fact, much of the violence in the world today comes from the suppression (or attempted suppression) of ethnicity in the name of the unitary state. Two years ago a survey carried out by Cultural Survival revealed that about 120 shooting wars were going on in the world, 90 of which involved states that were attempting to suppress ethnic minorities.

Yet even if we concede that the suppression of ethnicity can lead to as much bloodletting as its expression, ethnic divisiveness is still a legitimate concern. The issue was recently and powerfully addressed by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in his book *The Disuniting of America*. Schlesinger admits that the traditional canon of American culture has reflected the traditions of only part of the country's population, excluding others and making them feel like second-class citizens. He argues, however, that the cure for this state of affairs proposed by the multiculturalists is worse than the disease. That cure includes such measures as the tendentious rewriting of history, the introduction of curricula whose main purpose is to make minorities feel good, the denial of any merit to Western civilization, the insistence on adherence to inane standards of political correctness, and the espousal of an anything-goes relativism. Schlesinger asserts, therefore, that the United States should combat multiculturalism, virtually in defense of its own sanity, and that it should insist on its own common culture, taught to its citizens through a curriculum suitably modified to be less exclusionary than before.

I agree with Schlesinger's diagnosis and his convincing exposure of the absurdities of the extreme multiculturalists. But there is no reason to throw the baby out with the bathwater because of those absurdities. I agree that the proper corrective to the traditional exclusiveness of the American canon should not be an ethnic chauvinism that replies in kind with chauvinistic countercultures. It need not, however, be a renewed insistence that the expression of ethnicity is divisive and that it should be superseded or suppressed by American civic culture. A third solution is possible: what I call serious multiculturalism. This corrective is based on a presumption of tolerance and a desire for mutual understanding and mutual accommodation among subcultures. Such accommodation has to be taught and learned, and it depends on a serious effort to make multicultural, multiethnic systems work. Incidentally, serious multiculturalism would require as much effort from minorities that feel they have been wronged as it would ...

...the invaders created the category of Indians, imposed it on the inhabitants of the New World, and have been trying to abolish it ever since.

from the majority that is accused of excluding them.

Is this a hopelessly utopian vision? No more so, I suggest, than the idea of democracy. Yet we feel it is realistic to try and make democracy work. We do not give up on democracy because the Germans once elected Adolf Hitler or because of any of the other crimes that have been committed in its name. I use the analogy deliberately, for it seems to me that the countries with the best chance of making serious multiculturalism work are those that are relatively wealthy and have traditions of democracy, tolerance, and openness—countries, in fact, like the United States and Canada and Australia.

Is all this a long way from the Indian question? I do not think so. The New World dilemma was how the invaders were to deal with the indigenous populations of the hemisphere. This presented at the time of the conquest, and still presents today, a challenge to every country in the Americas. The challenge is, What kind of a country is
ours? What kind of a country do we want it to be?

Nations, as Benedict Anderson so rightly put it, are imagined communities. The indigenous challenge to the United States is to make a further leap of the imagination beyond the ideals of democracy and egalitarianism; to imagine a nation that can tolerate indigenous cultures within its pluralism; to imagine a nation that does not need to extinguish the traditions that nourish it, because it inspires in its citizens a commitment to a transcendent Americanism.

If any country in the Americas could achieve this, it would be the best possible tribute to the civilization that was imposed on the hemisphere five hundred years ago, for it would show that Western civilization was not exhausted (as its critics claim) by the waning of European hegemony. It would show instead that Western civilization is capable of renewal, of using its democratic traditions to lead the way into the multiethnic future that awaits us all.

This paper was presented at a meeting of the Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, Massachusetts, on November 18, 1992.

In the June 1991 issue of Symbols, Ass’t. Director Barbara Isaac discussed the legislation signed into law by Pres. Bush known as “The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.” In May of this year Mrs. Isaac organized a symposium, “The Dynamics of Museum Ethics: Native Peoples and Ethnographic Collections,” to give Native Americans throughout New England the opportunity to discuss the legislation and the Museum’s policy, and to inform the public of the Museum’s efforts concerning repatriation. More than 300 people came to hear speeches by Native American leaders and administrators from the Museum and Harvard Univ. and to attend workshops on a variety of topics relating to repatriation. The two day event began with a ceremony in the Hall of the North American Indian when the Peabody Museum returned a sacred war god, or Ahayu:da, to representatives of the Zuni Pueblo of New Mexico. Pictured above are Joe Dishta, Chairman of the Zuni Tribal Council, left, Mrs. Isaac, and Elder Brother Bow Priest Tsadiasi.
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the field, and at universities and museums. These include: research on textiles at the Museum of New Mexico in Santa Fe; construction of a composite soil stratigraphy profile for the Lamb Spring site in Colorado at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of Natural History; and Cultural Resource Management projects in Virginia, Arizona, and California. Her research on hide-tanning practices of North American indigenous peoples, undertaken at the Provincial Museum of Alberta (1986), will be published in Skin-tanning in the Canadian Subarctic, D.E. Young and R. McConnell, eds.