
REVIEW ESSAYS

SURVIVAL AND CULTURAL EVOLUTION IN THE ANDES

Jeffrey A. Cole
Manakin-Sabot, Virginia

MISSION CULTURE ON THE UPPER AMAZON: NATIVE TRADITION, JESUIT ENTERPRISE, AND SECULAR POLICY IN MOXOS, 1660–1880. By David Block. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994. Pp. 240. \$30.00 cloth.)

HACIENDAS AND “AYLLUS”: RURAL SOCIETY IN THE BOLIVIAN ANDES IN THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES. By Herbert S. Klein. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993. Pp. 230. \$39.50 cloth.)

THE PEOPLE OF QUITO, 1690–1810: CHANGE AND UNREST IN THE UNDER-CLASS. By Martin Minchom. Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1994. Pp. 297. \$48.50 paper.)

Twenty years ago, Lewis Hanke and Benjamin Keen exchanged notes in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* concerning the value of controversy surrounding the “White Legend” versus the “Black Legend” in the field of colonial Latin American history. That controversy unfortunately continued to frame many of the questions asked of archival data on into the 1980s. Try as we might, either in conversations among ourselves or with colleagues in other fields of history, colonial historians were unable to shake the need to place blame for contemporary Latin America’s ills on some aspect of the colonial drama. In public, this “blame game” escalated into the level of hyperbole as the Columbian quincentennial approached, while in academic circles, the issue was more often

colored in the subtler shades of political correctness and solidarity with victimized peoples.

Meanwhile, around the edges, new approaches to historical analysis were being applied to the massive quantities of archival data in the Andes, Iberia, and elsewhere. Some historians, attracted to the cause of social history, began focusing on the lives of ordinary people (as opposed to heroic figures), studying peasants, slaves, women, and others who had long been ignored in the traditional historiography. James Lockhart's *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560* fired an opening salvo in 1968 by employing an approach that valued complexity, thoroughness, and the critical use of untapped riches in notarial archives.¹ That work is now available in a 1994 second edition (with only minor changes) and remains a watershed in the study of Spanish efforts to replicate Iberian culture in the Americas.

Lockhart argued that mid-sixteenth-century Spanish society was indeed transplanted to Peru in all its complexity, but by the eighteenth century, Peruvian society differed markedly from that of Spain or Mexico. The native Andeans' contribution to cultural evolution had proven decisive, for the kind of complexity that Lockhart documented within the Spanish population existed to an even greater extent within Andean peoples. Although the Spanish contribution may have proven stronger in the governmental centers, the Andean contribution was clearly stronger in the more remote areas of the viceroyalty.

What Lockhart set into motion has been carried forward in the work of Kenneth Andrien, Ida Altman, Peter Bakewell, Noble David Cook, Keith Davies, Robert Keith, Susan Ramírez, Ann Wightman, Ann Zulawski, and others. The full complexity of colonial society is emerging from the folios as the notarial records and other caches of archival documentation are being mined. That society included multiple European, multiple Andean, multiple African, and multiple Asian actors as well as many mixtures who become ever more common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. With this superseding of the simplistic Indian-Spanish dichotomy has come the realization that no single group controlled the development of colonial society. Rather, colonial Andean societies developed as a result of interplay, negotiation, and the embracing of alternatives on the part of all these peoples of every imaginable social, economic, and political station. The controlling factors were systemic—geographical, meteorological, economic, and other dimensional—and the degree to which any one group, including the Spanish imperial regime, could affect the future was limited.

To be an Andeanist in the 1990s therefore requires an affinity with the complex and a tolerance for analyses that preclude easy comparisons

1. James Lockhart, *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968).

with other fields of history. This complexity is frustrating when we attempt to explain our work to colleagues, who often insist that our work somehow relate to their own. But it is fundamental to the future of colonial Andean history that its practitioners stop orienting their research according to the expectations of other areas of historiography. It is far more important that colonial historians work together to produce a vision of the past that is accurate, human, and relevant.

A second significant trend in historical research over the last twenty-five years has been the incorporation of quantitative methodology. Since the advent of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and then more portable means of quantifying archival data, Herbert Klein, John TePaske, and others have published key studies based on crunched numbers. These works have been especially valuable in testing hypotheses and posing new questions of the qualitative documentation. Yet they have also proven the old saw that numbers lie as often as they illuminate. The difficulty is that the numbers themselves were generated for definite purposes and therefore reflect not so much fact as particular perceptions and interests. Moreover, the categories that were employed often meant one thing in a particular era and quite another thing later on, as Suzanne Alchon found in preparing her study *Native Society and Disease in Colonial Ecuador* (1991). Words often mutated from adjective to noun to verb and back again. Applying sophisticated analytical tools to these data without understanding clearly the motives for which they were gathered and the original terminologies used only compounds the biases inherent in them.

The work done in notarial records as well as the efforts to digest numerical data have led to another inescapable conclusion: competition, if not outright conflict, was a constant in the colonial period in the Andes. It raged within groups previously viewed as ethnically homogeneous (as among the Iberian nationalities in the war between the Basques and other miners for control of Potosí in the 1620s) as well as among distinct ethnic and political groups (as exemplified in the Tupac Amarú and Tupac Catari rebellions of the late eighteenth century). Thus a kind of retrofitted national security ideology seems appropriate, in which competition (but also cooperation) is perceived as the norm. Periods of violent conflict represented only one form of such competition, which was generally carried out via economic and other means.

At what point did an individual living in the Andes in the seventeenth, eighteenth, or early nineteenth century decide to act, and why? How did individuals decide who they were, which group they belonged to, and why? Which associations were important and which were not? When did action become necessary, and why? Who was on which side, and why?

In asking this flurry of new questions, colonial historians are mov-

ing beyond the previous fixation on establishing responsibility for the ills of the colonial period. Not that there is any shortage of blame—rather, scholarly focus has shifted to the means people employed, as individuals or as members of groups, to protect their interests and maximize their possibilities. This approach makes the lessons learned from historical analysis relevant for the present and the future because it examines the colonial period as valuable in its own right, not just as the preface to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

One side effect of the evolution of Andean colonial historiography has been abandonment of language born of political science and sociology. Colonial historians have always found it uncomfortable, like a hand-me-down shirt, and they have now outgrown it. Imported caste and class models, while useful as tools, have also been found wanting. Marxist analysis by extension has presented more problems than it has solved. The process has been a gradual one. For example, the work of three prominent colonial historians was built on definitions of Indian interests that had been drawn primarily according to notions about class. Steve Stern, Karen Spalding, and Brooke Larson all documented Andean Indians' efforts to resist their incorporation into the colonial economy, advancing the once inconceivable notion that Andeans were active participants.² But these historians also concluded that efforts at resistance had failed, with the Indians losing ground at every turn. For Stern, this outcome was inevitable, given the historical imperative, but it may have more to do with the fact that Huamanga was closely administered by the Inca prior to the conquest and was well within the domain of the Spanish colonial administration. Larson's study of Cochabamba, which shared Huamanga's fate in this regard, suggested that less central areas might have witnessed more successful responses by the native population.

Other Andeanists (myself included) have argued that native Andeans were more successful at withstanding the efforts of some Europeans to exploit them, often allying themselves with other Europeans and Andeans to achieve that end, even in the heart of the viceroyalty.³ Ann Wightman's *Indigenous Migration and Social Change: The Forasteros of Cuzco, 1570–1720* inventoried adaptive strategies in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Cuzco, including the Andean tradition of Indians voting with their feet.⁴ For those who stayed put, successful subterfuge required understanding the Spanish

2. See Steve J. Stern, *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982); Karen Spalding, *Huarochiri, an Andean Society under Inca and Spanish Rule* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1984); and Brooke Larson, *Colonialism and Agrarian Transformation in Bolivia: Cochabamba, 1550–1900* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988).

3. Jeffrey A. Cole, *The Potosí Mita, 1573–1700: Compulsory Indian Labor in the Andes* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1985).

4. Ann Wightman, *Indigenous Migration and Social Change: The Forasteros of Cuzco, 1570–1720* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990).

legal system and the limits to which it might be employed to their advantage. *Forastero*, it should be noted, was a Spanish label adopted by Indians because it brought them freedom from tribute and mita obligations.

Some individuals found it preferable simply to leave the colonized areas and take up residence among “the infidels.” They may be considered victims of Spanish colonization, but their response was still successful to the extent that they did escape. The sheer volume of documentation extant in the archives of the Audiencia de Charcas and elsewhere on the response to the Duque de la Palata’s census of the 1680s clearly reflects the effectiveness of native responses to efforts by the viceregal administration to control them. My interpretations in this regard have been bolstered by conversations in the field and in the United States with anthropologists doing fieldwork in Andean rural communities who spent considerable time living in contemporary native communities.⁵

Given the staying power of the Black Legend and the current trends in European and North American history to focus on victims, it has been nearly heretical to suggest that Andean peoples resisted—at times successfully—efforts to incorporate them into Spanish colonial society. Fortunately, publishers have been more tolerant of the voices of heresy than have departments of history. As latecomers to political correctness, U.S. and European historians have found it difficult to accept the idea that the Black Legend, which was elaborated by Anglophones to justify English colonization of America, is a gross oversimplification. But while our colleagues have remained enmeshed in the issue of who was or is at fault, we Andeanists have shifted attention to native American strategies for survival.

This review looks at three contributions to recent Andean historiography. Each one focuses primarily on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and treats the cultural evolution of a particular area removed from the viceregal administration in Lima. All three reflect the evolution of Andean history beyond the issues that dominated the field twenty-five years ago, moving toward an understanding of late-colonial and early-national cultures based on archival data (albeit incomplete) that considers all participants as fully developed human beings who were capable of developing multiple strategies for adaptation and survival, learning from one another, and expressing their needs and goals in various ways.

Martin Minchom’s *The People of Quito, 1690–1810* employs a wide range of source materials—official reports, litigation records, parish and notarial data—to examine the roles of lower-class peoples (whom he calls “the plebe”) over a period of 120 years. His focus on peoples avoids the terms *white*, *Indian*, and *mestizo* as much as possible. It was inspired by John Leddy Phelan and James Lockhart, as was his use of notarial records

5. Two examples are John Murra’s students Roger Rasnake and Inge Harman.

(following also the example of similar studies made on Mexico and Argentina). The longer time frame permits Minchom to describe processes that might be too subtle to detect in the more traditional thirty-year segment used in other studies based on notarial records (including Lockhart's exemplar).

The People of Quito also exercises considerable caution in using the available documentation. In the first place, Minchom admits that many sources that would have been useful were unavailable to him at the time he conducted his research. Second, he understands that the documents are couched in the "'Sunday-best' language prepared for the law-courts" and are therefore unreliable as pure reflections of motive or belief (p. 8). Finally, Minchom is nimble in using class and caste categories when describing non-elite Quiteños. He notes that racial categories were socio-cultural rather than genetic (an Indian man could change his status with a change of clothes, thereby avoiding tribute or labor obligations). Caste divisions were also imprecise: the market women of Quito were mini-capitalists and entrepreneurs yet continued to be Indians and mestizas.

Minchom suggests that language was less important as a divider in Quito than it might have been because Quichua was spoken even among the elite. This part of his argument is weaker than the rest. In my view, language is the key to ethnicity because it is the means used to communicate with one's peers and also defines the ways in which individuals define and think about themselves.

More successful is Minchom's reconstruction of the nature of change in Quiteño society over 120 years. The barrios of Quito were set off from one another by geographical barriers, by profession, and by parish affiliations. Within them, inhabitants of the city adapted to changing circumstances: sometimes seizing economic opportunities, sometimes organizing against proposed changes that would affect them negatively, becoming more self-sufficient at times, and extending communal relationships at others. In all cases, individuals acted according to their identity as members of clans, residents of barrios, and members of a given profession but also in terms of their sense of their own vulnerability to change.

Sometimes responses were made as individuals, sometimes as members of a group, but always in accordance with economic conditions. As Minchom explains, "Indeed, extreme adaptability and mobility was characteristic of much of the lower social strata in forms which were sometimes observable (migration, occupational adaptation or the pursuit of a temporary livelihood in Quito for the duration of a lawsuit), but must more often have escaped us" (p. 262). Here Minchom shows his respect for those participants whose actions were not recorded in the archival documentation.

Violence, in contrast, was usually documented. Social upheaval erupted after alternative forms of response proved insufficient or when

violence was judged to be the appropriate response, given the degree of threat presented by a proposed change of the status quo. These upheavals were not the work of criollos but broke out instead when perceived vulnerability was highest, as when forasteros were threatened with taxes on food production on city plots or when Indians and mestizos faced a tax on women giving birth (p. 230). *Hurinsaya* and *hanansaya* linkages (affiliations surviving from pre-Columbian times) remained important among the possible resources on which one could draw, which included guild, parish, and other ties—the more alternatives the better, given the potential problems. Here too cultural fusion provided individuals with a wide variety of possible courses of action, thus enriching their possibilities for successful response.

The Bourbon era brought a series of threats to a society that all the peoples of Quito had helped shape, one that had evolved from compromise among those peoples. As a hybrid culture, Quito exhibited characteristics of European society before 1492 and others of pre-Columbian Andean cultures. Minchom argues that Quiteño society might have been unique due to its location on the periphery of the viceroyalty. Although colonial Quito clearly had specific characteristics arising from its geography and pre-Columbian experience in the region, the city also shared many traits with other regions of the viceroyalty of Peru.

David Block's *Mission Culture on the Upper Amazon: Native Tradition, Jesuit Enterprise, and Secular Policy in Moxos, 1660–1880* also evidences enormous respect for the native Indian contribution to a colonial society, in this instance the peoples of the lowlands. Like Minchom, Block focuses on the everyday lives of everyday people and on how Europeans and native Americans contributed to the birth of a culture that drew on all their traditions to create a new hybrid society, which he calls "mission culture."

Block's account highlights the fact that no one controlled the development of this Andean colonial society. Rather, it evolved over time, conditioned by human response to geographical, biological, political, and social forces that were never mastered by any single group of contributors. One advantage of taking a long-term perspective (in this case, about a century of Jesuit participation, followed by another century of experience after their expulsion) is the realization that individuals were born, grew up, had families, and died without ever being aware that they were simply biding time between the conquest and the wars for independence.

The Jesuits did not arrive in Moxos until 1660, a full century after the fall of the Inca, and they were expelled in 1767 with the rest of their society. During that hundred years, the Jesuits interacted with the peoples of the region. What resulted, according to Block, was "the evolution of new systems—biological, technological, organizational, and theological—which conditioned another century of [the region's] history" (pp. 1–2).

As with Quito, the geography of the Moxos region and its relative isolation from the viceregal administrative centers were important conditioning factors. Here too the array of possibilities open to the evolving culture was enlarged by drawing on both European and Andean traditions. The introduction of class distinctions or (perhaps better said) guild distinctions was one result. Block observes, "the missions ushered in a new social and economic complexity by establishing a functional hierarchy based on occupation, with those practicing European arts and industries constituting a separate group from those involved in subsistence activities" (p. 2).

But for Block, "the most striking feature of Moxos' central support, and of a particularly Jesuit approach, is the development of an investment strategy for the missions" (p. 175). Much of the capital for financing the missions came from the Society's urban centers, meaning that in this case the center supported the periphery. Block disproves two of the most tenacious beliefs about the Jesuit missions: that they were founded primarily for spiritual purposes, and that the fathers and brothers insisted on a thoroughly paternalistic administration. In reality, the Indians had a major impact on the nature of the hybrid society, with the Jesuits learning from them as well via the missionaries' active participation in traditional governmental, religious, and social practices. Meanwhile, Indian leadership actually expanded with the introduction of Spanish forms of government.

Block therefore suggests that "a model of indirect rule, similar to that practiced in the European colonization of Asia, seems more apt than paternalism for describing the Moxos experience" (p. 176). Because the mission culture had been agreed to by both the Jesuits and the Indians, it survived the Society's expulsion in the mid-eighteenth century.

Historians' previous view of the Jesuit missions was derived almost entirely from the European perspective and thus emphasized the Jesuits' accomplishments during their campaign and the subsequent decline of the missions following their expulsion. Block argues that this perspective awarded the Jesuits too much credit for the accomplishments of the missions, measured in European terms, and treated the native population as little more than a natural resource.

By examining the situation from the Indian perspective, Block arrives at quite a different conclusion: "To native eyes, the missions opened Moxos to regular deliveries of metal implements, offered the several competing ethnic groups an opportunity to redress their positions vis-à-vis their neighbors, and fostered a new sociopolitical structure based on Indian and Iberian models. Only inducements such as these could have convinced the native peoples of Moxos to abandon their tropical forest culture, tied as it was to centuries of subsistence and belief structures, and to enter missions established to centralize their conversion" (p. 9).

This non-European perspective is also enlightening with regard to the period following the Jesuits' expulsion. Instead of being a period of stagnation and decline, the latter half of the eighteenth century witnessed an increase in Indian population and the preservation of mission culture, including traditional governmental forms.

Here, then, is a useful key: if historians ignore what the native population received during the colonial period—viewing them as helpless victims of a Jesuit program of colonization—then we cannot fathom the survival of mission culture without the Jesuits. The earlier approach was based ultimately, I believe, on the explanations provided by the Jesuits' successors to rationalize their failure to duplicate the missions' successes. Unable to accept a scenario in which Indians were human beings capable of independent thought and requiring inducements to participate in a new system, the successors chose to blame the Jesuits for somehow ruining the Indians. Bourbon reformers blamed the Jesuits, and subsequently nineteenth-century liberals and twentieth-century reformers blamed the colonial administration. The truth is that none of these later groups treated the Indians as human beings.

The missions in Moxos represented not so much a conquest as a marriage. The partners may not have entered the marriage as equals, but each chose to stay in the relationship because it was preferable to the alternatives available. Remaining in a pristine pre-Columbian state was neither an option nor necessarily better. Ultimately, Block concludes, it was mission culture that "bridged Moxos' ancient and modern worlds, giving the native people a breathing space between autonomy and dependence" (p. 10).

This marriage was terminated in 1767, when the Bourbons usurped the Jesuits' role and altered the terms of the agreement, mainly by requiring the missions to support the center rather than vice versa. This interpretation does not imply, as Block stresses, that the Jesuit century in Moxos was a golden age. Rather, it was a period of accommodation in which two groups collaborated in creating a new society. When the Jesuits were replaced and demands on the native population were heightened, the resources with which Indians could respond were removed. Thus can be perceived a parallel to the Bourbon efforts in Quito and elsewhere, as well as the later reforms of nineteenth-century liberals.

The mission Indians' immediate response to the Bourbon reforms was to try to obtain recourse through legal appeals. Only when that effort failed did they resort to violence. This response indicated clearly the value ascribed by the mission population to their geographical ties with the missions. Only when violent response failed did they fall back on the ultimate, but not preferred, course of resistance: flight. For these Indians, then, armed resistance represented a less desperate act than escape.

As they abandoned the missions, the Indians carried with them "a

biological and cultural heritage very different from that of Amazonian peoples not contacted by the priests and brothers. The history of mission culture does not suggest a melting pot, a gradual absorption of native people into the mainstream of the colony or the Bolivian nation. It is more accurately the account of a struggle for Indian survival, a struggle that continues five hundred years after Columbus's arrival on American shores set it in motion" (p. 181).

Herbert Klein's contribution to introducing quantitative history to the colonial Andean field has already been noted. In *Haciendas and "Ayllus": Rural Society in the Bolivian Andes in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, Klein pairs the quantitative approach (using two major censuses, the royal Indian tribute census of 1786 and the republican cadastral survey of 1881–1882) with the use of the local notarial records for the province of La Paz. The result has much to offer but once again reveals the weaknesses of quantitative analysis. Although Klein's conclusions mesh with those of the other two studies reviewed here, the route taken through the data is sometimes very tenuous. For example, Klein tries to use the number of Indians on haciendas as an indicator of wealth without data to corroborate his conclusions in this regard.

Partly because of the nature of the surviving documentation and partly because of Klein's continued faith in the power of numbers, his focus remains fixed on the macrostructural level and thus does not take into account the "individual units of production" that might have led to more reliable conclusions. He tries to make up for this weakness by stressing the demographic structure of the workforce. The problem is that he lacks the means to do much more than divide the Indians into the broad categories used primarily by census takers, rather than employing the categories used by the Indians themselves.

This is not to say that Klein's instincts are wrong. In the first place, he acknowledges the clear impact of geography on the La Paz region (pp. 3–4). Second, Klein attacks the misinterpretation by nineteenth-century liberal reformers that Indians were anticapitalist as well as the equally mistaken notion of *indigenista* and Marxist reformers that Indians are naturally socialist or cooperative in their approach to economics. Third, Klein successfully shows that key problems arise in using the terms *feudal* and *anticapitalist* to describe landed estates in Bolivia and elsewhere in the Americas.

Estate owners were highly capitalistic when the opportunities presented themselves, but they also drew on Andean strategies of economic integration and survival when those strategies promised to be more successful. Here too Europeans learned from Andeans, borrowing from the store of alternatives. For example, because of the limitations imposed by geography, wealthy landowners held properties at higher and lower elevations in order to diversify their production (p. 161).

In examining the behavior of the Indian communities in the La Paz region, Klein notes that they “not only survived the initial shock of conquest but were able to dominate rural society into the late nineteenth century” (p. 2). Like the haciendas, which responded to market factors with all the means available to them, “the Indian peasant communities successfully responded to the market economy in a number of complex ways” (p. 162). Levels of success in this endeavor, measured in terms of wealth, varied among communities but also among individuals. Those communities did not abandon traditional ways, however. Klein is quick to point out that members of the Indian communities also responded to changing conditions by using more traditional Andean means when appropriate (p. 163).

Klein’s explanation of the origins of violence in the La Paz region also squares with the conclusions reached by the two other authors. He notes first that protests were a constant force to be reckoned with (rebellions being less frequent) and then that the rebellions responded to state violations of “the recognized order” (p. 164). That order was a product of negotiation: the Indian communities paid tribute to the state in exchange for the state’s recognition of their special rights to land, which differed from those of *yanaconas* or *colonos*. For the communities, those special rights represented the security needed to ensure the future well-being of their families and *ayllus* (p. 165). When their security was threatened, they responded.

Klein is in no way arguing, however, that the Indians were masters of their own destiny or that scholars should exaggerate the degree to which native peoples succeeded in responding to the economic and political challenges facing them. He explains, “That Bolivia was a poor nation with an illiterate Amerindian rural population enmeshed in an exploitative social and economic system cannot be denied. But what is most impressive is the extraordinary ability of these non-Spanish-speaking Indians to survive and even prosper in this context” (p. 165).

Haciendas and “Ayllus” provides further evidence to disprove what Klein terms the “traditional models of a manorial, paternalistic, closed, corporate, and ultimately anti-capitalist market world that some have applied to ‘traditional’ Latin American rural society” (p. 166). Klein, Block, and Minchom have all countered that notion for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I would add that it cannot be applied to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries either.

Conclusion

Clearly, colonial historians have moved well beyond the traditional Andean historiography. We are no longer seeking to discover why Latin American societies have “failed” (in the nineteenth- and twentieth-cen-

ture meaning of that word) but rather how so much of pre-Columbian culture has managed to survive and evolve over more than five centuries. The questions asked of the historical data have shifted from seeking to determine blame or the extent of colonial devastation to analyzing strategies for survival. Colonial historians today are shedding not only the historiographical approaches of a generation ago but also an interpretation drawn ultimately from the nineteenth-century debate over Latin America's best path to modernization and the twentieth-century search for villains to blame for the failures of those nineteenth-century campaigns.

As a result of a return to the documentation and the new focus on the lives of common peoples and their strategies for survival, convenient classifications based on race and geographical origin have proven unreliable and ultimately inconsequential. Certainly, the use of data deriving from the eighteenth century is considerably less problematical than for the sixteenth and seventeenth, but it would be a mistake to assume that the trends observed in the Bourbon century were not at work earlier. Furthermore, while all three authors employ models used in Mexico and elsewhere, they eventually conclude that Andean societies differed greatly from those in Mesoamerica because of geography and the peoples who contributed to their cultures.

The focus on everyday lives has yielded another effect: removal of historical actors from the stage of some large operatic production with a prescribed final chapter. Just as none of the peoples discussed here were aware of the effect of their actions on the development of twentieth-century Latin American culture, all three authors discussed here are well aware that they are making a limited contribution to a growing body of knowledge about Andean history. Its final shape will evolve over time. The cooperative and collaborate nature of colonial Andean history and historians is not often noted and should be held up as an example to be followed in other fields.

The focus on strategies for survival and determination of the best of all available options leads to a still more complex level of interpretation that makes quantitative history even more difficult. As rich as the notarial archives are, they do not hold the stories of everyone (especially not those who chose to leave), and therefore quantifying the anecdotal evidence would be a mistake. Macro-level analysis becomes even more difficult because the terms used in the documentation and the purposes for which the documents were produced involve meanings that shifted over time and place. When we add to all this the fact that peoples of primarily Andean heritage thought as individuals (as well as members of ayllus, families, and ethnic groups), the number of variables proliferates to approach the number of participants.

After decades of exhausting archival research, colonial historians

have reached a point at which the conclusions reached ring true not because they fulfill the expectations of a political philosophy but because they make sense in human as well as intellectual terms. Clearly, the process is continual and ongoing: a new framework toward which to orient new research. It is not a model—the time has come to get rid of models entirely—but a new series of questions. Most of these questions relate to the survival of Andean cultures. Answering them is not just an academic exercise because these cultures are currently interacting with external forces that include international communications media, national governments, and Protestant missionaries. The strategies employed by native peoples to survive colonization in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries may yet prove critical to the survival of Latin American cultures in the future.

One advantage of being a Latin Americanist is that one cannot focus too narrowly. While preparing this essay, I had occasion to read portions of *Globalización, integración e identidad nacional (análisis comparado Argentina-Canadá)*, edited by Mario Rapoport.⁶ Ethnicity in the Canadian context of the late twentieth century is determined principally by idiom, not by race. The antipathy between adherents of the Church of England and those of Roman Catholicism is also a central factor. Rarely, however, have historians approached religion and language in assessing the interaction of peoples during the colonial period.

To understand native Andeans' view of history and the future, we need to do much more than simply empathize with their position. Unless scholars are able to frame the discussion within Andean languages and belief systems, no amount of political correctness or sympathy will be sufficient to comprehend their perceptions, let alone to represent their viewpoints in histories. New research must include conversations with those peoples in their own languages, as well as with ethnographers and other anthropologists who are studying their contemporary societies.

With research focusing on strategies for survival and accommodation accompanied by interest in the motivations that led to various courses of action being selected, the value of the oral tradition is enhanced. Although oral histories are often imprecise regarding names, dates, and other details, they speak directly to the issues of importance to future generations and the meaning of events.

With regard to the archival data, historians need to draw on the talents and methodologies of linguists and discourse-analysis specialists to approach more closely the meanings held by the language used in the historical documentation. A strong dose of caution will be fundamental in this process: these new methodologies should be applied with the

6. *Globalización, integración e identidad nacional (análisis comparado Argentina-Canadá)*, edited by Mario Rapoport (Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano, 1994).

same degree of caution that we have adopted in using those borrowed from sociology and political science in the past.

Furthermore, because the language of the documentation is almost entirely Castilian Spanish—not even Basque or Galician—and “Sunday-best” *castellano* at that, historians must not overlook non-native populations. We must explore more fully, using written and unwritten accounts, the processes by which Europeans, Asians, Africans, and mixed-blood populations adapted to life in the Andes. To do so is not to side with “the villains” but rather to keep trying to determine what motivated non-native peoples to act as they did.

Nor is language static. Lockhart speaks of a verbal “loosening” with regard to the Spanish honorific *don* during the first generation of Spanish colonization. The same was true of many words as they evolved in various places over five centuries. Andean words were adopted into Castilian Spanish and altered it fundamentally. Meanwhile, words from Castilian evolved differently in Peru than elsewhere. Aymara and Quichua words were filtered through Spanish into the other Indian language. For example, Klein uses *ayllu* as a geographical term, although it originally had no such meaning. Language has always been the key for historians, and it will continue to be fundamental.

Andean peoples found the means to survive—not unchanged over three centuries (they surely would have changed even without European contact)—by preserving intact core elements of their culture into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, adopting selected elements of European culture, and coproducing with Europeans unique hybrid societies. Andeanists need to turn to the Andean peoples for inspiration as we develop the skills necessary to carry our search forward. Meanwhile, we must stop apologizing for the truth that Andeans resisted absorption and survived despite it all. We have more than ample cause to admire them, to respect their cultures, and to learn from their examples.