INTRODUCTION

Indigenismo, Modernity, Indigenismos, Modernities

This book explores the contradictions that lie at the center of *indigenismo*, the cultural, social, and political movement that grew to prominence in the early twentieth century in Latin America. As a constellation of extremely varied practices, including painting, photography, literature, and literary and cultural criticism, as well as diverse government policies, indigenismo endeavored to vindicate the area's indigenous peoples after centuries of abuse and marginalization. In order to achieve this goal, it promoted the reconfiguration of society such that it would be more amenable to the *indio,* the term used to designate all indigenous people. Without exception, the discourses that sought to articulate this reconfiguration all constructed particular versions of the indio and of indigenous culture. As a result, the indio, represented by others' projections, became the critical component of the new configurations of Andean society and culture that these practices imagined. That is to say, the discourses of indigenismo were always also ways of figuring how the region might, in its own way, become modern. Thus, rather than focusing exclusively on how indigenismo represented the indigenous population and indigeneity, I seek to understand

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

a wide range of indigenista work as a commentary on and reaction to the appearance and implementation of modernization in its different forms within a region marginal to Europe and the United States. To do so, we must outline indigenismo in broad terms and then address conceptualizations of modernity as they relate to it.

While I will discuss some important concepts pertaining to the terms *modernization* and, in particular, *modernity,* it seems useful to make some initial comments concerning these two at times unwieldy terms. By *modernization* I mean to refer to a wide array of material and conceptual changes in Latin America, especially as they began to take place after the independence period of the 1820s. These transformations include the processes of societal democratization and the subsequent emergence of new subjects into the nation, the region, the city, the neighborhood, and other conceptual units of communal and individual identity. These transformations triggered subaltern subjects to lay claims on the societies that had previously marginalized them and, in most cases, persisted in so doing. This pressure from below is crucial to understanding the contours that modern societies assume in Latin America in general and the Andes more specifically.

In contrast to such claims, which can be understood as reactions, the term *modernization* may also denote initial actions. In this sense, it signals the influx of economic entities and systems from other parts of the globe, as well as the introduction of new technologies into Latin America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. One has only to imagine the impact that gas lighting, railroads, electricity, running water, radio, and cinema—to name but a few innovations—had on the organization of daily life to conceptualize the vast transformations that these advances wrought on Andean societies. Each of these innovations alone, and all of them together, decisively changed what it meant to live in the region over the course of this period. We must also not forget the importance of the industrialization of certain sectors of the economy, such as (significantly for this study) mining and textile production. Within this second connotation of modernization, which one might clarify by calling it instead "technologification," I want to stress technology's deep alteration of human experience and sensibility. In reality, it is difficult and perhaps impossible to separate, say, the implementation of railroads from their economic manifestation in a local context. Nevertheless, insisting on the conceptual distinction between these imports and the real-world contexts in which they appeared as novelties allows us to fully appreciate Latin America's initial receptiveness toward the material and conceptual apparatuses that appeared on its stage.

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Finally, by *modernization* I also mean to invoke the arrival and eventual eruption of foreign cultural concepts and artistic production in emphatically local cultural scenes. Here I note simply that foreign *ideas*—often experienced in the form of printed matter—were part and parcel of the mounting influx of goods that is a hallmark of the period. In whatever form they entered, these high and low cultural imports—which include Marxist concepts, cinematic forms, and highbrow surrealism—were sought out and eagerly welcomed by many Latin Americans. By suggesting that these conceptual and material imports are an explicit component of modernization, I anticipate the related, but distinct, terminology I will here employ to distinguish between the moment of their arrival—that is, modern*ization*—and their absorption or reformulation into what we might understand as properly Latin American cultural discourses.

The term I assign this second aspect is, in fact, *modernity.* In this sense, modernity designates quite explicitly the cultures that arise as a result of the types of encounters, contacts, and absorptions described above. I use this term to signal not an ideal state, but instead a fluid *response* to the dizzying varieties of modernization that spread across Latin America in the early twentieth century (although the term is applicable to much broader time periods and geographies). It is especially important to note that once any aspect of modernization is present in these societies—and it would be correct to ask, as Aníbal Quijano has, if there was ever a time from the moment of the conquest that modernization was not in some manifestation present—the production of modernity becomes unavoidable ("Modernity, Identity" 141).[1]

I also use the term *modernity*—often in the plural—to describe the particular discursive formations belonging to the intellectuals who took it upon themselves to represent indigenous peoples in their own works. This usage stresses modernity as a discursive strategy that, although not always realized in the material world, speaks about shaping the features of the future and the present in response to the forces or agents of modernization as described above. The articulations of Andean modernities that I study here are assertions of local agency before the often-foreign processes that shape both global and local realities. My use of this concept relies on a broad definition of *culture* as the customs, art, and worldview of a people, as expressed by either the whole of the group or by any individual who forms a part of it, even if here I focus on texts and those who write them as primary examples.

In choosing to narrow the concept of modernity in this way, I depart

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

from a broader understanding of the term that is intimately tied to the notion of the subject as it emerges in Europe from seventeenth century onward. In a recent study on the term *modernity,* Frederic Jameson claims that "Descartes' thoroughgoing break with the past constitutes not only the inauguration of modernity but already a self-conscious or reflexive theory of it" (31). This is because, according to Jameson, "with Descartes, we should be able to witness the emergence of the subject, or in other words, of the Western subject, that is to say, the modern subject as such, the subject of modernity" (43). Jürgen Habermas, in his well-known essay "Modernity: An Incomplete Project," clarifies the impact of this new subjecthood and its stance before the object world in his discussion of Max Weber, whom he says "characterized cultural modernity as the separation of the substantive reason expressed in religion and metaphysics into three autonomous spheres. They are: science, morality, and art" (9). The problems that arise in each of these spheres could, in turn, be handled as "questions of knowledge, or of justice and morality, or of taste" (9). The distance from this fragmentation of reason to the institutionalization of it proper to modernity is short.

According to Habermas, this form of the subject, and in particular the principle of subjectivity, determines modern culture (*Philosophical Discourse* 17). For him, the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution constitute the key historical events that embody the realization of the modern subject at the center of what had previously been a divinely ordered world. Thus, the godly became something formulated and reformulated by man much as the law lost its foundation in divine dictum and became anchored instead in the principle of the freedom of will, as reflected in the Napoleonic Code and in the Declaration of the Rights of Man (17). In this understanding, then, modernity can be taken to designate a utopian horizon at which the individual subject would be fully and triumphantly rationalized, to use Weber's terminology. This rationalization is indeed equivalent to the eighteenth-century ideals—embodied in the nascent French republic's call for *liberté, egalité, fraternité*—fomented in the wake of Europe's industrial and bourgeois revolutions. While there is no doubt that these ideals operate in the historical period and geopolitical space I study here, my use of the term *modernity* should be understood as a sort of account of their continuing journey through the Andes, and in particular of the eddies left in their wake.

One point merits a clear and forceful articulation here: in my view, modernity is not a choice with respect to the human subjects that experience it. Subjects may resist modernization, and they may even articulate or enact

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

an antimodernization agenda. Indeed, history is full of examples of people who have done just this, and for multitudinous reasons. However, once subjects respond to modernization, they have already defined themselves in relation to phenomena that do not, by definition, reflect pure originary social and cultural values. That is, I do not primarily understand modernity in the Andes as the outcropping or manifestation of an Enlightenment investment in an emancipated, egalitarian citizenry. Rather, I conceptualize modernity as the symptom that invariably and irrevocably, probably for better *and* for worse, marks the body of what was once the nonmodern.

Encompassing a wide array of intellectual production concerning the indigenous peoples of Latin America, indigenismo is intimately related to these two terms—modernization and modernity—and the phenomena to which this book understands them to refer. Without doubt, the early twentieth century witnessed an explosion of literary, critical, and visual work on the figure of the indio, especially in Mexico, Guatemala, and the Andean region. This broad geographical presence stems from the wide applicability and appeal of indigenismo's central, self-declared objective of vindicating the continent's indigenous peoples. This objective and the efforts to implement it distinguish indigenismo from the idyllic and idealized representations of the indio with which Latin American cultural history is equally rife, as evidenced by, for example, romanticism-inflected *indianista* works of the nineteenth century. As opposed to indigenismo, *indianismo* portrayed the indio in a sentimental light and was noticeably silent regarding the indigenous population's social, economic, and political marginalization in modern Latin America. *Cumandá* (1879), by Ecuador's Juan León Mera (1832–1894), for example, illustrates indianismo's tendency to represent indios as part of an idealized past and thus to ignore the conditions of their contemporary presence. By omitting any possibility of claims to the present that indigenous peoples might have, indianismo was successful at representing the indigenous while upholding entrenched hierarchies that kept the indio in subservience.

In contradistinction, indigenismo takes a critical position with respect to the dominant society and accuses it of exploiting and debasing indigenous people and their cultures. Such critical views, of course, are not unique to the twentieth century. Indigenismo finds foundational antecedents in figures such as Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas (1474–1566) and El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (1539–1616), who, respectively, denounced the atrocities visited upon indios by the Spanish colonizers and praised the order and complexity of the Inca Empire in the face of accusations of its barbarity.

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Other sympathetic works on the indio can be found in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including Clorinda Matto de Turner's (1852–1909) novel *Aves sin nido* from 1889 and Narciso Aréstegui's (1818–1892) *El Padre Horán* from 1848, the last of which the critic Efraín Kristal considers a major early Andean indigenista work. These works evidence the outrage that typifies indigenista discourse, as well as their authors' willingness to challenge such strongholds of authority as the church and the state. Thus, the vindication of the indio through the indictment of social and political institutions was already in place at least as early as the mid–nineteenth century. Later indigenistas were equally in debt to figures such as Manuel González Prada (1848–1918), who was among the first, in works such as the 1888 "Discurso en el Politeama," to call for social revolt in order to rectify the abuses committed against the indigenous population.

While indigenismo should, and indeed must, be historicized among the many writings on the indio produced during the colonial and republican periods, its defining moment occurs with the explosion of voices on indigenous matters in the first decades of the twentieth century. This is a period marked by the efforts to rebuild the nation and national pride after Peru lost the War of the Pacific to Chile in the late nineteenth century. A critic of indigenismo, Henri Favre makes a distinction between what he calls a *corriente,* or current, which generally preceded the modern period in Latin America, and what he calls a *movimiento,* or movement, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a periodization that is helpful in contextualizing the significance of these twentieth-century cultural practices. For Favre, the term *current* in this context denotes a generally favorable opinion toward the indigenous population that, according to the French anthropologist, has been in existence ever since Columbus wrote idealized accounts describing the natives that he encountered in the New World. As such, indigenismo, as a current, is "ancient, permanent, and diffuse" (7). In contradistinction, indigenismo as a movement has an ideological density that is not present in the current. Favre locates the start of the movement in the nineteenth century, in conjunction with the problematic of nationalism (8). Thus, Favre understands the indigenista movement to have taken on its full vigor, paradoxically, at precisely the moment when the fragility of Latin American nation-states became apparent.

At its core, the movement is understood to have crystallized around several seminal novels, such as Alcides Arguedas's (1879–1946) *Raza de bronce* (Race of Bronze) from 1919, Jorge Icaza's (1906–1978) *Huasipungo* from 1934, and Ciro Alegría's (1909–1967) *El mundo es ancho y ajeno* from

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

1941. However, as central as these novels have been to our understanding of indigenismo, they should not overshadow the significant and equally important critical and scholarly production on and about the indio in the same period. Here I refer to works such as José Carlos Mariátegui's (1894–1930) *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* from 1928, Pío Jaramillo Alvarado's (1884–1968) *El indio ecuatoriano* from 1936, Hildebrando Castro Pozo's (1890–1945) *Nuestra comunidad indígena* from 1918, and José Vasconcelos's (1882–1959) *Indología* from 1926, all of which purported to study "the indigenous question" through a more rigorously scientific lens than that provided by literary fiction. These critical works, perhaps more so than their aesthetic counterparts, reveal the ways in which the importation and acquisition of foreign theoretical models stoked new perspectives on what role the indigenous population should play in a modern Latin America, as well as how they, in fact, generated multiple solutions. Marxist political and cultural criticism, for example, was central to efforts to animate the defense of the indio within revolutionary frameworks that understood the indio as a constituent component of classed society. Models proposed by the German historian Oswald Spengler in *The Decline of the West* (1918) also irrefutably informed the surge of optimism concerning Latin America's indigenous peoples and the battle on their behalf. No matter how foreign their theoretical models, the novelistic, poetic, and critical discourses on the indio had a profound impact on social and political movements, including the emergence of socialism in Peru and political parties like the APRA (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana).[2] At the same time, it must be noted that indigenismo also found ready proponents in conservative and establishment circles.

This book addresses a particular historical period within this movement as defined by Favre, the period roughly from 1920 to 1940. As a scholar of lettered production, I was readily drawn to this period by the explosion of literary and academic works that occurred during this span. Although to my knowledge little quantitative data has been collected on the actual numbers of indigenista works published during the period, there is no doubt that these decades have long been widely recognized as witnessing a veritable avalanche of writings focused on the plight of the indio, as the works of Luis Enrique Tord, Wilfredo Kapsoli, José Deustua, José Luis Rénique, Efraín Kristal, José Tamayo Herrera, Mirko Lauer, and others indicate. As this book will show, this production ranged across a variety of lettered practices, including the properly literary practices named above but also, and crucially, fields such as law, journalism, and social criticism.

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

This effervescence, of course, did not arise in a void. As my attention to the great nineteenth-century Peruvian essayist Manuel González Prada shows, the effort to represent indigenous people, with a view to their vindication, took off at a full gallop after the disaster of the War of the Pacific (1879–1883). The war is widely understood to have demonstrated the utter failure of Peru and its state apparatus to consolidate the citizenry into a modern nation in the six decades following independence (Bonilla 220–21). Peru became involved in the conflict, originally a regional squabble between Bolivia and Chile over land and especially mineral rights in the Atacama Desert, when it refused to pledge neutrality. Peru thus emerges as a full participant in the war beginning in 1879, and indeed after 1880 the war effectively devolved into a struggle between Peru and Chile. However, equipped with a modern war machine, including technologically updated naval vessels, Chile was easily able to devastate the armies of the other two Andean nations.

Ultimately, the war resulted in not only humiliation and occupation but also the loss of both Peru's and Bolivia's southern coast. The shock of this loss, compounded by Peru's occupation and administration by a foreign power, led to much national concern with interrogating the causes for the defeat. Figures such as González Prada focused on denouncing the Creole oligarchy, which he, along with others such as members of the politicized El Círculo Literario (Kristal 107–10), understood to have retarded Peru's development by clinging to a colonialist and Hispanist culture and by relying on the semifeudal landowning system as the basis for a national economy. Such critics also vociferously denounced the marginalization of the indio as a central flaw in Peru's progress. As a result of this critique—occasioned, it should not be forgotten, by a lost war—González Prada came to be regarded as the first modern indigenista. No doubt, the effectiveness of Peru's indigenous masses in the resistance to the Chilean armies and their occupation played an important part in the launching of this denunciation. González Prada may well have taken note of this resistance and understood it as the emergence or possible protagonism of the indigenous masses in a future Peruvian history. Both Florencia Mallon and Nelson Manrique have indicated that, at the time, the militarized indigenous peasantry was responsible for creating their own brand of incipient nationalism (qtd. in Bonilla 223–24).

It would be several decades, however, before the critique of the nation's economic bases that arises in the aftermath of the war was addressed fully, in Augusto B. Leguía's government, and especially during his second

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

tenure as president from 1919 to 1930, an eleven-year period known as the *oncenio*, when he significantly expanded foreign investment in Peru. This period thus saw the exacerbation of differences between the export bourgeoisie and the landed middle class whose wealth was rooted in the hacienda system. The moment was equally characterized by a massive migration of middle- and lower-class highland Andeans to the major urban centers, such as Lima, in search of educational, economic, and social opportunities.

Significantly, this same government enacted the swiftest absorption of indigenista ideas to date. For example, as Paul Gelles points out, during the 1920s Leguía authorized several hundred indigenous groups to become legally recognized as *comunidades indígenas* with title to lands (244). Furthermore, Leguía also funded and supported the activities of the indigenista Comité Pro-Derecho Indígena Tawantinsuyo. This body operated under the leadership of the activists and intellectuals Dora Mayer and Pedro Zulen until 1923 and therafter existed under Leguía's sponsorship, when, as María Elena García recounts, the Comité split into two different groups because of a successful co-optation by the Leguía government (70). According to Marisol de la Cadena, the split occurred because of a heated disagreement over the Ley de Conscripción Vial (96). This piece of legislature emerged as part of the government's version of indigenismo. It was meant to modernize roads and thus allow merchandise and primary goods to flow more freely through the Andes. Perverted from the ideals of a liberatory indigenismo, this law meant to free up indigenous labor by removing it from the land and channeling it toward modernizing projects. It was thus promoted as liberating the indio from his colonial past. The irony that the labor was not paid and was frequently forced seems not have been a problem for Leguía or the government-aligned indigenistas who took over the official Comité.

The period I study in this book is thus defined by the existence of indigenismo first as an oppositional force, but then also as *both* an oppositional and an establishment set of practices. This duality is fundamental to the 1920s and 1930s, when revolutionary groups flourished alongside official government offices dedicated to bettering the lot of the indigenous population. The concomitant institutionalization of indigenismo in the law and in academic disciplines such as archeology, anthropology, and ethnography represents the movement's simultaneous entrenchment in and rejection of the status quo. As we shall see, however, indigenismo's activities across the political spectrum seem to have had at best an ambivalent effect on the day-to-day lives of the indigenous population.

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Indigenous persons in the Andes were likely the majority during the period in question. Thomas Davies reports, for instance, that Peru's 1940 census revealed a total population of 7,023,111, with indigenous persons representing 40 percent of this number, or 2,847,196 (3). These figures do not square with José Carlos Mariátegui's oft-cited calculation, published in the late 1920s, that the indigenous peoples constituted 80 percent of Peru's population (*Siete ensayos* 44). Magnus Mörner states that in 1950 official numbers put the percentage of that country's indigenous population at over 60 percent, while close to 40 percent were classified as such in Ecuador's 1942 census (209). As Davies and Mörner remind us, an important fact to remember is that the censuses were conducted in the absence of rigorous guidelines, and we do not know how fundamental categories such as indio and mestizo were then defined (3; 208–9). Most likely, the truth lies somewhere between the census and higher estimates such as Mariátegui's.

According to the same census that Davies cites, the central and southern highlands of Peru contained the largest number of indigenous persons, in particular in the departments of Ancash, Huánuco, Huancavelica, Ayacucho, Cuzco, and Puno (3). Living conditions for highland indios were generally abysmal. Davies recounts the scarcity of nourishment and chronic hunger, terrible sanitation, absence of health care, inadequate housing, and the continual exploitation faced by highland indigenous peoples during the period (4–9). Indeed, the pervasiveness and intractability of these problems are evident in recent studies that find that 79 percent of Peru's indigenous population continues to live in poverty (Macisaac 171).

Mörner has provided an ample vision of indigenous people's plight within a fuller context of economic structures and political developments. The Swedish historian has also given body to the claims made by Andean thinkers such as Manuel González Prada and José Carlos Mariátegui to the effect that the republic treated indigenous peoples worse than the colony did. Mörner understands the insertion of the Andes into the world market as the reason for this worsening situation, insofar as production for the world economy at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth was based on the exploitation of indigenous labor (162). This circumstance led inevitably to indigenous uprisings across the Andes and notably in Peru and Bolivia, which were violently repressed (186, 210). It should not be forgotten that recent studies have demonstrated that, across the Andes, the period of the early twentieth century also witnessed the organization of indigenous people into political actors who demanded their

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

rights be recognized (Gotkowitz, *Revolution* 69–100; Becker, "Comunas" 531–44).

This stark reality can correctly be taken up as the impetus behind the most benign of indigenismo's goals. However, when indigenismo is understood beyond its desires to improve the lot of the region's indigenous peoples and placed, rather, at the intersection of nationalist, classist, and racial contentions and the difficult birth of a modern society, the contradictions between indigenista texts and discourses and their titular objects become glaring. At this intersection, the disconnect between indigenismo's representational goals and its real effects becomes visible. This disconnect raises the question of why indigenista writers and artists would choose the indio, arguably the representative of some of the most backward aspects of Andean society as it relates to modernization, to communicate ideas about how the Andes should enter into and reap the benefits of a modern future. That is to say, why choose precisely the nonmodern in order to articulate the modern? At least in part, the answer to this question can be found in the processes of societal modernization itself.

Indigenismo's stated intention to make the indio an equal member of society, or at least to alleviate his centuries of penury, was put into effect in differing fashions depending on the interests of particular authors. For example, in texts such as *Contribución a una legislación tutelar indígena* (1920) and *La educación: Su función social en el Perú en el problema de la nacionalización* (1913), the educator José Antonio Encinas (1888–1958), from Puno, suggested that proper instruction of the indio, through reform of the Peruvian educational system, would substantially better his condition. Others, such as Pedro Zulen (1889–1924), an indigenista activist who founded the Asociación Pro-Indígena in 1909, tended to emphasize the role of moral improvements in bettering indigenous people's lives. These motives notwithstanding, in most cases the impulse to redeem the indio allowed, either explicitly or implicitly, indigenistas to articulate novel forms of communal identity in the Andes. This fact has usually resulted in the elaboration of a particular version of nationalism, but importantly it has also led to the fabrication of regionalisms, as in the case of the Cuzco indigenistas.

The emergence of coexistence and competition between regionalism and nationalism follow from the weakness of the latter and as a result of the processes that are hallmarks of many modern nations, such as democratization, a capitalist consumer economy, and the elaboration of a civil society. The often-mentioned and well-known coexistence of traditional forms

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

of social organization with society's advances is not solely a hallmark of the Andes today. In his by now canonical study of how nations are imagined as communities, Benedict Anderson provides a definition of nation that can be employed both expansively and productively in the context of the Andes. He writes that the nation "is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (6). But what if the all-encompassing imagination of a community in a given geopolitical space is made not from a centralized locus of official power and through its organs, such as dominant print media, but rather from another, marginalized position in an area's geopolitical space? What if what is perceived as sovereign is not the nation per se, but a part of its people? In modernity, Anderson's definition applies equally well to regional elites within a national space that elaborated a "deep, horizontal comradeship" that nevertheless limited itself to a unit smaller than the nation (7). Anderson's idea of imagined communities thus pertains equally to both nations and other social units in the Andes.

Within the Andes, regionalisms have been strong enough, as the case of the Cuzco indigenistas demonstrates, to mount a considerable response to the homogenization of a given geopolitical space proposed by nationalism. In turn, of course, regionalisms have proposed their own homogenization across class, race, and culture in alternative geopolitical spaces. While I cite Cuzco's intellectual movement as an example, regionalism should not be understood as limited to local, reduced geographical areas. The weakness of nationalism also cut another way: figures such as Gamaliel Churata (1897–1969), for instance, were able to fabricate discourses that exceeded any one nation and included at least two in a sort of super-regionalism. Thus, in his novel *El pez de oro,* from 1959, Churata sought to characterize Andean culture beyond national borders to include both Bolivia and Peru, and also importantly Aymara, Quechua, and Hispanic cultures.

In either the case of regionalism or nationalism, the discourse on the indio in the Andes has been, in part, the product of an anxiety about precisely who and what constitute the area's societies. González Prada signaled it early by asking who it was that, in fact, made up the majority of the nation. In the aftermath of the War of the Pacific, González Prada suggested that indios, and not the coastal *limeños* who had led the disastrous war against the foreign enemy, were the "real" national subjects. In so doing, he not only inverted the received knowledge of who could be counted as a citizen of Peru, but he in fact implemented a reasoning that came out of the egalitarian promises, although not realities, of independence. We should

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

take it as indicative that this meditation on the indio arises in the context of the war, widely understood to have been lost precisely because of Peru's insufficient modernization and thus inadequate modernity. Although written some years later, the despair at an inadequate modernity is also the case for the Bolivian Alcides Arguedas, whose pessimistic *Pueblo enfermo* from 1909 assigns this backwardness and the impossibility of modernity in the Andes precisely to a broad degeneration symbolized in the indigenous people themselves and present in all sectors of Andean society. In either writer, the indigenous becomes essential to imagining what modernity might —or might not—signify in the Andes.

The "discovery of the indigenous," as the historian Jorge Basadre memorably termed it, has had its greatest impact on intellectuals thinking about communal identity in the twentieth century. While we might immediately think of the preponderant turn in recent critical theory to a concern with identities marginal to dominant constructs of nation (gender, sexuality, and race, among others), indigenista works of the 1920s and 1930s did not generally seek to articulate a communal identity at the margins. As Silvia Rosman has commented, while critical paradigms that challenge dominant national identity, such as postcolonialism and queer theory to name but two, seek to designate identities at some distance from the centers of power, they continue to rely on and reiterate the idea of nation in order to do so (10). The nation still provides the contours of these identities, even as they mark its limits.

Quite to the contrary, the indigenistas discussed here had little interest in elaborating a novel identity at the social margins of dominant political traditions. Their discourses made claims on the very centers of regional and national identities and in fact sought to banish alternative articulations of community to power's periphery. In this way, the indigenistas presented a vocal and sharp contestation of traditional, established forms of understanding the nation, such as those based in Lima and in its wealthy elite. Signs of their success in these efforts at destabilization mark the century's literature.

One example that speaks to this point is the work of the Peruvian critic and playwright Sebastián Salazar Bondy (1924–1965). His writing demonstrates the urgency of doing away with inherited, unworkable modes of expressing communal identities and, in their stead, creating inclusive models. The publication of the *limeño*'s *Lima la horrible* in 1964 testifies to the impact of indigenismo. In this text, Salazar Bondy mounted a ferocious and eloquent critique of Lima and its avatars. He singled out one

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

of these, *criollismo,* which designates the culture of Creoles, or Peruvians born of Hispanic ancestors, and studied how it had allowed for a conflation of a colonialist ideology with a discourse of community that sought to be understood as the essence itself of Peruvianness (25–37). Salazar Bondy felicitously phrased the internal contradictions and powerful exclusionary tactics that constituted criollismo as "limeño nationalism" (27). Furthermore, Salazar Bondy's critique of dominating, urban articulations of a national community is motivated precisely by the fact that "here, in Lima, like pilgrims from all of Peru, the provinces have come together and, thanks to their frequently rending presence they now reproduce, in a multicolored urban image, the national duel: its abyssal split into two different fates, into two opposed—and one could say enemy—groups" (8).[3] Writing past the middle of the twentieth century, Salazar Bondy's awareness of indigenous people, and of the pressure their demands placed on efforts to articulate an Andean society, is deeply influenced by the effervescence of indigenismo. While the indigenistas' efforts lay in creating novel concepts of communal identity, it remains significant that their emphasis on the figure of the indio has left a long and deep imprint on this and innumerable other attempts to fashion an Andean identity.

In a sense, this imprint is a direct result of one of the issues that I find to be central to the representational strategy that the indigenistas fostered in respect to indigenous peoples. As they mounted their titular defense of the indios, they also created an image or figure that could *represent,* and do so amply. Until the rise of indigenismo in the nineteenth century, the indio as a cultural sign had seldom stood for more than the negative qualities and backwardness that were ascribed to indigeneity. A large part of indigenismo's labor and energy was spent in rehabilitating this figure and, in the sense Julio Ramos gives the term in his study of nineteenth-century Latin American literature, lending the indio representativity. With respect to identity and literary forms, Ramos asserts, "If identity has not always been an external piece of information to the discourse that names it—if the form, authority, and the institutional weight of the subject that designates it determine in large part the shape, the choice of materials that compose identity—perhaps today we could say, remembering Martí, that there would not be a Latin America until there was a discourse authorized to name it. Literature would bear the enormous and at times imposing weight of that *representativity*" (16, emphasis in original). Ramos's description of the interplay between identitarian discourse, literature, and the visibility of a region overlaps in telling ways with the project of indigenismo. The

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

indigenistas mobilized both lettered discourse and lettered institutions in order to articulate a novel communal identity for the Andes. However, *literature* is perhaps too broad and unwieldy a term for what ultimately bore the enormous weight of this representation. The study of indigenismo has been overwhelmingly centered on novels and book-length critical works, while arguably the most resonant contributions to the indigenista effervescence appeared in periodical publications and, especially in the Andes, in poetry. In their work on newspaper debates and on avant-garde poetry of the 1920s, respectively, Gerardo Leibner and Mirko Lauer have begun to shatter the façade of indigenismo as a mainly narrative and novelistic project. The implications of opening up the corpus of texts used to study indigenismo reconfigure the movement beyond narrow attempts to understand it as an effort in fiction.

While it was lettered production—in forms as diverse as the novel, the short story, poetry, anthropological treatises, literary theory, and history—that constituted the means through which the brunt of the indigenista assault on received articulations of the Andes was launched, it was actually the indio, in all of these cases, who bore the pressure of representing peculiar and divergent modernities. This pressure, according to each particular indigenista's vision, shaped the representation of the indio according to particular discursive needs. If the subject of this book is the use of the indio to conjure modernity in early twentieth-century cultural production in the Andes, it must also be centrally concerned with the variety of these configurations. It is precisely through them, and not through other means within this lettered movement, that the challenges of thinking society and identity in the region become perceptible.

My account departs substantially from what is perhaps the most important conceptualization of indigenismo in recent criticism. First developed in his reading of the indigenista tradition, Peruvian critic Antonio Cornejo Polar's theory of heterogeneity is applicable to vast portions of Latin American literature. According to Cornejo, heterogeneity describes literary texts in relation to their permeability, as Hispanic and European cultural products, to American indigenous cultures. Cornejo saw heterogeneity as a defining factor in Latin America's literary history, and he located it at every point in that history, beginning with the event of the conquest, and in particular with the different *crónicas* that came out of it ("*Indigenismo*" 106–7). His understanding of heterogeneity placed the concept between a homogeneity that the violence of conquest contaminated and an implied

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

other, future homogeneity that might arise when subaltern, indigenous culture would be able to express its own values to itself. As Cornejo Polar himself notes, this trajectory of literary practices surrounding the indio mirrors Mariátegui's early theorization of a tripartite progression from indianista literature that romanticized the indigenous, to indigenista literature that advocates for the indio and is written by mestizos, to *indígena* literature, to be produced eventually by the indio himself (109–10).

Cornejo's discussion of Andean indigenismo, and notably of the work of José María Arguedas, makes clear the real force and value of heterogeneity as a critical tool. Its power lies in its capacity to maintain the status of literature as representational of the complex social dynamics and history of the Andes. For Cornejo, this means that heterogeneity makes visible the violence and discord that lie at the center of Andean society. Heterogeneity involves the eruption of the codes and semantic systems of a subaltern culture into products of the dominant culture, but this does not imply that any sort of synthesis takes places. Rather, instances of heterogeneity are a sort of tense cohabitation and agon between two estranged cultures. Heterogeneity takes two major forms: "either the subjection of the referent to the rule of exogenous factors . . . or, as in some exceptional cases, the capacity of that same referent to modify—and the implications are obvious—the formal order" of the dominant tradition's texts (108). The results of the degrees of heterogeneity, of the intensity of its constituent parts, are visible in the literary text.

I make recourse to the concept of heterogeneity in order to understand works of Andean literature as reflective of the conflict between the region's different cultures and groups. However, Cornejo Polar's theory exceeds a singular representation of conflict: "The best indigenismo . . . does not just assume the interests of the indigenous peasantry; it also assimilates, at a diverse degree, timidly or boldly, certain literary forms that organically pertain to the referent. It is understandable that this dual assimilation of social interests and aesthetic forms constitutes the dialectical correlate of the imposition that the indigenous world suffers from the productive system of indigenismo: in a manner of speaking, this is its response" (114). While the representation of the exteriority of the conflict between two different cultures seems undeniable in indigenismo, we must view with skeptisim Cornejo Polar's insistence that the interiority of an indigenous worldview might also be communicated in this production. Even in the case of José María Arguedas, whom Cornejo Polar signals as an exemplar of this "best indigenismo," the assertion that cultural forms "common to the referent"

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

(that is, indigenous culture) can be transported intact into a distinct tradition (in this case, the materiality of Hispanic literature) is suspect. At best, and happily, Spanish-language literature offers an approximation of that culture's forms (114).

My understanding of indigenismo thus differs from Cornejo's as expressed through his early elaborations of heterogeneity. Rather than conjecture the presence of indigenous culture in the indigenista texts, I read the continual and tenacious displacement of this same culture and its associated interests. This is to say, I understand indigenismo not in a representational register, but rather as a constant disavowal of an indigeneity that, by definition, cannot be equal to it. In my conception, lettered practice of the period does not embody or authentically communicate indigenous interiority. Rather, in relation to indigenous subjects and cultures, lettered indigenismo operates as a mechanism that constantly evokes an indigenous object. As it does so, indigenismo may create novel cultural forms, but it does so always at a distance that reflects the gap between Hispanic society and indigenous cultures. Indigenismo's many cultural products do not close this distance; on the contrary, they mark it.

Importantly, in his late writings on indigenismo (such as the masterful *Escribir en el aire* [1994]), Cornejo Polar himself stressed an alienation of the indigenous in indigenista production. This he attributed to the movement's political goals: "Indigenismo is as much an effective weapon against its historical enemy, the oligarchy and especially the Andean hacienda system, as it is a displaced writing that, precisely because of this, puts at the center of the national scene the producer of the discourse on the other, the Indian (*Escribir* 206).[4] Thus, in his final work, Cornejo Polar noted a tension between his previous claims of indigenismo's representativity with respect to indigenous culture and the ways in which that same discourse represented a will to power put into circulation by an ascendant mestizo subject. I follow and build upon this skeptical turn in Cornejo Polar's later work.

The skepticism with respect to the claims of authenticity that heterogeneity can channel is borne out in the early twentieth-century texts that I analyze here. This suspicion arises not from an a priori judgment concerning the capacity of Hispanic lettered works to represent indigenous peoples, but rather from reading these texts together with their historical moment. Texts such as Mariátegui's *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana,* Oquendo de Amat's *5 metros de poemas,* and the newspaper *Labor,* when placed within the historical context of modernization, overwhelmingly suggest that indigenista works were much more concerned with articulat-

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

ing a vision of Andean society that would fit into the modern period than they were in offering truthful accounts of indios and their worldview. Indeed, this suspicion should ultimately be applied to Cornejo Polar's theory, in particular as it concerns Arguedas's own attempts to envision, through his rich and polymorphic indigenismo, the modern Andes of his time. The purpose here is not to deauthorize or denounce these works as false because they do not "truly" represent the indigenous. On the contrary, these works responded to the challenge of conceptualizing a modernity in such a way that might itself better accommodate the indio. But these efforts are not synonymous with a communication of indigenous culture from within.

Cornejo Polar argues that heterogeneity operates both in the circulation of a literary text and on the level of the text's language itself (104–5). That is, it may be expressed in a text's audience and in its codes. But whereas the backdrop for heterogeneity, and ultimately its referent, is the conquest and the clash of cultures to which it gave rise, the referent for my reading of indigenismo is modernization and the modernity that it triggered, particularly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As Mariátegui himself noted, indigenismo "is not disconnected from the other new elements of this hour. On the contrary, it is connected to them" (*Siete ensayos* 238). While Cornejo's theory of heterogeneity attempts to understand indigenismo as an instance of the intercalation of indigenous culture as a disruptive presence within one of the central institutions of Hispanic society in Latin America, my intention is not to produce a similar snapshot of a particular moment of conflict between cultures in the Americas. Rather, in my reading, indigenismo provides a rich account and conceptualization of the forms that modernity was thought to take, and still might, in the Andes. Under this view, indigenismo constitutes one of the richest archives on the modern in Latin American letters.

THIS STUDY RELIES on the notion that at a given historical moment, in a given geographic space, the expression of a unique modernity is likely and indeed unavoidable. In his study of the cultural discourse of modernity in Latin America, Carlos Alonso asserts, "'Modernity' is a concept with a historical dimension that is privative to every context in which it is invoked and thus must be accounted for—not only because the idearium of modernity and what is regarded as 'modern' evolve both in metropolitan and peripheral circles but also because the historical circumstances in which every claim for modernity is made in Spanish America lend concrete specificity to each claim, however repetitive or derivative the gesture may seem"

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

(*Burden* vi). Accordingly, the context of indigenismo in the early twentieth century in the Andes necessarily lends its proper stamp to the series of discursive formations analyzed here, and it does so in ways that are inflected by both the forms that these discourses take—poetry, newspaper, polemic, essay, and photography—and by the uniquely nuanced perspective of the agents that enunciate them. In other words, we must take into account both the materiality and the social and historical contexts of the production of these indigenista works.

This approach to indigenismo and to its discourses on the modern leads inevitably to the conceptualization of *modernities:* that is, to a plural understanding of the cultural forms modernization generates in societies. It is precisely the insistence on this plurality that informs theories that have been attentive to modernity's manifestations in societies peripheral to Europe and the United States. In the introduction to a collection of essays on the topic, Dilip Gaonkar lucidly comments on the notion of "alternative modernities" and on the interrelationship of this notion with the idea of a central modernity. In his commentary on Charles Taylor's work, he characterizes the idea of a single modernity, applicable everywhere, as "acultural" (16). Such an understanding "describes the transition to modernity in terms of a set of culture-neutral operations, which are viewed as 'input' that can transform any traditional society" (16–17). According to Gaonkar, this notion does not take into account the deeply cultural nature of modernity as originated and disseminated from Europe, nor the diverse encounter with this European modernity in the global margins.

In contrast, Gaonkar gestures to a cultural theory of modernities, which "holds that modernity always unfolds within a specific cultural or civilizational context and that different starting points for the transition to modernity lead to different outcomes" (17). This articulation necessarily multiplies the impact of the modern and thus gives rise to modernities as Alonso has also described. This theory of divergence allows for an understanding of the ways in which specific cultures inflect and interpret modern transformations. These modernities are perhaps best understood as "an attitude of questioning the present" (13).

With respect to the lettered and visual discourses that are the subject of this book, I believe one finds this critical stance in relation to the contemporary moment at almost every point. However, this dimension of the articulation of the modern in the Andes does not take precedence over, and indeed may be secondary to, the forceful proposition of particular dynamics and manifestations inspired by the question posed by the processes of

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

modernization. Said another way, while the cultural production studied herein questions the technological, intellectual, and social transformations as they appear in the Andes in the twentieth century, it also takes them as extraordinarily and fundamentally pliable. There is a vibrant agency at play here that undoes the idea that modernization is simply a threat to traditional cultures, against which local cultural producers defend themselves. None of the writers and artists discussed here can be understood solely as guardians of the local. Rather, in order to understand the full impact of their work, they must be taken as inventive middlemen who saw, in the modern, a chance to shape their lived and cultural contexts and thus to respond to and especially to correct long-standing local problems. In this, these discursive modernities evidence something of the dynamism that Néstor García Canclini, in his *Culturas híbridas,* identifies in the contact between traditional and modern cultures in the Latin American context and that he understands as hybridity.

This book evidences this negotiation and inflection of modernity by a local, Andean context. Both a literary theorist and a social critic, Mariátegui unifies disparate revolutionary discourses in *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* (1928) and other writings, evoking the basic teleological synonymy of both Marxism and indigenous utopianism in a way that allows him to sidestep the significance of indigenous cultural forms in favor of purported indigenous revolutionary beliefs. Thus, Mariátegui creates a specific image of the indio gleaned from an emphasis on and misreading of particular details, such as indigenous communal labor practices. If, in Mariátegui's view, indigenismo was meant to enfranchise the indio, it was severely hampered in this goal by employing representations that were removed from indigenous reality and a deep knowledge of the indigenous population and that omitted the indio's own worldview. Importantly, Mariátegui utilizes literature and, in particular, its arguably most rarified form in Western literary culture, poetry, in order to claim the centrality of the indio in Andean society of his time. His insistence on César Vallejo's poems as the premiere site for making the indio visible signals, in fact, the indio's invisibility within his own formulation of the modern.

Various other undercurrents in indigenismo sought to introduce indigenous and highland cultures into the formulation of modernity in the Andean region. Figures such as the conservative José Ángel Escalante (1883–1965) first muddied the placid waters of a dominant, coastal indigenismo led by figures such as José Carlos Mariátegui by insisting upon indigenous cultural customs and identities that questioned hegemonic in-

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

tellectuals' subordination of regional cultures to a utopian national identity. Contextualizing Escalante's discourse under the arc of a century of indigenista discourses demonstrates the importance of this idealized national identity. Escalante's disruption of indigenismo's tactics makes visible the power dynamics at the center of the movement. Furthermore, his interventions characterize the frequent tensions between regionalist and nationalist discourses within indigenismo. Finally, Escalante's case is also highly instructive as to the mobility of indigenismo's political allegiances, as he eventually became a government official who used indigenista discourse to prop up the government.

The innovative book-object created by the Peruvian poet Oquendo de Amat (1905–1936), *5 metros de poemas,* uses the metaphor of film to conceptualize the conflictive contact between the Andes and the influx of modernizing forces. For Oquendo de Amat, the Andes is equally evocative of nature, the area's indigenous and mestizo inhabitants, and his own childhood. He thus represents these elements by gesturing to the region and the traditions that, for him, it epitomizes. In the encounter between tradition and modernization, the poet eventually advocates the abandonment of a technological modernization. Oquendo de Amat's denial of technology leads him to propose migration as a cultural model that might allow Andean subjects to exist in both traditional and modern spaces without mixing them. Effectively, Oquendo de Amat proposes an impossible denial of modernization's processes and identifies poetry with traditional Andean culture in order to do so. His poetry thus narrates the emergence of a sort of antimodernity, and it is telling that after this work was published, Oquendo de Amat never again prioritized his poetic activity by publishing any other books of verse.

Labor was a working-class newspaper in the 1920s, created by Mariátegui but edited and written by a collective of indigenista intellectuals and activists that included Tristán Marof, Ricardo Martínez de la Torre, and Esteban Pavlevitch. Although at first *Labor* participated in an idealization of indigenous people, and in particular of their assumed communism, it is nevertheless a pioneer within indigenismo because its publication and circulation among both regional and urban masses quickly led its editorial group to consider indigenous people from the perspective of class. The newspaper thus shifted away from dominant indigenista texts, which remained anchored in ethnicity and race. In understanding indigenous peoples through a concept of class dynamics, *Labor* strove to connect indios to their rural and urban working counterparts, rather than to distinguish them. This shift leads directly to a politics of self-representation in print,

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

and thus constitutes a turning point in the configuration of lettered institutions in Andean modernity. Whereas previously the indigenous are often instrumentalized by lettered practice, *Labor* destabilized these lettered authorities and allowed for the possibility of the emergence and recognition of subaltern voices.

A consideration of Martín Chambi's (1891–1973) photographic practice allows us to take up the dynamics between lettered and visual cultures. Against scholarship that understands Chambi's work as indigenista discourse in the vein of either José Uriel García's celebratory view of the transformation of indigenous culture through mestizaje in *El nuevo indio* (1930) or Luis Varcárcel's messianic interpretation of the indio in *Tempestad en los Andes* (1927), I argue that Chambi's pictures of indigenous people and other highland denizens, taken between 1925 and 1940, visually represent and document the roles that they assume within the processes of societal and technological modernization. In equal measure discourse and documentation, these photographs attest to a peculiar Andean modernity that neither obliterates nor aggrandizes the indio but instead strives to understand the persistent ways in which indigenous and local cultures adapt to and exploit the rifts and fissures that modernization leaves in its wake. An analysis of modern visual technology suggests the contours and limits of lettered culture's representations of indios in the Andes.

Although I emphasize the plurality of modernity in the Andes, other theories of modernity propose a monolithic view of that phenomenon. These come in two varieties: those that are Eurocentric, as Gaonkar and others have identified; and those that, while asserting the unity of all aspects of modernity on a global scale, nevertheless understand the significance of different geopolitical parts of the globe as at least equal. The first are associated with figures such as Daniel Bell, who understands modernization as a process that runs its course in a similar way in every corner of the globe and which will thus eventually result in an identical modernity everywhere. His view, in *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism,* insists on the beneficence of this modernity but cannot account for the local contexts in which modernization takes root.

The latter variety, mapped out persuasively by critics such as Immanuel Wallerstein through the concept of world systems theory, holds that modernity originated as part of a dialectical process in the contact between Europe and the rest of the world and that any conceptualization that takes into account only one geopolitical site is therefore incomplete. A prominent Peruvian critic of modernity in the Andes, Aníbal Quijano, stands as a ma-

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

jor affiliate of this theory in Latin America. Quijano describes Latin America's relationship to modernization and modernity by saying, "Although Latin America may have been, in fact, a latecomer to, and almost passive victim of, "modernization," it was, on the other hand, an active participant in the production of modernity" ("Modernity, Identity" 141). In this fashion, Quijano touches upon the peculiar correlation between modernization and modernity in the area. The mere appearance of the first is enough to create a full manifestation of the second; indeed, this has almost always been the case in Latin America, given the region's lackluster record of expansive technological and industrial growth.

Furthermore, Quijano argues that "this copresence of Latin America in the production of modernity not only continued but became more conscious throughout the period of the crystallization of modernity, especially during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" (142). As such, and given the weakness of modernization, he understands modernity in Latin America to have been largely intellectual: that is, to have taken place in the intersubjective realm of cultural production (144).

Quijano's emphasis on the cultural manifestations of modernity, as opposed to its objective material existence, leads directly into my field of investigation here. Nevertheless, although I am aware of the persistent calls to propose a totalizing notion of modernity, I ground my analyses here on a synchronic plane and leave a diachronic reading—no doubt fascinating in the Andes—to another project. I take this position because I believe that the dynamics of a universal modernity can only be grasped after careful scrutiny of the particulars of modernities in many geopolitical hinterlands. Timothy Mitchell, in his commentaries on modernities at the margins, has argued that critics must note "the singularity and universalism of the project of modernity and, at the same time, attend to a necessary feature of this universalism that repeatedly makes its realization incomplete. Briefly, if the logic and movement of history can be produced only by displacing and discounting what remains heterogeneous to it, then the latter plays the paradoxical but unavoidable role of the 'constitutive outside'" (xii–xiii). It is this constitutive outside, and especially its paradoxes, that I sound in my research into Andean indigenismo.

Indigenismo is synonymous with cultural modernity not simply because as a movement it came to the fore at one of the most fervent historical moments for thinking about the modern. To make such a declaration limiting the contact between indigenismo and modernity to simple contemporaneousness would be to misunderstand the deep ties that bind them together.

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Whether it be Mariátegui's strident emphasis on and central position of the indigenous, Escalante's seesawing commitment to indios, *Labor*'s driven effort to absorb indios into a broader reading of class, Oquendo de Amat's attempt to affiliate the indigenous with rural tradition and his insistence on safeguarding such a position, or Chambi's photographic reflection on Andean subjects and modernity, all interpret the material and conceptual presence of the modern as more than mere tools. Simply put, they take the modern as the impetus, indeed the mandate, to correct the colonial legacy and neocolonial reality so firmly rooted in the region. As such, we should not forget the profoundly utopian sense that undergirds each of these attempts to pronounce modernity.

© 2009 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.