HACIENDA—INDIAN COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND INDIAN ACCULTURATION:
An Historiographical Essay

Erwin P. Grieshaber
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

In analyzing the historical development of Meso- and Andean–American society, historians have stressed the hacienda's destructive impact on native settlements, which, once broken down, became disposed to the adoption of Spanish traits. This view focuses primarily on the *hacendado*'s acquisition of Indian land and labor and the resultant destruction, partial or complete, of traditional Indian forms of cultivation, trade, and ultimately social relationships. To the extent that the hacendado forced communal Indians to resettle in newly opened lands, cultivate European crops, and engage in European trade, he encouraged the Indians to abandon their traditional rituals and adopt readily available Spanish patterns as replacements.[1]

The above description of the process of acculturation is in my view valid, except for one factor: it gives the impression that the chief causal agent in the breakdown of Indian society was the establishment of the hacienda. I would like to review the literature on the evolving relationship between Indian communities and haciendas, for the colonial and republican periods, with another thesis in mind. Rather than seeing the hacienda's interaction with Indian society as unidirectional—i.e., as always being destructive of native social organization and leading to the greater and greater acceptance of Spanish traits—I view the interaction as capable of going in two directions, one toward the survival of native traits and the other toward the wholesale acceptance of Spanish ways. The direction of a particular interaction would depend on local conditions: the relative openness of a native settlement to Spanish cultural penetration was not dependent exclusively on the presence or absence of a hacienda but on such conditions as the density of the Indian population, strength of Indian communal organization, type of agricultural production, proximity to a large Spanish city, and the number of non-Indians occupying the countryside.

These local factors limited the available forms of interaction between Indians and Spaniards. For example, in an area of high Indian population density, far removed from a Spanish market center and incapable of producing crops valuable to Europeans, the native inhabitants were not likely to experience a heavy influx of Spaniards nor a restructuring of their basic agricultural patterns.

107

On the other hand, in fertile areas capable of producing wheat, sugar, or other valuable non-native products and containing relatively few Indians, Spanish farmers were likely to establish farms in unoccupied areas that would require an imported labor force, either Indians uprooted from their traditional settlements and/or black slaves. Under these conditions of removal and interaction with blacks and whites, Indians became prone to the adoption of Spanish traits. Depending on how closely actual conditions matched these polar opposite models, the possible responses on the part of the Indians might range from total collapse of their native social organization to partial retention of Indian traits to full independence but existing in areas remote from Spanish influence.

In addition to the regional factors that influenced hacienda-Indian community relations and subsequent acculturation, these two processes must be placed within the context of the general demographic and economic changes that occurred over the period 1519 to 1970. The initial shock of the conquest resulted in a tremendous population decline and severed the ties of the local Indian villages with their empires. Despite the destructive impact of disease, however, enough Indians remained in the highlands of Mexico, Guatemala, and Peru to recongregate into new Indian sociocultural units. During the colonial era, the highland Indians in the densely populated areas slowly adopted aspects of Spanish diet, methods of agriculture, and outward forms of Catholic religious ritual. The adoption of these traits, combined with the survival of pre-Columbian traits, resulted in the formation of a syncretic culture that was still distinctively Indian. In the areas peripheral to the Indian core, the absence of sedentary Indians or the severe loss of Indians as a result of disease, plus a heavy influx of whites and blacks, led to the wholesale adoption of Spanish ways. For three hundred years, approximately 1550 to 1850, these divergent trends became more pronounced and ultimately evolved into two different societies.

After 1850, the impact of late nineteenth-century world economic development produced swift changes in the utilization of land and labor in Latin America. In some cases highland Indian communities suffered grievously and in others they were only slightly affected. During this period, Indian communities tried to close themselves off from rapid change. After 1930, however, the processes of population growth, industrialization, and urbanization tended to force the Indians into national culture. As the process of cultural homogenization spread, the societies of the Indian core areas began to take on the characteristics of the societies that had emerged in the peripheral areas. When social groups tend to become culturally more homogeneous (i.e., speak the same language and adhere to the same cultural values) but can be distinguished by slight differences in racial phenotype, or other outward characteristics, then social mobility is hindered not only by exploitive socioeconomic structures but also by racial prejudice. In fact, this kind of prejudice is most common among the poor themselves.

The most crucial factor in the long-term survival of native social organization would be the maintenance of a minimum level of population. This can be readily seen by using an example from North America. From 1830 to 1833 the

Indian tribes along the Columbia, Willamette, and Sacramento rivers in the northwestern United States suffered a malaria epidemic. Individual tribes, which contained about four hundred to five hundred people prior to the epidemic, lost 75 percent of their population. The few survivors wandered away from their traditional lands and either merged with white society or escaped into the mountains. Because the survivors were too few, too dispersed, and spoke different languages, they failed to unite with other Indians to recreate viable population clusters of Indian culture. Sherburne Cook, who analyzed the effects of this epidemic, concluded that: "The Indians as an effective social and biological organism were destroyed in the lower valleys of the Columbia and Willamette rivers. As a result the advancing tide of white settlement met with little or no resistance from the demoralized survivors."[2]

No such total dislocation occurred in the densely populated areas of Meso and Andean America. Although the native population declined by about 80 percent as a result of European diseases, enough Indians remained to reconstitute new societal units. Woodrow Borah's and Sherburne Cook's research, based on Aztec and Spanish tribute lists, showed that the Indian population of central Mexico (i.e., the area from just north of Mexico City to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec) declined from approximately twenty-five million in 1518 to 2,500,000 in 1568 to one million in 1605. Once adjusted to European disease the Indian population began to increase slowly, climbing to three million by 1805.[3] The Indian population of the Andean area prior to the conquest was much smaller than Mexico, but it also followed the same downward route. Noble David Cook, who also based his research on Spanish tribute lists, estimated a total Indian population of 2,738,000 in 1530 which declined to approximately 1,300,000 in 1570 and then down to 600,000 in 1620.[4] Contrary to the population rise in Mexico after 1605, the Indian population of the Andean area continued to fall until the middle of the eighteenth century. It amounted to about 400,000 in 1754 and thereafter increased slowly.[5]

These investigators also indicate that the demographic decline varied with regional factors. Because of the hot and humid climate along the coast of Mexico, the rate of annual Indian population decline there was double that of highland Mexico until about 1580, whereupon it began to level off and become less than the highlands by 1595. Coastal Mexico contained 33 percent of the Indian population in 1532 and only 13 percent in 1608.[6] Similarly, in the Andean area, the Indian population of the coastal regions, which amounted to only 20 percent of the total in 1570, declined by about two-thirds, while in the highland zones it declined by about one-half. By 1620 the coastal regions of Peru contained only 12 percent of the total Indian population.[7] Thus by 1600 the surviving Indian population in Meso America and Andean America was disproportionately concentrated in the highlands. In essence, enough Indians remained in the highlands to reproduce portions of their traditional social structure.

In addition to severe population decline, the Spanish conquest also disrupted the links between local villages and their supra-regional empires. Both in Andean America and in Meso America, local landholding villages, of varying population size, were intimately bound through tribute systems to the Inca and

109

Aztec empires. Although exploited, the Indians understood their exploitation as being part of a cosmic order ordained by priests and gods. As described by ethnohistorian Eric Wolf, the Aztec empire (as also the Inca) provided the Indians with "a common purpose and a common ritual idiom for the articulation of that purpose."[8] The Spaniards, however, by co-opting or destroying native leaders, by imposing a new religion, and by introducing new forms of tribute (money payments), increasing levels on old forms of tribute (especially textiles), and maintaining high levels of tribute despite population decline cut the ties that bound the Indians to their former empires and thus destroyed the Indian's traditional understanding of his universe. After the Spanish conquest, the Indians felt that they were being exploited without reason. As a result of this social dislocation, the inhabitants of the surviving Indian communities turned toward a revival of local religion for solace. They accepted portions of the Catholic faith, but retained many of their animistic beliefs that coincided with Catholic ritual.[9]

The Spaniards' chief allies in severing the villages from their empires were the local Indian leaders, *tlatoani* in Meso America and *kurakas* in Andean America. Once resistance to the conquerors proved fruitless, these Indian leaders joined hands with the Spanish rulers in exploiting the Indian commoners. Following the Spaniards' example, Indian leaders quickly learned the benefits of European commerce. Using privileges accorded to them under the old system, they appropriated land and laborers from their communities in order to produce commodities for new Spanish markets. They became the allies of priests, *encomenderos* and *corregidores*. They forced Indian commoners to support the Church, observe, at least nominally, Catholic rituals, and pay tribute. In executing Spanish economic, political, and religious demands, an Indian leader undermined his traditional source of authority and became just one more Spanish exploiter.[10]

Although Spanish colonization destroyed the Indian empires, co-opted Indian leaders, and reduced the native population by about 80 percent, Spanish rulers nevertheless sought to preserve, at least partially, the surviving native villages. Indeed the organization of the Spanish colonial economy depended on a steady supply of labor and tribute from these Indian villages. During the initial stages of colonization, the Spaniards used rotational labor-draft systems, modeled after Indian prototypes of *cuatequil* and *mita*, which regularly returned Indians to their villages after a certain period of service. Spanish law also accorded the Indian communities special rights, the prime one being the protection of a certain minimal amount of land. Although the Spanish violated that protection and illegally appropriated much Indian land, the landowners of the highland areas deliberately preserved Indian communities because they could be exploited as sources of cheap labor. Thus, in the Indian core areas of Meso and Andean America, Indian communities and culture survived despite the expansion of the hacienda.

The impact of Spanish institutions was quite different outside the Indian core. In areas that lacked large groups of exploitable Indians, Spanish landowners were forced to import new laborers, either black slaves or Indians uprooted from other areas. The resulting demographic ratios so favored whites and blacks, who were already acculturated to Spanish life, that they tended to

110

force the newly arrived Indians into the Spanish world, and vestiges of Indian culture disappeared in these areas. In reviewing the literature, the societies formed in the Indian core areas of the highlands of Mexico, Guatemala, and Peru will be contrasted with the peripheral areas of northern Mexico, coastal Guatemala, and coastal Peru.

For Mexico and Central America, the Indian core areas have been well researched. Charles Gibson's study *Aztecs under Spanish Rule, A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico 1519–1810* describes the process by which Spaniards acquired Indian labor and land and how it affected the Indian population. In the early period from about 1519 to 1560, when the Indian population was still substantial, the Spaniards exploited the natives indirectly through the *encomienda* system. Spanish governors entrusted to the men who had participated in the conquest large groups of Indians from whom the trustee, or *encomendero*, received tribute in goods and labor. Encomenderos obtained maize and other native products that were used to supply the cities with food. They also used encomienda laborers to build town houses, churches, and government buildings, and, most importantly, to plant and harvest crops on the first Spanish wheat farms located around Mexico City. Within the encomiendas, Indian leaders ensured the prompt arrival of goods and workers by employing native systems of exploitation that had been in use for centuries. But as the number of Indians dwindled and as the number of Spaniards increased during the sixteenth century, the competition for Indian laborers increased enormously. In 1549, in order to limit the power of an incipient nobility (encomenderos) and to ensure that non-encomenderos received their share of the labor force, the crown assumed formal control of all labor allocations. Called *repartimientos*, these labor allocations were used mainly for city construction, especially flood control, and for agricultural work on nearby wheat haciendas. The allocations were based on a rotational system, whereby a group of Indians would work one week, return to their village and not be called again for three months. As the population continued to decline, Indian leaders by the early seventeenth century began to default in delivering quotas. In response Spanish farmers began acquiring private groups of laborers, *gañanes*, many of whom volunteered to work on farms, temporarily or permanently, in order to escape the heavy demands made on their former communities. According to Gibson's analysis, the development of labor institutions from encomienda to repartimiento to private control was a response to a shrinking labor supply.[11]

But the growth of a private labor force was also a function of Spanish land acquisitions. As the Indian population declined, Spaniards easily acquired abandoned parcels of land. During the first century after the conquest, Spaniards, through purchase, usurpation, and grants, obtained about half of the usable land in the Valley of Mexico—two thirds of which had been turned to pasture land and one third to agricultural land. From these original grants and purchases, hacendados expanded their holdings by putting pressure on the remaining Indian communities to rent or sell them more land. As the amount of land owned by Indian communities shrank (to almost nothing but their housesites by the end of the eighteenth century), the communal inhabitants were forced to sell

111

their labor to haciendas in order to survive. Hacendados normally paid their workers partly in money and partly in grain. In essence, Spanish land acquisitions deprived the Indians of an independent livelihood and thus ensured the hacendados of a stable and cheap labor force without resort to overt forms of compulsion.[12] Thus land acquisitions were not intended to destroy Indian communities but to limit their economic development.

John Tutino's dissertation on the agrarian society of eighteenth-century Chalco, a province just south of Mexico City, describes the "symbiotic" relationship between haciendas and Indian communities. During the late eighteenth century, Indian population growth put a great deal of pressure on the landed resources of their communities in Chalco: as the number of Indians increased, the limited amount of land became inadequate to sustain them all. These demographic conditions produced a group of landless Indians in search of work. Hacendados of Central Mexico, who produced commercial crops of wheat, corn, and barley for the Mexico City market, found this situation ideal. They required a large seasonal labor force for planting and harvesting and the landless, poor communal Indians had no other choice but to supply it. In return for their work, the Indians acquired the right and the means to purchase grain from the hacendado and thus ensured their survival. Although this relationship was of more benefit to the hacendado, it nevertheless permitted the survival of Indian communities.

Tutino also emphasized that, rather than a large permanent labor force, hacendados only employed a few resident peons to take care of everyday chores such as shepherding flocks and maintaining buildings and gardens. Neither did they have to employ coercive methods (such as debt-peonage) to control their labor force; on the contrary, poor communal Indians regularly satisfied the demand for cheap labor. Hacendados thus encouraged the survival of Indian communities without adequate land resources because they functioned as reservoirs of cheap labor. This unequal symbiosis between Indian communities and haciendas contributed greatly to the formation of a society characterized by dual cultural sectors: Spanish in the city and Indian in the countryside. Indian *caciques*, although exploiting Indians the same as Spaniards, mediated the relations between the two sectors and thus helped preserve the cultural integrity of the Indian sector. Tutino noted that "by skillfully using their control of lands and their power over labor, Indian leaders shielded the majority of Indians from easy or extreme exploitation at the hands of Spaniards."[13]

Recent studies of Oaxaca, in South Central Mexico, and Metztitlán, northeast of Mexico City, also discuss how and why Indian communities survived. William B. Taylor's *Landlord and Peasant in Colonial Oaxaca* showed that, in the late Colonial period, native communities in Oaxaca controlled significant amounts of tillable soil. Reviewing seventeenth- and eighteenth-century land records, Taylor concluded that the average plot size amounted to between 5.6 and 8.5 acres, or about twice the average size of Indian plots today. Taylor estimated that the average native farmer, who usually controlled more than one plot, enjoyed the use of about eleven to seventeen acres.[14] Wayne S. Osborn's study of Metztitlán showed that in 1713 Indians owned a little more than half

112

the land area in the district, while Spaniards controlled the rest. The Indians also controlled enough cultivated land to provide them with a minimal subsistence.[15]

From his research, Taylor determined a set of conditions that made the survival of Indian communities possible in Oaxaca: (1) prior to the arrival of the Spaniards, a large Indian population, with a well-defined sense of landownership, occupied the area and cultivated the land according to Indian communal traditions; (2) the Spanish government protected communal lands because of the tribute paid by the Indians; (3) the Spanish system of justice allowed Indian communities to bring suits in court to defend their lands against the claims of private landowners; and (4) the relatively small numbers of Spaniards who settled in Oaxaca, especially in the sixteenth century, preferred cattle ranching to agriculture and therefore encouraged the Indians to retain their crop lands in order to produce food for Spanish city dwellers.[16] Osborn agreed with these general conditions and added a special one that prevailed in Metztitlán: the Spaniards' weak demand for extensive land holdings because of the dangers of recurrent floods.[17]

The matricula of 1805 shows the extent to which Indians continued to live in their own communities—and not on haciendas—in the Indian core areas of Mexico. Communal Indians (*indios de pueblo*) formed over 90 percent of the tributary population in each of the jurisdictions of Mexico, Puebla, Veracruz, and Oaxaca, the average of the four being 94.6 percent. Hacienda Indians (*indios laborios y vagos*) formed only 1.6 percent, while blacks and free mulattoes (*negros y mulatos libres*) formed 3.8 percent of the total tributary population of 500,223 adult males.[18]

Although more than 90 percent of the Indians lived in their own communities, the social characteristics of late colonial communities differed markedly from those of the early sixteenth century. In structural terms the Indian leadership, the tlatoani, had become part of the Spanish economic and cultural system, the amount of communally controlled land had been greatly reduced, and the population of Indian commoners had been swelled by a poor landless group who were forced to sell their labor to nearby haciendas. These communities had also become isolated social cells, with their inhabitants speaking an Indian language and adhering to rituals and customs that were labeled by the Spaniards as distinctively indigenous. The communal residents lived within their own cultural system and had only minimal contact with the Spanish world centered in urban areas.

A society of dual cultural sectors also evolved in the highland areas of Guatemala; the process was nearly the same as occurred in Mexico. Prior to the conquest, the Indian population had been concentrated in the highlands northwest of Guatemala City. Sixteenth-century epidemics, which caused much greater damage on the coast than in the highlands, only made this concentration greater. In the middle of the sixteenth century the cacao boom along Guatemala's Pacific coast might have caused a redistribution of Indians, but its influence in drawing laborers proved ephemeral. The cacao boom failed because other areas in Spanish America were opened up for production and because the

original labor force—the coastal Indians—died off quickly. Furthermore, highland encomenderos protected their dwindling labor supply and prevented the cacao producers from recruiting highland Indians. The other colonial export crop, indigo, which enjoyed a brief boom from 1590 to 1620, required only a few seasonal laborers during harvest time. The development of indigo production thus had little impact on Guatemala's Indian population. Moreover, by the early eighteenth century, indigo production had declined greatly primarily because producers had been cut off from their markets in Europe. With the decline of both export industries, urban Spaniards tended to migrate to the countryside where they established small haciendas dedicated more to subsistence than to commercial crops. Again this change was not of sufficient magnitude to encourage a new demand for Indian labor. The rural Spaniards obtained a few Indian peons for their small farms, but that was all.

By the middle of the seventeenth century, the Indian communities that had survived in the northwestern highlands had developed a culture of their own. It was syncretic, consisting of traits learned from the Spaniards plus traditions kept from the pre-Columbian era. This culture can best be described by examining the Indians' enthusiastic acceptance of *cofradias*, or religious sodalities. Cofradias were founded to venerate a particular saint; but behind the image of the saint, Indians placed a representation of their pre-Columbian idol. The cofradias grew so popular that in the latter part of the seventeenth century Spanish officials became concerned lest the wild drinking and dancing associated with religious observances lead to a dimunition of priestly, and hence state, influence. Although it might be viewed as a challenge to Spanish rule, the development of cofradias is perhaps better understood as providing local Indian leaders with a means to express village cohesion. Indian acceptance of cofradias thus helped to recreate a new Indian society, consciously distinct from the Spaniards.[19]

Communities also survived in the Indian core area of the southern, highland Andes, from Cuzco south to Potosí. As in Mexico and Guatemala, change within Indian villages was a direct result of their interaction with the Spanish economy. In the Andean area the motor of the economy was the Potosí mining industry. Potosí's period of expansion, which lasted from about 1545 to 1620, stimulated a vast population movement of Indians and the growth of new commercial haciendas (wheat and wine) in the valley areas of Cochabamba and Chuquisaca. Although both the silver mine and the valley haciendas required laborers, Potosí received by far the greatest number because of the importance of silver within the Spanish imperial system.[20]

Changes within the Andean Indian communities were a direct consequence of their integration into the Potosí mining economy. By adapting an indigenous rotational labor draft (mita), Spanish government agents recruited approximately 14,000 laborers per year, which amounted to about one-seventh of the adult male population of each village.[21] In addition to this labor draft, the villages were also required to pay tribute in agricultural goods, animals, textiles, and money; the last item was automatically deducted from their salary at Potosí. As the Indian population fell, the pressure of these two exploitive mechanisms

114

became so great that it encouraged the formation of a new social group known as *forasteros*, or escapees from mita and tribute. In their flight forasteros either reentered other Indian communities, where they tried to remain unregistered, or they made themselves dependents of valley hacendados. When forasteros reentered Indian communities they became the dependents of the original inhabitants (*originarios*), who allowed the newcomers to farm small plots of land in exchange for labor. In essence originarios competed with hacendados for the labor of the forasteros.[22] By the end of the seventeenth century forasteros had become a permanent feature of the altiplano social structure. In a letter to the King of Spain, written on 19 February 1689, Viceroy duque de la Palata reported that of the 64,581 tributaries residing in the provinces subject to the Potosí mita, 31,378 were forasteros and 16,000 of them resided on Spanish haciendas.[23]

As indicated by the viceroy's letter, by the end of the seventeenth century, forasteros had been reincorporated onto the tribute lists. That process was accompanied by two other important social processes: the introduction of the forced distribution of goods within Indian communities by the corregidores and the formation of altiplano haciendas. All three processes were largely the result of the gradual exhaustion of the silver deposits at Potosí, which contracted the entire economy and forced Spaniards to look for new ways of exploiting Indians.

During the mining boom, Potosí had been supplied with native products (potatoes, quinoa, llama wool, and meat) from the tribute of Indian villages. The officials in charge of tribute profited enormously in distributing these goods. But once the mine began to give out and the population of Potosí dropped, the market for agricultural products declined sharply, and the men who formerly had profited from supplying Potosí now had to find other ways of making a living. Many paid large sums to obtain positions as corregidores in order to use their offices to force communal Indians to buy goods (known as *reparto mercantil*). Others who had formerly manipulated tribute goods, especially kurakas, carved out private haciendas on the altiplano—not in order to produce more goods, but to monopolize a shrinking market. For a kuraka to make an altiplano hacienda profitable, he had to reduce the surviving Indian communities to the subsistence level; i.e., the Indian community's agricultural surplus, which formerly had been siphoned to Potosí, now had to be removed from competition to a much reduced market. This was accomplished through acquisitions of entire communities or parts of communities, specifically for the purpose of taking land out of production and of obtaining a group of dependent laborers, who supported themselves through the usufruct of subsistence plots on the hacienda and provided the labor for the small amount of goods required by the hacendado. Tribute extracted only in money payments and the forced sale of goods further reduced Indian communities to the subsistence level.

Eliminating Indian communities from participating in the market economy affected significantly their internal social structure. The earlier trend of increasing differentiation between richer communal Indians (originarios), who had been accumulating excess land in order to sell goods to Potosí, and poorer communal Indians (forasteros), who were becoming a dependent labor force, was arrested. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, only a few Indians,

115

mainly kurakas, managed to make a full-fledged entrance into the Spanish economy. Although the distinctions between originarios and forasteros remained on the tribute lists, in actuality they became nearly equal in economic status.[24] They became the residents of isolated, self-sufficient cells of Indian culture, many of them within the territorial boundaries of haciendas, that have survived on the Bolivian and Peruvian altiplano to the present day.

Compared to the formation of societies characterized by dual cultural sectors as occurred in the Indian core areas of highland Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, and Bolivia, the peripheral areas of these same countries developed entirely different societies—ones that were characterized by extensive race mixture and the wholesale adoption of Spanish cultural values. For example, the nomadic Indians of northern Mexico, who were few in number and difficult to control, were captured, killed, or otherwise dispersed. They added practically nothing to the emerging mestizo society of the north. François Chevalier's study shows that the ranching and farming hacendados of northern Mexico found it impossible to obtain a steady supply of labor from nomads. Instead, they employed "slaves, mulattoes, and free Indians; these last were imported from the south and detained by various means, especially by letting them get into debt."[25] The haciendas, in fact, became new population centers in a vast frontier. The high ratio of non-Indians to Indians and the fact that the Indians themselves had been resettled on the frontier destroyed the native's ability to maintain social units separate from the rest of society as they had done in central and southern Mexico. Rather than form a society with dual cultural sectors, the Spanish, black, and Indian settlers merged into a mestizo society that was characterized by its undisciplined nature. Northern Mexico was infamous for its highwaymen, adventurers, and outlaws.

In Guatemala, Indian depopulation along the Pacific coast in combination with the white immigration to the cacao and indigo fields resulted in the formation of a mestizo society there. The cacao and indigo growing areas attracted the heaviest Spanish occupation outside the cities. The few Indians who survived the epidemic plus the few who migrated from the highlands and became permanent residents mixed with the dominant Spaniards and formed a mestizo (*ladino*) area. In these lowlands, Indian communities virtually disappeared and private ownership became the predominant form of land tenure.[26]

Robert Keith's study *Conquest and Agrarian Change: The Emergence of the Hacienda System on the Peruvian Coast* shows how rapid Indian depopulation affected land and labor systems and the future structure of society there. As the Indians died and the coast's original encomiendas became worthless, encomenderos recovered their fortunes by investing in land and black slaves. These coastal haciendas were established primarily to supply wine and sugar to the growing city of Lima.[27] But since coastal haciendas only had a local market (Lima) and no export market, hacendados had no need for a large rural labor force. They thus used many blacks as domestic servants and artisans in the cities. Genuine affection between master and domestic slave probably led to the great number of manumissions and the existence of a large proportion of free

116

blacks in Peruvian coastal society. According to a 1795 Peruvian census, blacks amounted to 81,389 persons, 7 percent of the total population of 1,115,207. But 82 percent of the blacks resided in coastal towns, 35 percent of them in the city of Lima alone. Of the total number of blacks, free Negroes outnumbered slaves 41,004 to 40,385. The City of Lima contained 10,023 free blacks and 13,497 slaves, who together formed 45 percent of the city's total population of 52,645.[28]

Since the blacks adopted Spanish language, dress, and values, they belonged to the Spanish cultural system. The coexistence of whites, blacks, and mestizos within the same cultural milieu made color prejudice an important determinant in how society functioned. Black artisans, who competed with whites and mestizos, were relegated to the worst jobs.[29] Race prejudice by whites against blacks and mulattoes, and by mulattoes against blacks, prevented the blacks' advancement in society and provided the elite with an additional means, besides the monopolization of political and economic power, of controlling society for their own benefit. This is in contrast to the highland areas where two racially and culturally distinct sectors coexisted and only came into minimal contact. In the highlands race prejudice did not constitute such a strong, active, day-to-day influence since hacienda-Indian community relations tended to isolate Indians into self-sufficient rural units separate from the Spanish world.

Race, however, could become an important consideration in Indo-America if demographic and ecological conditions tended toward the formation of a relatively homogeneous culture based on race mixture. The Cochabamba valley in Bolivia, especially the eastern portion, was such an area. Compared to the altiplano, few Indians lived in Cochabamba prior to the Spanish conquest. After colonization, especially during the latter half of the sixteenth century, Cochabamba attracted many Spaniards because of its ability to produce wheat and corn for the mining centers of the altiplano. These commercially oriented planters established their estates on unoccupied land and attracted (or forced) Indians from settlements in western Cochabamba or the altiplano to work on them. Since the Indians were permanently removed from their communities, they began to lose their traditional characteristics—especially communal forms of land tenure and social organization.

When Cochabamba's large estates began to be broken up, after the market shrank at Potosí, workers acquired lands and turned them into small private estates. These workers also deliberately sought mestizo status as a means of remaining free of mita and tribute obligations, which were legally applied only to Indians. As part of the original exchange, Indians who had become permanent residents on the farms of Cochabamba were protected by the hacendado from those obligations. When the Indians became free of hacendado rule, they tried to maintain that exemption by seeking mestizo status. In these common struggles to obtain a plot of land, eke out a living in a contracted economy, and remain free of state obligations, Indians and non-Indians came into increasing contact. Sometimes they competed for plots of land; other times they made common cause against the enforcement of royal rules. The eventual outcome of this mixture was a homogeneous syncretic culture that was characterized by a heavy Quechuan influence. Spanish and Quechua were spoken by the highest

117

members of Cochabamba society, although only Quechua was spoken by the lower orders. In the city of Cochabamba, high society women spoke mainly Quechua among themselves.[30]

In this milieu, the distinction between mestizo and Indian took on political and economic importance. A 1720 epidemic reduced significantly the number of Indians paying tribute to the state. After other measures had failed, the viceroy in 1730 attempted to enlist the mestizos of Cochabamba as tributary Indians. That move sparked a revolt of the common folk of Cochabamba, who refused to be reduced to the despised status of Indian tributary. Although the revolt was crushed, the viceregal government refrained from forcing Indian status on the lower class of Cochabamba city.[31] In later years the eastern Cochabambinos always distinguished themselves from the backward "indios" of western Cochabamba and the altiplano. In a homogeneous but racially mixed cultural milieu, racial categories become increasingly useful tools in determining one's place in society.

Independence from Spain in 1825 resulted in a decentralization of the political order, as the empire split into its constituent parts, and in the opening of these new nations to direct commercial contact with Britain. But it was not until after 1850 that this new orientation toward northern Europe produced significant changes within Latin America's social structure. As a result of European industrialization and urbanization, Latin America's raw materials (sugar, coffee, wheat, henequen, copper, and nitrates) became valuable commercial goods on a world scale. After 1850, with demand for these crops growing, hacendados of Mexico, Guatemala, and Peru sought more land and laborers to take advantage of the new economic conditions. The impact of this late nineteenth-century economic change should be viewed in regional terms, for the social changes varied considerably according to the nature of the export economy and its relationship to a labor force.[32]

In Mexico the most sustained assault on communal lands occurred in the state of Morelos, located just south of Mexico City and suitable for planting sugar. As described by John Womack in *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*, planters, utilizing technological improvements in sugar production and in transportation facilities (railways), required more land to satisfy the demand for sugar in national and foreign markets. The planters, of course, took the land they needed from Morelan Indian communities. As their landed resources diminished, communal residents were forced to labor on the haciendas. When the peasants complained that they had too little land to survive, the planters callously responded that the peasants could plant in a flower pot. It was in this situation that Emiliano Zapata, a Morelan peasant, joined the revolt against Porfirio Díaz. His aim was to recover lost communal lands.[33]

But further south in the Mexican province of Oaxaca few residents joined the rebellion, although it was a region densely populated with Indians. Ronald Waterbury compared the social and economic conditions of Oaxaca with Morelos in order to determine why this was so. He concluded that the dominant modes of agricultural production and exploitation were quite different, and this

118

difference prompted one group of peasants to join the rebellion and the other to hold back. In Oaxaca peasants retained control of the means of production (land). Although corn production, the Indian's staple, had declined, relative to new plantings of cotton, tobacco, coffee, and sugar on haciendas it still remained the dominant form of production. Competition from other areas in Mexico and Latin America, located closer to transportation facilities, prevented the new Oaxaqueño commercial enterprises from expanding greatly. Moreover, elite exploitation of Indians remained indirect: the elite obtained the Indian's surplus production through exploitive credit arrangements rather than through direct expropriation of land and labor. When the Revolution of 1910 broke out, Oaxaqueño Indians still had fairly good relations with the elite, mainly as a result of the paternalistic connections developed over the years of indirect exploitation. In Morelos, however, the sustained (1880–1910) direct exploitation of land and labor by technologically advanced modern sugar haciendas destroyed paternalistic connections and provided the social and economic background for the Zapatista revolt.[34]

In the Indian core areas of Guatemala and Peru, as in Mexico, the changes wrought by late nineteenth-century world economic development did not destroy Indian communities, but did make them more vulnerable to outside pressures. In Guatemala, the rise of the coffee plantations, located on the Pacific Piedmont to the west of the Indian-occupied central highlands, occasioned a forced transfer of laborers from one zone to the other. The Guatemalan government aided the planters in their quest for highland workers. In 1877, President Justo Rufino Barrios abolished communal ownership of land and instituted a government-administered program of forced, migratory labor known as *mandamientos*. The system worked through the intervention of local government agents (*jefe politicos*), who supplied Indian laborers to the coffee fincas. In 1894, the Guatemalan government again assisted the coffee planters by legalizing debt peonage (known as *habilitación* in Guatemala), thus lawfully allowing planters to detain migrants and make them permanent residents of the coffee fincas.[35] In Peru an expansion of the coastal sugar industry beginning in 1870 motivated the planters to enter the highlands in search of workers. To fulfill their demands, the planters greatly intensified a forced labor draft known as *enganche*, whereby agents of the planters cajolled highland Indians to sign labor contracts, which committed them to extensive work periods on coastal plantations. Both in Guatemala and Peru, the migration of highland Indians led to a significant "re-indianization" of the coast.[36]

In highland Bolivia a slightly different process was at work, although it also led to assaults against Indian communities. In 1877, 70 percent of the Indian population (approximately 500,000) still lived in Indian communities while the other 30 percent lived on haciendas. Most of the Indian communities were located on the altiplano and only participated to a minimal extent in the commercial economy. Altiplano hacendados monopolized the small urban markets for highland goods such as llama products, potatoes, and quinoa, and as long as the hacendados maintained their monopoly, they left the Indian communities alone. But the export demand for sheep and llama wool expanded during the

119

1880s, which provided opportunities for Indian communities and hacendados to engage in trade. Thus, in order to eliminate Indian competition, hacendados purchased entire Indian communities located near La Paz and the transportation routes to the city. Furthermore, the Bolivian government, newly reorganized after the War of the Pacific, abolished state protection of communal lands, thus allowing the hacendados to manipulate in their favor private property negotiations with the Indians.[36]

These late nineteenth-century assaults on Indian communities had a direct impact on the communities' internal social organization. According to anthropologist Manning Nash, communal inhabitants, in order to protect their land and way of life, strove consciously to cut themselves off from outside stimuli by forcing their members to adhere strictly to communal traditions. During this period, Indian communities developed the fullest expression of the politico-religious hierarchy, which consisted of a series of posts in village government and religion that each adult male was expected to occupy at least once every two or three years. The major function of the office-holder was not to govern but to sponsor fiestas for the benefit of the entire community. These ritual expenditures prevented the accumulation of capital and acted as a leveling device insuring that certain Indians did not become too rich and thus separate themselves from the community as a whole. Indeed social prestige was measured by the degree to which one sacrificed himself to the community and resisted incorporation into the national political, economic, and social system.[37] Closed corporate communities were characteristic of central and southern Mexico and highland Guatemala, Peru, and Bolivia. In fact in Bolivia, the Indian settlements that were located wholly within altiplano haciendas contained politico-religious hierarchies that were replicas of the hierarchies existing in free Indian communities.[38] In the twentieth century these closed corporate communities became "the Indian problem" and nationalist politicians spent much time and energy discussing strategies designed to "integrate the Indian in the modern world," either as consumers in the national economy or as participants in the political system.[39]

By 1930 the aggressive stage of hacienda expansion had waned considerably. National elites directed their economies toward building import-substitution industries, expanding mining operations, extracting oil, and developing the agricultural potential of unpopulated tropical areas. These trends were accompanied by tremendous population growth and rapid urbanization. Indian communities have been affected by these new forces and contemporary research by historians and anthropologists has revealed the direction taken by some of them.

In Mexico the pronounced development of industrialization, rapid population growth, and urbanization have greatly increased the contact of rural residents with the modern world. These processes have led to a significant decrease in the use of Indian rituals, languages, and dress and to the displacement of traditional Indian occupations. Oscar Lewis, who studied the rural community of Tepoztlán (Morelos) in 1944 and again in 1956, noted that the ceremonial barrio officers of the politico-religious hierarchy had completely disappeared by 1956. Furthermore, the occupational structure had changed: "The number of

nonagricultural occupations increased from 26 in 1944 to 33 in 1956 and the number of people engaged in these occupations rose from 273 to 565, [out of a total population of about 4,800 in 1957]. This increase has been accompanied by greater specialization and a decline in the role of agriculture in the total economy. In 1944 approximately 70 percent of those engaged in nonagricultural occupations also farmed; in 1956 the comparable figure was only 25 percent."[40] The increase in the number of barbers, butchers, and storekeepers has given rise to greater internal differentiation within the community. About 25 percent of the population belongs to the middle economic group "whose values and goals have come to differ substantially from those of the peasantry." The economic status of the lower economic group has become poorer because of inflation and the disappearance of many traditional occupations.

Similar changes have occurred in many Mexican villages located in the Indian core area of the Center and the South. This increasing contact with the modern world has led to a significant reorientation of the rural villagers' view of their position within society at large. Gregory G. Reck described the psychological changes that took place in villagers of Jonotla (Puebla) who had moved from an Indian world view to a mestizo world view. Under their traditional ideological system, Indians tended to accommodate themselves to the "given order of things"; they became passive and withdrawn when confronting strangers and devoted themselves to following the rules of their community. But as a result of schooling, travel, and obtaining work in nonagricultural jobs, young villagers acquired new attitudes, labeled by Reck as mestizo; they primarily sought freedom from group demands.

Whereas the Indian was group-oriented, the mestizo became aggressively individualistic, challenging the world at every turn. Whether he had been successful or had failed in a certain venture, in order to gain the respect of his friends or enemies, the mestizo must be self-assertive. The ultimate result of this psychological change was usually departure from one's original and restrictive community.[42] Once alone, in a new village or in the provincial capital, the new mestizo had to face the awesome, combined power of the state bureaucracy and the national economic elite. In order to survive in this world, the mestizo usually made strategic alliances with his fellow workers and through them with members of the bureaucracy, but the chief characteristic of these alliances was their temporary nature. Once limited goals had been achieved, the alliances dissolved and new ones were formed. Because mestizos were out for themselves (as Reck argued), the state found it relatively easy to co-opt leaders and frustrate demands for long-range reform inimical to elite interests. David Ronfeldt, in his study *Atencingo: The Politics of Agrarian Struggle in a Mexican Ejido*, described the tactics of bureaucratic lobbying and direct action used by the ejidatarios in attempting to wring concessions from the state and the sugar mill administration that controlled the local economy. Although the villagers made some gains, in the final analysis the state was the winner because of its ability to co-opt ejidatario leaders with bribes of money and power. As Ronfeldt concluded, up to the early 1970s there had been little evidence of "the mobilization of any massive peasant struggle."[43]

Villagers in the Indian core areas of Guatemala and Peru also have ac-
quired mestizo attitudes, but not in such a pronounced fashion as in Mexico. Sol
Tax's research in the Guatemalan Indian community of Panajachel in 1937 and
then again 1964 showed that a significant amount of economic and social change
had taken place in the intervening years. As a result of new service-oriented
jobs provided by the expansion of a tourist industry, the Indians' dependence
on subsistence agriculture declined markedly. The percentage of annual income
derived from agriculture declined from 97 percent in 1937 to 42 percent in 1964.
Enough jobs had been created that the doubling of the population from 800 to
1600 caused little pressure on landed resources, but with the expansion of new
job opportunities, Indians began accumulating wealth and keeping it. The pres-
sure to spend money on ritual festivals declined as did participation in the
politico-religious hierarchy. Tax reported a significant increase in bilingualism,
use of western dress, and acceptance by Indians of many belief patterns that had
been distinctively mestizo. Nevertheless Indians did not seek to become mesti-
zos but consciously identified themselves as Indian. For example, they adopted
western style clothes except for sandals or a sash that clearly marked them as
Indian. Tax reported that this process was common for the villages of the Indian
core area of west central Guatemala.[44]

Manning Nash's investigation of the Indians of Cantel, also in western
Guatemala, coincides with Sol Tax's work. Despite the establishment in 1876 of
Central America's largest textile mill, which employed about one-fourth of the
economically active population of Cantel, Nash reported that 96.2 percent of the
pueblo's 1,910 inhabitants considered themselves Indian in the late 1950s. By
that time the politico-religious system had been seriously eroded; election to
office was not dependent on service to the community but on union member-
ship and political party affiliation. Again, significant acculturation had occurred
but no change in ethnic identification.[45]

Madeline Leon's study of the Aymara Indians of the coca-growing valleys
of Bolivia, after the 1952 agrarian reform, indicated that the same trend was
taking place in the Andean area. With the displacement of the hacendados by
peasant syndicates, the Indians have participated more directly in the marketing
of coca and have acquired the financial means to change their material culture. It
has become common for Aymaras to purchase shoes, transistor radios, and
mestizo town houses. But, as she concludes: "Although the Yungas campesinos
are trying to improve their standard of living, they are not trying to make
themselves into mestizos."[46] Hans and Judith-Maria Buechler's research in the
community of Copi, located on the shores of Lake Titicaca, also shows that,
since the agrarian reform of 1952, the Indians have by-passed hacendado and
mestizo middlemen and now market their crops directly in La Paz. And rather
than produce potatoes, many Indians have switched to onions, a commerically
more valuable product. The Indians' increasing contact with La Paz potentially
could have encouraged them to seek mestizo status, but even the permanent
migrants to La Paz have retained close ties to Compi and still take part in the
fiesta system. Ritual sponsorship of fiestas is still a very important part of com-
munity life, serving as a "symbolic system" designed to promote community

cohesiveness. Although they are becoming increasingly integrated into a wider, more modern network, the inhabitants of Compi still identify themselves as Indian.[47]

A political expression of the Andean Indian's increasing integration into national culture may be gleaned from F. La Mond Tullis's work *Lord and Peasant in Peru: A Paradigm of Political and Social Change*, a study of the intervillage systems of Chupaca and Acolla in Junin department northeast of Lima. Tullis noted that travel and formal education were the main prerequisites for inducing political modernization, the principal agent for which was commonly one of the villagers who attended a boarding school in the provincial capital, returned to the village, and then attempted to organize a peasant committee with the purpose of constructing a local school. If the peasants encountered resistance from the local elite, they began to seek alliances with sympathetic members of the national government in Lima.[48]

Although political modernization was a general phenomenon experienced by many Peruvian communities, the local leaders showed little ability to form an effective national peasant movement. Outside of school construction, other village problems were so particularistic (many times including land disputes with neighboring villages) that potential national peasant leaders found it difficult to devise a meaningful common program.[49] Beyond that, if the process of modernization includes a psychological change to mestizo individualism, then the leaders, if they follow the Mexican model, will become co-opted through bribes of money and influence by an increasingly more powerful state.

In areas peripheral to the Indian core, such as northern Mexico and coastal Peru, distinct demographic and economic conditions produced quite different societies. Here, for centuries, Indians formed a minority of the total population which also included whites, blacks, and fully-acculturated mestizos and mulattoes. In these multi-racial societies, race prejudice, based on somatic and/or cultural distinctions, became an important determinant in how society operated.

According to L. C. Faron's study of Peru's Chancay Valley, the highland Indian, or *serrano*, who migrated to the coast in search of work on the cotton and sugar haciendas, was viewed as less than human. He was, in fact, equated with a beast of burden. He was below the black man, below the despised Chinese and Japanese immigrants who had been forcibly imported during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and below the descendants of the original Indians of the coast who pridefully labeled themselves as *cholos* to distinguish themselves from the serranos. The popular consciousness of this racial hierarchy severely limited social mobility and contributed to the formation of a system of rigid social stratification, with the Indians at the bottom. As the population increased during the twentieth century, the competition for land and work (i.e., as sharecroppers on the haciendas) increased enormously and fostered a considerable amount of racial tension among the laboring groups. During Chancay's cotton boom prior to World War II, Japanese leaders acquired many managerial positions on the cotton fincas because of their efficient organization of fellow Japanese workers. The anti-Japanese feeling of WW II permitted the hacendados, with the encouragement of cholos, to drive this group out of Chancay and into

123

the cities. In this situation of increasing competition for work and land and resultant high racial tensions, the highland migrants were forced into the lowest paying jobs as day laborers.[50]

In northern Mexico race prejudice was not directed at Indian migrants but at remnant Indian tribes such as Tarascans, Coras, Mayos, and Yaquis. In general, racial hatred went both ways. The white and mestizo majority viewed the Indians as uncivilized barbarians who could only bring trouble. Northern Indians had frequently raided isolated ranches and settlements as Spanish colonization moved northward. For their part, the Indians viewed the whites and mestizos as alien intruders bent on the destruction of their way of life. In response, the Indians attempted to seal themselves off from white society through retaining their cultural integrity. Indeed the northern Indians maintained in active operation the politico-religious hierarchy that had eroded so greatly among the rural villagers of the Indian core areas. When white military pressure became too great, the Indians, especially the Mayos and the Yaquis, resisted with nativistic movements, sometimes religious and sometimes violent in content, that sought the elimination of the white race.

Cultural mestization of northern Indians did occur, but at a very slow rate. In the late 1950s and early 1960s the Tarascans, Coras, Mayos, and Yaquis were still very identifiable groups in northern Mexico because of their language, dress, and distrust of whites. As late as 1957 there arose a prophet among the Mayos who preached the revitalization of traditional religious ceremonies, with the purpose of preserving the distinctiveness of the Mayo way of life. Upon hearing of the religious revival, the provincial authorities readied troops for a conflict that never materialized. This incident reveals the depth of the distrust between the two groups.[51]

The aim of this review has been to divert attention from the hacienda as the sole acculturative instrument outside the city and instead to explore the differences in the development of Indian-white relations by studying the Indian core areas in contrast to the periphery. Because of varied demographic and ecological conditions a distinct type of society developed in each zone. In the Indian core areas, Spanish exploitive institutions, whether encomienda, mita, or private hacienda labor, depended on the preservation of an Indian social unit that supplied cheap laborers. For the hacienda, the acquisition of laborers was accomplished in a variety of ways—monopolization of land being the most basic. Hacendados acquired land partly for production and partly as a device to restrict the independent, commercial possibilities of Indians so that they would be amenable to hacienda labor.

The surviving Indian social units changed over time. During the early colonial era, they were shorn of their leaders and their connections to supra-regional empires. In their isolated condition, they became more open to Catholic rituals and beliefs, although Catholic practice was only imperfectly assimilated. The greatest pressure on Indian communities came during the late nineteenth century when hacendados began producing for the world market. In selected areas, such as Morelos, the pressures became so great that they led to an Indian

124

rebellion. But in general the Indian response to nineteenth-century changes centered on revitalizing the closed corporate nature of their village. In this condition, Indian villages survived until the 1930s when new forces of incipient industrialization, urbanization, and the rise of nationalist political organizations forced the Indians to leave their enclosed world and participate in the modern world. The Indians' increasing contact with white culture provoked a psychological change. Indians abandoned their passivity and cultural isolation and acquired the attitudes of mestizo aggressive individualism. In order to confront the growing power of the state, mestizo villagers made strategic alliances with fellow workers, government bureaucrats, and political parties. But because of the differences in local village problems and because of the ability of the state to co-opt village leaders (whose salient characteristic had become ambition for power), the alliances among villagers tended to be very unstable and thus quite powerless vis-à-vis the state. The decline of the Indian's cultural distinctiveness, his deliberate turning away from his original community, thus has led to increasing individual atomization rather than new forms of cooperation based on new realities.[52]

In the peripheral areas, the absence of sedentary Indians as in northern Mexico or the rapid depopulation of the original settled Indians as in coastal Guatemala and Peru led to the virtual disappearance of Indian social units and to the predominance of the hacienda. The shortage of native laborers required hacendados to import black slaves or highland Indian migrants. Those who permanently stayed lost their identification with their original land and became acculturated to the Spanish system. The dominant feature of this society became extensive racial mixture and the use of ethnic categories to hinder social mobility.

During the twentieth century, as the Latin-American population becomes culturally more homogeneous, racial attitudes, based on somatic or other easily observed distinctions, will become much more important in determining social and economic mobility. This condition will be characteristic not only of the peripheral areas, where it is already evident, but also in the Indian core areas. Population growth and competition for limited numbers of jobs encourage workers in any sector of the economy to stereotype disparagingly the ethnic characteristics of their competitors. This is a natural consequence of any multi-racial society tending toward cultural homogeneity.[53] Its consequences will be to restrict the ability of the poor, whether in the urban or rural setting, from forming cohesive organizations that might influence the power of the state and its alliance with the national economic elite.

NOTES

1. The above view is implicit in Robert Keith, "Encomienda, Hacienda and Corregimiento in Spanish America: A Structural Analysis," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 51 (Aug. 1971):431–66.
2. Sherburne Cook, *The Epidemic of 1830–1833 in California and Oregon*, University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnohistory 43 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955), p. 316.
3. Sherburne Cook and Woodrow Borah, *Essays in Population History Mexico and the Caribbean*, 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971–74) 1:viii, 269.

125

4. For a description of Noble David Cook's work see Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, *The Population of Latin America: A History*, trans. W. A. R. Richardson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), p. 44 and Daniel E. Shea, "A Defense of Small Population Estimates for the Central Andes," William M. Denevan, ed., *The Native Population of the Americas in 1492* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), p. 176.
5. Sánchez-Albornoz, *Population of Latin America*, pp. 91, 113.
6. Cook and Borah, *Essays in Population History* 1:83, 99–113.
7. Sánchez-Albornoz, *Population of Latin America*, pp. 44–47.
8. Eric Wolf, *Sons of the Shaking Earth*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 199.
9. Ibid., pp. 168–75, 200; for the Andean area see Nathan Wachtel, *The Vision of the Vanquished: the Spanish Conquest of Peru through Indian Eyes, 1530–1570*, trans. Ben and Sian Reynolds (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1977), pp. 13–32, 85–139, 152–58.
10. Wolf, *Sons of the Shaking Earth*, p. 212 and Karen Spalding, "Kurakas and Commerce: A Chapter in the Evolution of Andean Society," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 53 (Nov. 1973):581–99.
11. Charles Gibson, *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico 1519–1810* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964), pp. 220–56.
12. Ibid., pp. 257–99.
13. John Mark Tutino, "Creole Mexico: Spanish Elites, Haciendas and Indian Towns, 1750–1810," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1976, pp. 270–390.
14. William B. Taylor, *Landlord and Peasant in Colonial Oaxaca* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1972), p. 77.
15. Wayne S. Osborn, "Indian Land Retention in Colonial Metztitlan," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 53 (May 1973):103–15.
16. Taylor, *Landlord and Peasant*, pp. 107–10.
17. Osborn, "Indian Land Retention," pp. 234–35.
18. Borah and Cook, *Essays in Population History* 1:288–92.
19. The section on Guatemala is a summary of Murdo J. Macleod, *Spanish Central America: A Socioeconomic History, 1520–1720* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).
20. For the most detailed early history of Potosí, see Bartolome Azans de Orzua y Vela, *Historia de la villa imperial de Potosí*, 3 vols., eds. Lewis Hanke and Gunnar Mendoza (Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1965).
21. Alberto Crespo Rodas, "La mita de Potosí," *Revista Histórica* 22 (Lima: 1955–56):171–72.
22. For descriptions of the formation of the forastero group see Oscar Cornblit, "Society and Mass Rebellion in Eighteenth-Century Peru and Bolivia," in Raymond Carr, ed., *Latin American Affairs: St. Anthony's Papers* 22 (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 24–25 and Karen Spalding, "Hacienda-Village Relations in Andean Society to 1830," *Latin American Perspectives* 2 (Spring 1975):110–11.
23. Crespo Rodas, "La mita de Potosí," p. 182.
24. The process by which Spaniards exploited Andean Indian communities is best described by Karen Spalding "Hacienda-Village Relations" pp. 107–22 and Karen Spalding, "El corregidor de indios y los orígenes de la hacienda serrana peruana," Karen Spalding, *De indio a campesino: cambios en la estructura social del Peru colonial* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1974), pp. 127–46.
25. François Chevalier, *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico: The Great Hacienda*, trans. Alvin Eustis (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 169.
26. MacLeod, *Spanish Central America*, pp. 307–09.
27. Robert Keith, *Conquest and Agrarian Change: The Emergence of the Hacienda System on the Peruvian Coast* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 27–79.
28. For a history of slavery and black-white relations in Peru see Frederick P. Bowser, *The African Slave in Colonial Peru 1524–1650* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974), pp. 272–334. For the population data on Peru in the late eighteenth century,

126

see J. R. Fisher, *Government and Society in Colonial Peru: The Intendant System 1784–1814* (London: The Athelone Press, 1970), pp. 251–53.

29. Jorge Juan and Antonio de Ulloa, *A Voyage to South America*, trans. John Adams [abridged] (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964) pp. 195, 223 and Bowser, *The African Slave*, pp. 302–23.

30. The description of colonization in Eastern Cochabamba comes from Erwin P. Grieshaber, "Survival of Indian Communities in Nineteenth-Century Bolivia," Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1977, pp. 59–62, 67–81.

31. Patricia Cozier Hutchins, "Rebellion and the Census of the Province of Cochabamba, 1730–1732," Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974, pp. 61–62.

32. For a concise description of the impact of European industrialization on Spanish-America see Roberto Cortés Conde, *The First Stages of Modernization in Spanish America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

33. John Womack, Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*, (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 37–66.

34. Ronald Waterbury, "Non Revolutionary Peasants: Oaxaca Compared to Morelos in the Mexican Revolution," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 17 (Oct. 1975):410–42.

35. Alain Y. Dessaint, "Effects of the Hacienda and Plantation Systems on the Guatemalan Indians," *América Indígena* 22 (Oct. 1962):330–31. For a full treatment of government-sponsored labor programs to aid coffee planters see: Chester Lloyd Jones, *Guatemala: Past and Present*, 2d ed. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1966), pp. 141–67 and David McCreery, "Coffee and Class: The Structure of Development In Liberal Guatemala," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 56 (Aug. 1976):438–60.

36. Grieshaber, "Survival of Indian Communities," pp. 212–67.

37. Manning Nash, "The Impact of Mid-Nineteenth Century Economic Change upon the Indians of Middle America," in Magnus Mörner, ed. *Race and Class in Latin America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), pp. 170–83.

38. William E. Carter, *Aymara Communities and the Bolivian Agrarian Reform* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964), pp. 7–48.

39. François Chevalier, "Official *Indigenismo* in Peru in 1920: Origins, Significance and Socioeconomic Scope," in Mörner, *Race and Class*, pp. 184–98, reviews early indigenista writers of the 1920s.

40. Oscar Lewis, *Tepoztlán: Village in Mexico* (New York: Holt, 1960), p. 97.

41. Ibid., pp. 102–3.

42. Gregory G. Reck, *In the Shadow of Tlaloc: Life in a Mexican Village* (London: Penguin Books, 1978), pp. 15–17.

43. David Ronfeldt, *Atencingo: The Politics of Agrarian Struggle in a Mexican Ejido* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1973), p. 215.

44. Sol Tax and Robert Hinshaw, "Panajachel a Generation Later," in Walter Goldschmidt and Harry Hoijer, eds., *The Social Anthropology of Latin America: Essays in Honor of Ralph Leon Beals* (Los Angeles: University of California Latin American Center, 1970), pp. 175–98.

45. Manning Nash, *Machine Age Maya: The Industrialization of a Guatemala Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967) 2d ed., pp. 6–16.

46. Madeline Barbara Leons, "Stratification and Pluralism in the Bolivian Yungas," in Goldschmidt and Hoijer, *Social Anthropology of Latin America*, p. 266.

47. Hans C. Buechler and Judith-Maria Buechler, *The Bolivian Aymara* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), pp. 1–19, 68–89.

48. F. LaMond Tullis, *Lord and Peasant in Peru, A Paradigm of Political and Social Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

49. Ibid., pp. 164–81, 267.

50. L. C. Faron, "Ethnicity and Social Mobility in Chancay Valley, Peru," in Goldschmidt and Hoijer, *Social Anthropology of Latin America*, pp. 224–55.

51. For descriptions of relations between Indians, whites, and mestizos in Northern

Mexico see Thomas B. Hinton, "Indian Acculturation in Nayarit: The Cora Response to Mestizoization" and Edward H. Spicer, "Contrasting Forms of Nativism among the Mayos and Yaquis of Sonora, Mexico," in Goldschmidt and Hoijer, *Social Anthropology of Latin America*, pp. 16–35, 104–25. See also George M. Foster, *Tzintzuntzan: Mexican Peasants in a Changing World* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), pp. 32–37; Luis Gonzalez y Gonzalez, *San José de Gracia: Mexican Village in Transition*, trans. John Upton (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972), pp. 27, 45–56, 74; and Paul S. Taylor, *A Spanish-Mexican Peasant Community: Arandas in Jalisco, Mexico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933), pp. 14–17.

52. The atomization of peasant society is described in Peter Coy, "A Watershed in Mexican Rural History: Some Thoughts on the Reconciliation of Conflicting Interpretations," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 3 (May 1971):39–57. Coy reconciles Robert Redfield's description of Tepotzlán in 1928 (peaceful cooperation among communal residents) with Oscar Lewis' description of Tepotzlán in 1943 (aggressive individualistic behavior) by showing that the population of Tepotzlán had increased tremendously after the Mexican Revolution, making access to land for everybody (the goal of the Revolution) very difficult. "By 1943 the swollen population . . . is expressing its multifaceted individuality and competitiveness in the behavior which Lewis discovered" (p. 57). Villagers, who acquired positions in the local governing ejidal institutions, engrossed land and labor for their own benefit and encouraged "all kinds of activity prejudicial to the equitable sharing of the fruits of the land" (p. 55).

53. The last conclusion is derived from H. Hoetink, *Slavery and Race Relations in the Americas, Comparative Notes on Their Nature and Nexus*. (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 115–28.

128