

INDIGENOUS APPROPRIATIONS
AND BOUNDARY CROSSINGS:
INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES
ON INDIGENOUS CULTURES AND
POLITICS IN THE ANDES

Carmen Martínez Novo
University of Kentucky

Heads of State: Icons, Power, and Politics in the Ancient and Modern Andes.

By Denise Y. Arnold and Christine A. Hastorf. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008. Pp. viii + 291. \$89.00 cloth. \$34.95 paper. ISBN: 9781598741711.

The Andes Imagined: Indigenismo, Society, and Modernity. By Jorge Coronado.

Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. Pp. xiii + 208. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822960249.

Struggles of Voice: The Politics of Indigenous Representation in the Andes.

By José Antonio Lucero. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008. Pp. xvi + 236. \$65.00 cloth. \$25.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822959984.

Amid resurgent scholarly interest in indigenous cultures and politics, three recent books on Andean indigenous peoples transcend epochal, disciplinary, and geographic boundaries in insightful ways that help rearticulate and reimagine this evolving field. Along the way, they contribute to ongoing debates about indigenous representation and essentialism. Denise Arnold and Christine Hastorf's *Heads of State: Icons, Power, and Politics in the Ancient and Modern Andes*, Jorge Coronado's *The Andes Imagined: Indigenismo, Society, and Modernity*, and José Antonio Lucero's *Struggles of Voice: The Politics of Indigenous Representation in the Andes* all look at indigenous cultures, indigenous politics, and in Coronado's case the political and cultural uses of indigeneity, from a historical perspective. Arnold and Hastorf present data on heads as symbols of political power and the rituals and cults associated with them from pre-Hispanic times (approximately 2000 BC) to the present. Although Coronado focuses on the period from 1920 to 1940 to explore *indigenista* (i.e., policies and cultural products that take the Indian as their focus) and indigenous representations, he connects these works and debates with larger trends that extend from the mid-nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. Lucero goes back to the mid-nineteenth century to better understand the roots of twentieth- and twenty-first-century indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador. Historical depth and richness of detail help these three volumes better ground the debates on indigenous and indigenista culture and politics.

Latin American Research Review, Vol. 48, No. 2. © 2013 by the Latin American Studies Association.

The three volumes have an interdisciplinary reach. *Heads of State* is the result of collaboration between Arnold, a sociocultural anthropologist, and Hastorf, an archaeologist. Coronado writes from the field of literary and cultural studies but also uses the insights of anthropology, history, and other disciplines. Lucero takes pride in being a political scientist who also applies anthropological methods, and his work engages in debates with anthropologists, historians, sociologists, and other social scientists.

As their titles indicate, the three books seek an Andean scope, but geographically, the volumes cover ample territory. Arnold and Hastorf study mostly what are today Bolivia and Peru but also make reference to the northern Andes as well as the Amazon. Coronado centers on Peru but often refers to indigenismo in Ecuador and other Latin American countries as a point of contrast. Lucero compares Bolivia and Ecuador, with frequent allusions to Peru. There is a tendency throughout Arnold and Hastorf's volume to assume that the ethnographic findings in an area of Bolivia apply to the whole Andean region, and they do not always provide specific evidence from other areas to prove their point. By contrast, when Lucero and Coronado suggest larger regional trends, it is based on an exposition of evidence from a variety of countries and regions.

Another geographical boundary that these books trespass to good effect is that between the highlands and the lowlands. Very often, anthropologists study the Andes and the Amazon as separate culture areas, and the scholarship in one of those areas tends to ignore research on the other. Even in contemporary contexts in which the nation-state is sometimes cast as an important interlocutor of indigenous movements, scholars have tended to be either Andes centered or Amazon focused. However, as archaeologists, ethnohistorians, and ethnographers have argued for some time, the connections between the Andes and the Amazon have been many from pre-Hispanic times to the present, and the works reviewed here show cognizance of that fact.

Arnold and Hastorf help us understand the head as a symbol of political power in the Andes through a fruitful conversation between Andean and Amazonian ethnography (27). Similarly, Lucero studies the Andes and the Amazon jointly to comprehend the formation of modern indigenous movements that, to achieve national relevance, seek to coordinate organizations from both regions. Coronado compares indigenista thought emanating from Cuzco and other cities of the highlands of Peru with the ideas of their counterparts in the capital. The author shows how location in Lima or the highland provinces produces different points of view about the role of indigeneity within Andean modernity. Whereas from Lima indigeneity was understood as something to be incorporated or assimilated to create a more egalitarian and developed society (11), in the provinces, more attention is paid to the cultural particularities of indigenous peasant societies to give shape to provincial identities and political projects able to challenge *limeño* centralism (52–74). Ironically, Coronado shows that highland *hacendados* and elites claimed to speak for indigenous peoples and to be their legitimate representatives (60). Lucero's historical account of the administration of indigenous populations in the Andes helps contextualize this paradox: landowners were the ones in charge of the administration of indigenous populations through the hacienda system in the

first half of the twentieth century and therefore assumed the role of representatives of indigenous peoples (50).

An important reason to look at the links between highlands and lowlands, as Arnold and Hastorf point out, is the multitiered ecology of the Andean region and the way Andean peoples have historically dealt with this environmental characteristic through apparatuses of political control or social relations that allowed them to have access to the products of different altitudes. John Murra's and Frank Salomon's seminal works first explored this characteristic of Andean societies.¹ Because of these enduring vertical connections, we cannot understand highland and lowland indigenous cultures or their political systems as isolated from each other. Lucero adds another reason to look at these areas jointly—the importance of the nation-state as interlocutor of indigenous peoples since independence (8–13). It is not by chance that Andean nation-states have struggled to include coast, highland, and Amazon lands in their national geographies; modern nations seem to replicate older political arrangements of vertical control. Interestingly, despite these findings, scholarship on the Andes and the Amazon, the highlands and the coast, often continues to treat these regions separately, perhaps because of the enduring tendency toward essentialism in which indigenous subjects are presented as if they were isolated and had no interaction with larger contexts.

If Arnold and Hastorf expand on Andeanist canonical texts to emphasize the connections between the Andes and the Amazon, they seem to depart from those interpretations when they focus on violence (head-hunting) instead of cooperation and reciprocity as the central element from which Andean cultures develop many of their traits, including art, textiles, rituals, politics, and note taking through *kipus* (21). The authors argue that the “head,” literally the body part and its representations, understood in Andean culture as the organ from which spirituality and thought emanate, is a pervasive element in Andean culture and a powerful symbol of political power and legitimacy (21). The evidence they provide to substantiate this claim includes archaeological representations of heads associated with those in positions of authority; the cult of ancestor and trophy heads to strengthen group cohesion as well as land and political claims over neighboring groups; representation of heads in the *vara* staffs of office of *ayllu* (communal) authorities, who are also called “heads”; and modern ethnographic examples, such as the custom of eating animal heads and brains to increase or demonstrate a man's power or authority. According to the authors, this latter activity is a legacy of earlier human brain-sucking activities that took place after taking trophy heads from dead enemies (92). Ancestor and trophy heads are male, and mostly men take advantage of the power gained by possessing, eating, drinking, or worshipping heads. However, women are in charge of the necessary rituals that tame enemy heads to appropriate the power, knowledge, and energies of enemies for the purposes of bringing renewed fertility to the group. The authors assert that

1. See John Victor Murra, *The Economic Organization of the Inca State* (Greenwich, CT: Jai Press, 1980); Frank Salomon, *Native Lords of Quito in the Age of the Incas: The Political Economy of North Andean Chiefdoms* (1986; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

females metaphorically transform the head into seed and rain, thus converting death and the products of violence into new life (47–50).

Arnold and Hastorf could have made clearer what lies behind the idea that violence is at the heart of Andean culture or what the implications are of demonstrating that such violence existed and shaped this culture. Instead, the authors seem to fall back on ideas of complementarity and harmony when females transform death and violence into new life (47–50). The book's findings may derive from the fact that the people with whom Arnold has worked for many years were in the past warriors that subdued Amazonian groups for the Inca Empire (40). If so, there is reason to question whether these ethnographic findings will apply elsewhere in the Andes. For instance, Luis Alberto Tuaza, a Kichwa intellectual, argues that the organ producing thought and spirituality in his native region of Chimborazo, Ecuador, is the heart (*shunku*), not the head (*uma*). According to Tuaza, when Chimborazo communities speak in the Kichwa language, they claim to think, remember, and worship with the heart (*shunku*, also translated as "entrails"), not the head.² However, in Chimborazo, like in Bolivia, the head of the guinea pig is served to the most powerful person in a ritual meal, and communities use skulls of the dead found in cemeteries for protection. Some of Arnold and Hastorf's evidence linking violence and head-hunting to other activities seems weak or metaphorical. For example, the authors argue that khipus originate in the falling long hair of trophy heads, offering as evidence representations of men holding khipus and trophy heads in similar ways in Guaman Poma's sixteenth-century drawings (141–142); this is hardly persuasive.

Although Arnold and Hastorf seem fascinated with the many rituals to tame and contain trophy heads and with the legacies of head-hunting in different contemporary cultural manifestations, they omit discussion of the actual violence to which these body parts made into cultural artifacts refer. One need only think about the many decapitated heads left in public spaces by the Mexican drug cartels to terrorize the population in order to have an idea of the brutality implied in head-hunting. In contrast, trophy heads and their taming through ritual are powerful metaphors that convey something very interesting about Amazonian, and, according to the authors, also Andean culture: a central element in these indigenous traditions is not only to reproduce their own cultural characteristics (through the cult of ancestor heads) but also to appropriate the energies and ideas of other peoples for their own purposes (through the rituals associated with taming trophy heads) (57). As Eduardo Viveiros de Castro has shown, Amerindian thought is more often open to external influences than oppositional to them and sometimes seeks to appropriate those outside influences.³

The use of contemporary ethnography to illuminate the past in Arnold and Hastorf's study, though perhaps a common practice in archeological studies, is intriguing to those coming from other fields; cultural anthropology is more prone to

2. Personal communication with Luis Alberto Tuaza (with whom I have long collaborated), October 10, 2012.

3. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *From the Enemy's Point of View: Humanity and Divinity in an Amazonian Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

use the past and the findings of archaeology to convey something about the present. Together with the authors' focus on violence, this temporal reversal invites inquiry about the largely unstated overall project of this book. Given the many interesting things going on in relation to Bolivia's indigenous peoples today, why use the present to understand the past? This twist is particularly curious in light of the thick historical and cultural approach taken to illuminate recent political developments in Denise Arnold's excellent earlier book with Juan de Dios Yapita, *The Metamorphosis of Heads*.⁴

If Arnold and Hastorf discuss the head as a symbol of death, violence, regeneration, political power, and group identity for Andean peoples, Coronado argues that Andeans themselves became powerful symbols for non-Indians in postcolonial times. Coronado contends that when Peruvian indigenistas spoke about the Indian, they were not particularly concerned with indigenous peoples, but with how Andean societies could better modernize, a point that has previously been made by other authors.⁵ Instead of focusing on influential indigenista novels to make this argument, Coronado borrows the methods of disciplines other than literature, exploring a variety of documents such as political writings, working-class newspapers, poetry, and photography, as well as studies by lesser-known authors. An interesting contribution is Coronado's thorough illustration of how the Indian became a symbol for diverse projects and understandings of modernity. For example, for José Carlos Mariátegui and other indigenistas, the Indian symbolized colonial oppression and injustice, and his redemption was expected to bring modernity to Peru in the shape of greater justice and democracy (25–51). Coronado argues that, contrary to his reputation, Mariátegui had little contact with indigenous Peruvians and knew little about them. Provincial elites like José Ángel Escalante paid more attention to the actual rituals and customs of Andean peoples in order to re-create a modern highland identity that could compete with and challenge cosmopolitan Lima (52–74). For Oquendo de Amat, a poet and humble migrant from the highlands to Lima, the Indian and the highlands were sources of nostalgia that contrasted and ultimately clashed with the attractive but dangerous modernity of the capital city (85).

Coronado contrasts other perspectives to the writings of these indigenistas. Examples include the representations of Martín Chambi, a photographer of Aymara origins, and the views of peasants interviewed in the working-class publication *Labor*. Different from the indigenistas, who perceived the Indian as the embodiment of the legacy of colonialism that needed to be redeemed for modernity to arrive, Chambi and others sought to appropriate modernity for their own purposes, theorizing an Andean modernity with a role for the Indian as a consumer and a protagonist of contemporary transformations (138). The unveiling of an indigenous way of thinking eager to appropriate Western modern influences,

4. Denise Arnold, with Juan de Dios Yapita, *The Metamorphosis of Heads: Textual Struggles, Education, and Land in the Andes* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006).

5. See Marisol de la Cadena, *Indigenous Mestizos: The Politics of Race and Culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919–1991* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race, and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997).

instead of oppositional to them, resonates with Arnold and Hastorf's description of the importance of appropriation of outside energies and ideas into Andean culture through rituals associated with head-hunting.

Lucero's book explores in greater detail the last decades of the twentieth century, a period when indigenista ventriloquism and the use of the Indian as a metaphor for something else seem to have been challenged, and indeed transcended. Andrés Guerrero has shown that under colonial rule, indigenous peoples were legally considered minors, and as a consequence, a mestizo would be designated to represent them in public transactions. This legal aspect became ingrained in Andean and Latin American culture beyond the legal domain and was used to justify the role of indigenistas who spoke for the Indian population. The term *ventriloquism* was developed by Guerrero to question the authenticity of that practice.⁶ According to Guerrero, ventriloquism was abandoned in Ecuador in the 1990s, after indigenous people created modern political movements, staged massive uprisings, and were able to question such forms of representation by outsiders. Lucero agrees with that time line, finding that indigenous peoples are only now speaking fully with their own voices.

That process started and began to insinuate itself in art and literature in the period researched by Coronado (1920s–1940s), picking up pace in the 1930s as Andean indigenous peoples began to organize themselves politically with the help of communist and socialist activists and political parties. However, there is ongoing debate about the extent to which indigenous people had an independent voice within such leftist movements. Whereas Guerrero claims that communists, like other indigenistas, spoke for indigenous peoples, Marc Becker argues that indigenous activists possessed their own voice and had an independent role within communist organizations.⁷ Lucero does not take sides in this debate but instead emphasizes the role of communist activists in relocating struggles that previously had played out within the confines of hacienda politics in a broader context of class struggle that prepared the terrain for the agrarian reforms of the 1960s and 1970s (97).

Lucero discusses the formation of indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador, both in the highlands and the Amazon regions, on the basis of the particular historical and regional configurations that gave shape to varied forms of political mobilization of indigenous peoples. Though Lucero's material on Bolivia is more complete and compelling than his coverage of Ecuador, the histories of indigenous organizations in both countries are detailed and nuanced and are useful both to nonspecialized readers and to specialists, who will discover intriguing new details and unexplored aspects. Earlier publications tended to emphasize the relative unity of the indigenous movement in Ecuador because in the decade

6. See Andrés Guerrero, "Una imagen ventrílocua: El discurso liberal de la desgraciada raza indígena a fines del siglo XIX," in *Imágenes e imagineros: Representaciones de los indígenas ecuatorianos siglos XIX y XX*, edited by Blanca Muratorio (Quito: FLACSO Ecuador, 1994), 197–252.

7. See Andrés Guerrero, "La desintegración de la administración étnica en el Ecuador," in *Sismo étnico en el Ecuador*, edited by José Almeida (Quito: Centro para el Desarrollo y la Investigación sobre Movimientos Sociales del Ecuador, 1993), 91–112; and Marc Becker, *Indians and Leftists in the Making of Ecuador's Modern Indigenous Movements* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008).

of the 1990s the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE), Ecuador's largest indigenous organization, dominated indigenous politics. As Lucero explains: "One weakness common to much of the existing literature on indigenous movements is the tendency to speak of the Indian movement in the various countries as a unitary actor, eliding the organizational and ideological diversity of contemporary indigenous contention" (5). Lucero's account, by contrast, explores in depth not just one but multiple movements involving organizations coming from diverse traditions that may or may not seek or achieve convergence in their agendas. Lucero has perhaps overstated the literature's failure to acknowledge pluralism among indigenous organizations. Nonetheless, his is a welcome corrective.

Lucero's complex account of the history of indigenous organizational diversity and the traditions that make up the different organizations will be most important to students of indigenous politics. Indigenous organizational diversity has played a key role in recent political developments in both countries. In Ecuador, governments have used the existence of different organizations of indigenous peoples to fragment and weaken indigenous struggles.⁸ In Bolivia, indigenous organizations other than Evo Morales's Movement toward Socialism (MAS) oppose his government's policies of extraction of natural resources that pollute the territories of frontier indigenous peoples.⁹

Lucero argues that the legacy of corporatism and trade unionism has characterized the political culture of indigenous movements in the Bolivian highlands. Following Philippe Schmitter and others, he defines corporatism as "a system of interest mediation in which social groups (peasants and workers especially) were linked directly to the state" (60). Through a discussion of the 1937 Law of Communes, Lucero characterizes Ecuador's corporatism as weak (69–74). However, the text could have profited from a more detailed evaluation of former president Velasco Ibarra's brand of populism in Ecuador.¹⁰ In contrast to Bolivia, where Lucero suggests that corporatism and trade unionism have burdened the highland's indigenous movements with ideas alien to indigenous struggles, Ecuador's weaker state and thin trade-union influences left the indigenous movements freer to develop an original indigenous approach centered on an understanding of indigenous peoples as nationalities (*nacionalidades*) concerned more with ethnicity than class (110–120). However, the legacy of corporatism and leftist politics in Ecuadorean indigenous movements, as well as the importance of class issues in Ecuadorean indigenous agendas, though perhaps weaker than those of Bolivia, are underemphasized in this analysis.

8. See León Zamosc, "The Indian Movement and Political Democracy in Ecuador," *Latin American Politics and Society* 49, no. 3 (2007): 1–34; Carmen Martínez, "The Backlash against Indigenous Rights in Ecuador's Citizen's Revolution," in *Latin America's Multicultural Movements: The Struggle between Communitarianism, Autonomy and Human Rights*, edited by Todd Eisenstadt, Michael Danielson, Moisés Bailón, and Carlos Sorroza (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 111–134.

9. Nancy Postero, "After the Revolution: Shifting Notions of Indigeneity in Evo Morales's Bolivia" (paper presented at the conference "Repositioning Indigeneity in Latin America," Johns Hopkins University, November 4–6, 2010).

10. See Carlos de la Torre, *Populist Seduction in Latin America* (Athens: Ohio University Press).

Lucero's book suffers somewhat, but also profits, from having been written during a historical watershed between the period of multicultural neoliberalism and the new post-neoliberal era that gave rise to the governments of Evo Morales (2006–present) in Bolivia and Rafael Correa (2007–present) in Ecuador. Lucero's book starts with the hypothesis of the greater relevance of ethnicity over class as a motivator of indigenous struggle, which Lucero posits as the reason the indigenous movement of Ecuador has been more successful than its Bolivian counterpart and has been able to unify at the national level. In Bolivia, according to the author, a highlands movement hampered by an emphasis on class, corporatism, and trade unionism has not been able to put together a common agenda with a more agile Amazonian movement centered on novel understandings of ethnicity and territory. However, as Lucero's investigation progressed, his initial thesis was confronted in 2004 with a growing crisis in the Ecuadorean indigenous movement that exposed fault lines within it, and in 2005 with the sweeping victory of Evo Morales's MAS party. These events necessitated the reworking of Lucero's initial hypothesis asserting the greater relevance of ethnicity over class for Andean indigenous peoples. He grapples with that reformulation in his conclusion (175–191), but even so, Lucero leaves us with unanswered questions: Has the progressive abandonment of issues of class made the Ecuadorean indigenous movement more vulnerable to co-optation by multicultural neoliberalism in the long run? Has international funding agency and Bolivian neoliberal dislike of Evo Morales and Bolivian highland movements influenced by trade unionism and class-based agendas ultimately made such movements stronger? Having been researched and written at a moment of change, this book struggles to answer such questions, but the historical fluidity also helps ensure that the author avoids facile assumptions and commonplaces while he struggles with many interpretive tensions.

An early thesis of Lucero's book that could be challenged, and that the victory of Morales seems to question, is the preeminence of Amazonian movements over highland ones (109). Perhaps the Shuar Federation was a pioneering modern indigenous organization in Ecuador, but that does not mean that the movements in the highlands that had been developing since the 1930s and 1940s have been less influential for the formation of CONAIE. Similarly, the Bolivian Amazonian movement Confederation of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia (CIDOB) is not necessarily more innovative and politically successful than Evo Morales's MAS. Perhaps the search for a more pristine indigenous agenda uncontaminated by issues of class that are perceived as alien to indigenous interests leads Lucero to favor Amazonian movements. However, as Arnold and Hastorf (223), as well as Coronado (168), point out, appropriation of alien ideas does not make indigenous cultures less authentic and may even make them truer to themselves.

The independence of indigenous movements from external actors might have been overstated in Lucero's account of indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia. For example, the creation of the Shuar Federation cannot be fully understood without more detailed reference to the role of the Salesian Catholic order (101). Similarly, the indigenous movements of Cotopaxi or Chimborazo cannot be comprehended without giving due attention to the Salesian order or to Monsignor Leonidas Proaño, a Catholic bishop who subscribed to liberation theology. Libera-

tion and inculturation theology, different groups of the Left, and nongovernmental organizations and social scientists are important elements of the formation of indigenous movements, as authors like Alison Brysk and Joanne Rappaport have pointed out.¹¹ Lucero acknowledges this relationship between indigenous movements and nonindigenous collaborators, but a desire to declare the end of the “ventriloquist” stage, in which non-Indians spoke for Indians and represented them, perhaps leads him to underplay the role of nonindigenous advocates in the formation of indigenous movements (75). Reliance on the accounts of indigenous leaders who want to emphasize their own roles of leadership over those of their collaborators and advocates may have further diminished emphasis on external agents in Lucero’s account of the cultural making of political groups (24). Upon reading Lucero, one might well ask, are the indigenistas and ventriloquists described by Coronado a thing of the past, or do we still need to go back to indigenismo to understand indigenous cultures and politics today?

To sum up, these three well-researched, well-written, and thorough volumes provide important insights into indigenous cultures and politics past and present. For the most part, the books transcend the narrow boundaries of historical periods, disciplines, and geographical focus areas. Perhaps their most important contribution is to challenge essentialist understandings of indigenous cultures by describing them as open to outside influences and as nonmonolithic. In Arnold and Hastorf’s volume, women’s taming of enemy trophy heads is a powerful metaphor for the appropriation of outside ideas and energies in Andean culture, as is the emphasis on the contacts between Andean and Amazonian civilizations. This view challenges perspectives that pose Andean culture as bounded and isolated from outside influences. Coronado shows how the Indian was constructed by indigenistas as the antithesis of modernity and the embodiment of premodern colonialism. However, Coronado also demonstrates that people of indigenous descent saw themselves not as alien to modernity but as striving to achieve its benefits and to be included in it. By contrasting indigenista and indigenous perspectives, and by showing that indigenistas like Mariátegui were not as knowledgeable of indigenous cultures as previously believed, Coronado questions indigenista essentialist constructions. Lucero, too, acknowledges that indigenous activists have adopted alien elements, notably trade unionism and corporatism. Although he seems somewhat uncomfortable with this discovery and prefers a purer indigenous culture that he locates in the Amazon, Lucero’s thoughtful account of the historical depth and diversity of indigenous political organizations and practices becomes an alternative path to the rejection of monolithic and closed understandings of indigeneity. Collectively, these three accounts of indigenous appropriation of culture challenge the persistent colonial legacy of essentialism that has categorized Amerindians as “other,” thus providing a more complex and accurate picture of Andean culture.

11. See Alison Brysk, *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000); Joanne Rappaport, *Intercultural Utopias: Public Intellectuals, Cultural Experimentation, and Ethnic Pluralism in Colombia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).