CHAPTER NINE
THE SOCIO-POLITICS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN HISPANIC SOUTH AMERICA

GUSTAVO POLITIS

INTRODUCTION

The formation of archaeology as a scientific discipline in South America has been quite different in each country.[1] Although it is possible to point to some similarities, the continent-wide development of the discipline has been heterogeneous. When we talk about quintessential Latin America, most people, including scholars, imagine countries such as Peru or Bolivia, with large populations of indigenous peoples, or perhaps Brazil (see Funari 1995) and Colombia, where the population comprises a mixture of indigenous peoples and those of African or European ancestry. In contrast to the above examples, Argentina has a large population of European descent and one of the smallest indigenous populations in South America. Nevertheless, as an example of the development of archaeology in the region, Argentina is no more or less 'typical' than any of the other countries. In Argentina political changes have been extreme, and their impact on archaeology is perhaps more clear-cut than in the other countries.

The Argentinan case study, then, firmly rooted in its Latin-American context, allows us to reflect on how archaeological knowledge is constructed, and to what extent the national-political context and its place in the international arena affects both practical and theoretical archaeology in a given country. I also refer, but in less detail, to some of the political contexts of other countries, especially Peru and Colombia, because they help to clarify the socio-politics of archaeology in the region from a wider perspective.

Spanish South America comprises many countries, forming the fourth largest continent in the world with, in 1985, about 132 million inhabitants. Although the main language is Spanish, indigenous languages are quite widespread in some countries (i.e., Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, etc.). All of the countries in Spanish South America share a strong Catholic tradition.

These states were former Spanish colonies which became independent in the early decades of the nineteenth century, after several years of war against Spain. Two men, San Martin from Argentina and Bolivar from Venezuela, led the revolutionary forces, which included soldiers from several South American

countries fighting in close union until they liberated the continent in 1828. Subsequent to this liberation there was a period of violent civil wars in the mid-nineteenth century, as peoples of different regions sought to consolidate their states and political organizations, on the basis of new constitutions. The second half of the nineteenth century was characterized by border disputes between South American countries and also by new colonization of indigenous peoples' territory. During this period there was no room for systematic archaeological research, and the few recorded observations of archaeological remains (almost exclusively monumental) were made by foreign visitors (e.g., Humboldt 1814, Rivero & Tschudi 1851, Bollaert 1860).

THE RISE OF NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGIES H AEOLOGIES

Scientific archaeology emerged in South America in the last decades of the nineteenth century. This was also the time when the new ruling elites thought they could best develop their new nations by drawing as fully as possible on foreign enterprise, foreign investment and foreign culture. They increasingly looked to the United Kingdom, France and the United States for models (Whitaker & Jordan 1966).

In Argentina archaeology was born as a science at the end of the last century during the time of the so-called 'generation of the eighties', when the ruling elites were preoccupied with an idea of 'progress', promoting European cultural values rather than indigenous and *criollo* (creole) values. This idea of 'progress', which was related to early concepts of evolution, encouraged the development of science not only as a tool to improve knowledge about the country, but also as an intellectual exercise. It was also an attempt to mimic the behaviour of the more developed European countries, especially France and the United Kingdom, which were used as models. During this period, the national schools of natural sciences came into being and were strongly promoted, the first anthropological research began and some of the first archaeological papers in the country were published. Two of them were highly significant: one, written by Liberani and Hernández (1877), was the first 'catalogue' of the 'Indian antiquities' of the Northwest of Argentina, the other was by Florentino Ameghino (1880), who gained an international reputation by proposing that the first human beings appeared in the Argentine pampas during the Tertiary period. In keeping with the scientific conventions of the time, the first edition of Ameghino's book was also published simultaneously in France and, of course, in French. Ameghino was deeply influenced by Darwinian evolutionism and was its first advocate in the southern hemisphere (Politis 1988). Evolutionism was in tune with the political perception of progress. Late eighteenth-century governors believed 'progress' meant changing the face of the country, through progression from indigenous and traditional ways of exploiting resources to more developed intensive processes that would enable Argentina to enter world markets as a

major producer of raw materials. For them, progress meant populating the country with European immigrants (they naturally considered territory populated by indigenous peoples to be empty and called it 'the Desert'). The keys to the progress of the country were Europeans, private land ownership and railways to take crops and meat from the interior to ports, for export to Europe. The early Euro-Argentines (those who were of European origin but lived in Argentina) and local anthropologists had no difficulty in persuading governors to help them make their dreams reality. Large museums and important scientific expeditions were funded and significant resources were allocated to research. The evolutionary ideas of Ameghino were developed at the very moment when the state of Argentina was being consolidated, when notions of progress, evolution and struggle for life fired the social imagination of the ruling elite.

Between 1879 and 1881, the national government sent several military expeditions to the huge territories of the pampas and Patagonia in the so-called 'Conquest of the Desert', areas which, until then, had been the territory of the Mapuche and Tehuelche indigenous peoples. Some scientists (e.g., Zeballos 1960; Zeballos 1978) accompanied these expeditions in order to study the fauna, the flora, the landscape, and to collect the heads of dead indigenous people for bio-anthropological purposes (see the discussions in the *World Archaeological Bulletin* 1992). Following military conquests, British railway companies brought 'progress' by developing a rail network, centred in Buenos Aires. It is important to note that the construction of the Museo de Ciencias Naturales de La Plata (one of the largest museums in South America) began just as the military campaign against the indigenous people ended. Obviously a place to store and exhibit the recent achievements of the government was required. The architectural styles and exhibition halls reflected the European tradition of museum construction, and the Smithsonian Institution in the United States was also taken as a model, since that museum had also been conceived as a place in which human diversity could be studied and investigated.

At the beginning of this century, local archaeological research flourished in Argentina, thanks to government support. Local archaeologists attempted to mimic the intellectual achievement of some European countries: Ambrosetti (1897; 1902; 1906) developed pioneering stratigraphic research in the Northwest, Torres (1911) excavated mounds in the Paraná delta, and Outes (1908; 1909; 1916) and Debenedetti (1912) were active investigating the archaeology of the pampas, Patagonia and Northwest regions. Some foreigners also undertook research in the Northwest, among them the Swedish scholar Boman (1908), who lived in the country for several years, and Rosen (1904; 1924), a Swedish count.

In other Latin American countries, archaeological investigation was beginning in a very different way. In Mexico and Peru, early archaeological research was typically carried out by visiting foreign scientists attracted by monumental archaeology. In the Andes, especially in Bolivia and Peru, M.Uhle, a German archaeologist, was the outstanding figure of the time. Uhle (see Willey & Sabloff

1980) introduced the concept of 'horizon style', although he did not define or explain it, and he devised the first chronologies in the Andes based on Inca and Tiahuanaco remains. In Bolivia, Nordenskiöld (1913), another Swedish aristocrat, carried out excavations in several lowland mounds and, on the basis of stratigraphy, distinguished two chronologically defined cultures.

It was a Chilean, José Toribio Medina (1882), who laid the foundations of archaeology in that country, following on the work of Bollaert. Meanwhile, Ameghino visited Uruguay in 1875–1876 and undertook some research there (Ameghino 1880). Shortly after that visit, Figueira (1892), a pioneer who carried out excavations and engaged in research in many parts of the country, wrote the first comprehehsive work on the prehistory of Uruguay, contradicting many of Ameghino's conclusions (Toscano n.d.).

In Colombia, Zerda, an historian, published a study about the Chibchas (Zerda 1882) and, shortly afterwards, Restrepo (1895) produced a monograph on the same group. It was not until 1913, however, that systematic archaeological research was undertaken in Colombia, when Preuss—from the Museum für Völkerkunde (Berlin)—started excavations at San Agustín (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1965). Although his fieldwork and research had been planned to last for only a few months, Preuss was forced to remain in Colombia for six years, due to difficulties in returning to Germany as a consequence of World War I (Uribe 1987).

In most parts of Latin America, therefore, cultural evolution was the dominant interpretative paradigm, and the most obvious instances of cultural contacts and diffusion were ignored (Willey & Sabloff 1980). Only Argentina initially developed any kind of local archaeological tradition (based in part on Argentinians of Italian descent). Elsewhere, knowledge of the South American pre-Hispanic past was essentially controlled by foreigners (mainly European) who usually published only in their own languages. They determined the scientific priorities and the problems to be discussed. Andean archaeology was led by well-educated German scientists and Swedish aristocrats.

THE SPREAD OF DIFFUSIONISM

The decline of evolutionism everywhere at the end of the nineteenth century (Trigger 1989) brought to Latin America new ideas which developed along different paths in each country. Archaeology acquired historical significance thanks to the quest for chronologies with which to systematize the pre-Hispanic sequences. At the beginning of this century, archaeologists once again sought to reinforce the links between their discipline and national histories, and scholars paid more attention to the geographical distribution of types and clusters of artefacts, trying to associate them with historical groups (Trigger 1989). The main supporters of the study of the distribution and the chronology of archaeological remains were the Swede G.Montelius, the German G.Kossinna and the Australian V.G.Childe. Although some stratigraphic excavation had

already been carried out (e.g., by Manuel Gamio in Mexico and Max Uhle in the San Francisco Bay) this was the time of the 'stratigraphic revolution', when chronologies were derived from field data (Willey & Sabloff 1980). In Latin America, culture-historical syntheses of regions and areas became the main objective, involving a direct historical approach. Classification and typology were the core archaeological methods. In this context, the idea of diffusion emerged as a key concept.

During the early twentieth century the United States expanded its political influence and economic interests in South America. The *criollo* landowner elites were becoming increasingly weak in face of the representatives of North American companies. In some countries this process led to the rise of an incipient urban middle class. At the turn of the century it is clear that South America passed from an era of European intervention to one of North American tutelage. A clear-cut example of this is the 1902 conflict in Venezuela, when three European countries, the United Kingdom, Germany and Italy, blocked Venezuelan ports claiming a debt payment (Halperin Donghi 1972). With the growth of North American economic and political interest in the region, the old European powers began a cautious withdrawal; only Great Britain resisted longer, into the early twentieth century, and Germany, whose influence was important (especially around the Caribbean) until the beginning of World War I. The United States did not go as far as military intervention in South America, as it had done in Central America and the Caribbean; its means of domination were more subtle, and concentrated on political and economic pressure.

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, the structure of Argentine society began to change, as a result of massive immigration from Europe (mainly from Spain and Italy). The indigenous peoples no longer constituted a problem, since the national state had effectively taken control of their territory (Podgorny & Politis 1989). At the same time, conflict was emerging due to the arrival of working-class immigrants bringing with them anarchist and socialist ideas. Interest in the origin of humanity and its evolution declined slowly after Ameghino's death, and was replaced by an increased awareness and promotion of indigenous and Hispanic-American *(criollo)* traditions. This shift provided the ruling elite with a tool to control immigration: they needed to reinforce the Hispanic and *criollo* tradition in order to distinguish themselves from the immigrants and, in doing so, to claim 'acquired rights'.

In this context, archaeological research was oriented towards the use of historical sources. In spite of the considerable amount of systematic work carried out by Argentines, there was still little chronological systematization in comparison with other countries in the region. As a consequence, historical sources were overused and a tendency emerged to force chronology towards the most recent pre- Columbian periods. A remarkable exception was the pioneering work carried out in the Magallanes (Magellan) Strait by the North American Junius Bird (1938, 1946), who suggested there had been long-term human occupation in the area dating back to late Pleistocene times.

In the meantime, ideas from the Vienna School, based on the so-called *Kulturhistorische Methode,* began to spread to Argentina through lectures, papers and books written in Spanish by José Imbelloni. Imbelloni, born in Italy, visited Argentina for a short period and returned to Europe as a volunteer soldier during World War I. After the war he studied in Italy, obtaining a doctorate in natural sciences, with which he returned to Argentina in 1920 (Arenas & Baffi 1991–2). The same year he was appointed to a professorship at the University of Buenos Aires, from where he became influential among subsequent generations of Argentine anthropologists. Although Imbelloni was in the main a physical anthropologist (Imbelloni 1924–5; 1933), he also discussed anthropological theoretical issues in a wide-ranging book (Imbelloni 1936). It was in this publication that he developed the term *Culturología* ('culturology')—synonymous with the German *Kulturmorphologie* and the French *ethnologie culturelle*—that was based on the main principles of the *Kulturhistorische Methode* and that allowed him to articulate his theories about culture, society and diffusion.[2] His main objective was to provide 'a general idea about the relationship between man and civilization' (Imbelloni 1936:22). Cultural evolutionism was strongly criticized, especially the work of Sir Edward B.Tylor (1871), while Austro-German diffusionism was supported.

Imbelloni proposed three main characteristics or guidelines for the definition of 'cultures': (a) the outstanding originality of their component elements, (b) the constant association of their elements, and (c) the cultural traits used to define a 'culture' had to belong to all sectors of human activity. In this sense, each 'culture' was considered as a 'type of civilization' and had two connotations: a territory and a patrimonial content.

Through his definition of eleven main 'cultural circles', Imbelloni introduced into South America the ideas of Oswald Menghin, the Austrian prehistorian who proposed the concept of 'primordial culture' *(Urkultur)*.

This introduction provided fertile soil for the subsequent development of post-war archaeology. The triumphant arrival of the Vienna School occurred long after the crisis of evolutionism, at a time when there was no dominant paradigm in Argentina's archaeology; this school of research became popular, and even liberal-oriented archaeologists did not react against it (González 1985).

In the 1930s Argentina underwent a series of military coups, a characteristic way of siezing power which remained intrinsic to Argentine politics until as late as the last decade. Reactionary conservative governments of landowners, backed by army officers and opposed to working-class communities, continued to hold sway until 1946 (Halperin Donghi 1972). During this period Metraux, a well-known French researcher and former student of Paul Rivet, arrived in Argentina bringing with him not only his high prestige but also reinforcement of the historicist paradigm. Canals Frau, of Spanish origin but trained in anthropology and ethnology in Germany, also reached the country and concentrated on the analysis of historical texts, while also translating one of Graebner's main papers (Lafón 1958–9).

In terms of the theoretical frameworks adopted, Uruguay was quite similar to Argentina at that time. In 1926 the Sociedad Amigos de la Arqueología was founded, bringing together prestigious intellectuals and politicians of the day. The Society published a journal in which the articles reflected the historicist orientation of the discipline. Within the humanities, archaeological findings were interpreted with reference to historical accounts in order to associate them with historically attested aboriginal groups (Cabrera Perez 1988). Exceptionally among scholars of this period, local palaeontologist Francisco Berro, a strong supporter of Ameghino's model of coexistence between humans and megafauna, continued to claim a great antiquity for the human occupation of the country (referred to in Toscano n.d.).

The rest of South America increasingly adopted a culture-historical orientation. Uhle left Peru in 1911 and began working in Chile and Ecuador, adopting a diffusionist approach and ending up obsessed with his search for evidence of Maya invasions into Ecuador and Peru (Collier 1982). While in Chile, and still influenced by the Vienna School (Uhle 1918; Orellana 1974–5), Uhle made three major contributions to its archaeology: (a) the development of the first chronological chart, (b) the description of the Atacameña culture and its contribution to some stylistic traits of Tiahuanaco, and (c) the identification of a Tiahuanaco period in northern Chile (Orellana 1974–5). He also applied some seriation in order to organize the chronology of the materials and acknowledged that 'types could change through time' (Willey & Sabloff 1980).

In his last Ecuadorian writings, Uhle postulated that the Middle American Maya were the ancestors of the American Higher cultures (Uhle 1922a; Uhle 1922b; cf. Willey & Sabloff 1980). It had been Jijón y Caamaño, a bibliophile and ethnohistorian who, stimulated by Rivet's work between 1901 and 1906, and himself from an aristocratic family from Quito, personally sponsored Uhle to carry out fieldwork in 1919 in Ecuador (Collier 1982). As a result, Uhle 'had a diversionary or refractive effect on Jijón y Caamaño's archaeological focus' (Collier 1982:8). Some years after Uhle returned to Germany, Jijón y Caamaño (1951) produced his synthesis of Ecuadorian chronology and pre-Hispanic cultures which provided the foundation for a diffusionist approach in Ecuadorian archaeology.

Meanwhile in Peru, Julio Tello had rejected Uhle's cultural sequence and he, together with Rafael Larco Hoyle, was working in the Central Andes, which had became a kind of laboratory where North American culture-historical archaeologists had begun to experiment with their methods and theories. Larco Hoyle (1938–9, 1946) supported the hypothesis of coastal origins for Peruvian civilization (McGuire 1992) basing his interpretations on Gordon Childe's concept of the Neolithic Revolution (Patterson 1989). Tello, on the contrary, argued for an Andean origin.

Tello, from an indigenous family in the central highlands (Dagget 1992), became the most influential of Peruvian archaeologists, exercising a 'kind of monopolistic control over the archaeological research of his compatriot'

(Schaedel & Shimada 1982:360). Already in 1909 Tello had received a Peruvian government grant which allowed him to study for two years in the United States (for an MA in anthropology from Harvard University). Later he was afforded the opportunity to study in important European museums in England, France and Germany (Dagget 1992). He became an early supporter of the *indigenismo* movement developed in Peru and Mexico during the 1920s. This movement was a major manifestation of nationalism in both countries, glorifying the Aztec past in Mexico and the Inca past in Peru, in order to legitimize the unique Indian identities of both countries (McGuire 1992). Strong affiliation with the government of Augusto Leguía (1919–30) helped Tello not only to carry out his research but also to spread his ideas among his Peruvian contemporaries. Leguía was elected President in 1919, but later created a sort of civilian dictatorship until 1930 when he was removed from power by a military revolution. During his government, the *indigenismo* movement became part of a broad programme to develop the country, called 'Patria Nueva'. Leguía's transformations may not have been very profound, but they led to an avalanche of North American investment, accelerated economic expansion and a dramatic increase in public support. The government faced opposition from certain sectors of the oligarchy of Lima, as well as from an eclectic group including university students and *mestizos* which later developed into the Peruvian APRA political party (Halperin Donghi 1972). When Leguía was removed from the presidency in 1930, so Tello lost his post. Later, however, in 1937, Nelson Rockefeller assisted him in the foundation of the Institute of Andean Research (Patterson 1989). When Tello died in 1947, his body was guarded in the Museo Nacional de Antropología y Arqueología of Lima and was conducted to the cemetery with the honours normally accorded to a minister of state. Since then, libraries, streets, plazas and schools have been named after him. Tello was an exceptional case in South America, the unique archaeologist who became a scientist/politician indigenous hero. He was glorified and seen as

> a man of the people, a representative of the indigenous population, and a messenger from the Amautas, the descendants of the ancient Inca empire.
>
> (Mejía Xesspe, in Tello 1967:3)

During this time, a period defined by Willey & Sabloff (1980) as 'the Classificatory-Historical Period', the main objective of North American archaeologists was the culture-historical synthesis of the regions of America. To achieve this goal, several technical and methodological devices were created or adopted, including stratigraphic excavation, seriation of archaeological materials, typology and pottery classification. It is interesting to note that in the development of this 'stratigraphic revolution' (Willey & Sabloff 1980) a Mexican archaeologist, Manuel Gamio, played a major role by excavating in the Valley of Mexico, providing a sequence with which to demonstrate and understand pre-Columbian cultural development. Although stylistic seriation was

pioneered by Uhle in Peru, it is Kroeber and his students who should be credited for making these methods comprehensible to a broader public (Willey & Sabloff 1980). Stylistic seriation, based on the associations of vessels in tombs, was used to derive chronological information from both excavated and looted material, and became a procedure later used in several Andean countries (e.g., Argentina and Chile). Kroeber (1927, 1944) developed a conceptual framework for Uhle's synthesis, expanding and refining it. The work of Kroeber and his associates was a major contribution to knowledge about the pre-Columbian Andes, and laid the foundations for a growing North American influence in Andean archaeology.

After a period of violent civil war, known as the 'War of A Thousand Days' (1899–1902), North Americans started to undertake research in Colombia. There the Conservative Party remained in power until 1930 while retaining several aspects of the nation's archaic structure (Halperin Donghi 1972). During 1922 and 1923, Alden Mason, from the Field Museum of Natural History in the United States, carried out major excavations in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, and published an extensive report in the early 1930s which is still considered a milestone in the archaeology of the area (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1965). Several European researchers (from Italy and Belgium) also worked in Colombia, while the Spaniard J.Pérez de Barrada led the first archaeological expedition to San Agustín, with financial support from the Ministry of National Education (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1965).

During the 1930s the social sciences received a great boost as a result of the Liberal Party coming to power. Presidents E.Olaya Herrera, A.López Pumarejo and Eduardo Santos supported this initiative and energetically promoted education at all levels, developing at the same time a progressive social policy (Chaves Chamorro 1986). At the end of the decade the semi-official Banco de la República inaugurated the 'Museum of Gold' with the aim of reducing the age-old illegal export, and melting down, of thousands of gold artefacts discovered by grave-robbers (Gnecco n.d.). During World War II, in 1941, and during a short-lived period of liberalism, Colombian President Santos offered Paul Rivet, whom the Colombian government had helped to escape from France during the German invasion, premises from which he could pursue his research (Gnecco n.d.). A few years earlier Colombia had taken in representatives of the Spanish intelligentsia who had been exiled from Spain after the Civil War, as well as some German scientists who had been persecuted by the Nazis.

The conjunction of these three groups paved the way for the development of Colombian anthropology. With Rivet, the sociology of Durkheim and Mauss made its way to Colombia, as well as French functionalism (Chaves Chamorro 1986). French influence was increased by the arrival in Colombia in the early 1930s of the French anthropologist Henri Lehmann who was very active and influential during the 'liberal period'. A major local figure was G.Hernández de Alba, who had studied in Paris where Rivet and Mauss had been his professors. In 1935 he set up a North American 'Anthropological Mission' to carry out field research, while in 1937 he supported the creation of the Servicio Arqueológico

Nacional and in 1938 he was the driving force behind the creation of the Museo Arqueológico Nacional. In his early days, his research consisted of a somewhat socially 'neutral' archaeology but, as a result of the dramatic social situation in which the Colombian indigenous people found themselves, de Alba later embraced the *indigenismo* movement, following in the paths of Gamio in Mexico and Tello in Peru (Chaves Chamorro 1986). When Lehmann left his professorship at the Instituto Etnológico Nacional to move to the Universidad del Cauca in Popayán, de Alba moved with him.

Led by Rivet, the first generation of local archaeologists were trained at the Instituto Etnológico Nacional, modelled on the Institute of Ethnology of the University of Paris, which had been created by Rivet and Mauss in 1926. It was divided into four main sections: archaeology, ethnography, ethnology and linguistics. Its first generation of students included the first female South American anthropologists, a direct consequence of the decisive support for women's rights from the government of Santos who, in 1938, encouraged and made it legal for women to attend university. One of these female students, A.Dussan, married G.Reichel-Dolmatoff, an Austrian anthropologist who had arrived in Colombia at the end of the 1930s. Together they were to become the most influential figures in the fields of archaeology and social anthropology in the decades that followed.

Until 1927, Chile enjoyed parliamentary coalition governments led by alliances of the main political forces. Between the wars, the country welcomed two European archaeologists who lived in the country and became Chilean nationals: Richard Latcham (1928) from Britain, who became the Director of the Museo Nacional de Historia Natural in Santiago, and Austrian Grete Mostny (1954, 1971) who arrived in Chile from Belgium (where she had gained her doctorate in prehistory) and carried out much fieldwork in many parts of the country (Durán 1977). However, there was also North American archaeological interest in Chile through the research of J.Bird (1938), who developed sophisticated methods of excavation in southern Patagonia. His excavations at the sites of Fell's Cave and Palli Aike became landmarks in studies of the peopling of America. During World War II, Bird returned to Chile to investigate the northern coast where he established, through excellent stratigraphic control, the cultural development of the littoral fisher-gatherer societies (Bird 1943) and established new criteria which gave an important impetus to the archaeology of the country (Rivera 1983).

AFTER WORLD WAR II

The period which followed World War II saw the consolidation of North America's hegemony in the countries of South America and the region came under the political and economic domination of the United States. This domination was also accompanied by an increasing cultural influence in South American countries. This period, called the 'crisis of the neo-colonial order' by

Halperin Donghi (1972) represented a new step toward the dissolution of links between western Europe and South America.

Julian Steward's (1946–50) *The Handbook of South American Indians* constituted the first large-scale attempt to interpret the archaeology of South America (Roosevelt 1991). The organization of this series reflected the assumption that centres where innovations originated were those which attained the highest level of complexity. Numerous archaeologists, most of them North Americans, were appointed to contribute to this project of systematization.

Juan Perón took office in 1946 after democratic and open Argentinian elections, with the support of the working class, the church and the military. The early years of his government benefited from the prosperity that the war brought to raw material producers such as Argentina. This period was characterized by a high degree of state control of the economy. In the early 1950s Perón began to apply a neo-conservative formula to his rule; nationalism, state control and populism were characteristic of the latter part of his period in office, a time when he lost church and military support (Halperin Donghi 1972).

Under the Perón government (1945–55) universities were no longer autonomous (a right lost in 1930 at the time of the first military coup), and were under direct control of the government. During this period a significant percentage of liberal academics were expelled from the universities and the right wing of the Peronista government increased its control. As a result, Imbelloni became an influential person in the Academy and close to the Peronista government. It was also during the first term of the Perón government that eastern European scholars arrived in Argentina, under official protection, to take up influential positions: Oswald Menghin (Austria) started research in the Museo Etnográfico de Buenos Aires (later to become Professor in the two most important Universities of Buenos Aires and La Plata); Branimiro Males became Director of the Instituto de Arqueología de Tucumán; and Miguel de Ferdinandy (a Hungarian resident in Portugal) became Director of the Instituto de Arqueología y Etnología de la Universidad de Cuyo in Mendoza (see Schobinger 1971, González 1991–2). Of these, Menghin was undoubtedly the most influential. He taught and carried out research, enjoyed academic power and had a prestigious reputation in the field of European prehistory; it was he who extended Kossinna's ideas (the so-called settlement-archaeology method) into prehistoric archaeology (Härke 1991; Härke 1995). His ideas had already been brought to Argentina by Imbelloni, and his political past as an active member of the Austrian Nazi Party (Arnold 1990) was quickly hidden.

While Austro-German diffusionism declined in the rest of the world, in Argentina many students were taught how the *Kulturkreis* travelled from one continent to another, carried on 'population waves'. North American cultural history had very little impact on the theoretical structure of the Argentinan archaeology of the late 1940s and early 1950s. Aligned with a variety of historical approaches to late pre-Hispanic periods, such diffusionism was both monolithic *and* satisfied government expectations. Regional traditions were

reinforced during Perón's rule and local museums were also founded in order to demonstrate to the public those ancient elements which contributed to the formation of the 'national identity'.

By the time that the Peronista government was ousted by a military coup in 1955, a group of North American archaeologists had published a compendium of Argentine archaeology, based almost exclusively on the published literature (Bennett, Bleiler & Sommer 1948). By compartmentalizing ceramics into styles, and artefacts into complexes, they were able to propose a spatio-chronological framework of cultures and periods. As stratigraphic research in northwest Argentina intensified and provided a basic cultural sequence, this publication became important and was followed by the next generation of local archaeologists.

In the Central Andes, North American ideas were becoming more and more influential through the publications of Bennett (1945) and Willey (1946; and see Willey & Sabloff 1980). Along with definitions of concepts such as component, phase and tradition (Willey & Phillips 1958), the essential recipes for the organization of culture-historical reconstruction of the South American pre-Columbian past were now in place, and are today still used in most parts of South America.

The North American tradition of research in the Central Andes (the *'peruvianistas'*), although diffuse in origin, crystallized in 1946 at a conference entitled 'Reappraisal of Peruvian Archaeology' (Schaedel & Shimada 1982). It was at this time that the Virú Valley Project was taking place, a multi-disciplinary project claimed to be an holistic study of the complete culture history of a Peruvian valley (Willey 1946). It also attempted to go further than culture historical reconstruction by emphasizing 'function and context', and by looking for causal generalizations (Schaedel & Shimada 1982).

The end of the Viru Valley Project came at more or less the same time as Julio Tello's death in 1947. His post was taken over by R.Carrion Cachot who followed a policy which limited foreign research in the country, and for a short period the work of foreign archaeologists, especially North Americans, declined drastically (Schaedel & Shimada 1982). Later on, however, various circumstances combined to bring a new and significantly more durable wave of North American scholars to Peru. M.Summer, with R.Schaedel, negotiated a long-term agreement between the Peruvian government and the Fulbright Commission of the United States—the 'Muelle-Fulbright phase' (Schaedel & Shimada 1982). This phase lasted from 1958 to 1968 and was characterized not only by a constant stream of North Americans but also by archaeologists from Japan and Germany. Their impact was financial and technical rather than theoretical (Izumi & Terada 1966; Izumi & Terada 1972; Burger 1989; Härke 1995; Tsude 1995).

In Peru, the first Misión Científica Española en Hispanoamérica was set up in 1967 and, under the direction of J.Alcina Franch, a group of Spanish archaeologists worked for several years in the Chinchero area. Alcina Franch's

main interest was to test his Atlantic model for interoceanic connections, on the basis of a long-distance diffusionist model (Alcina Franch 1972). Despite more archaeological fieldwork by Germans, Japanese and North Americans, only the United States had any real theoretical influence.

The period after World War II witnessed important political changes in Colombia. The Liberal Party lost power due to internal division and, as a result, the conservative M.Ospina Perez was elected to office in 1946. He developed a moderate policy and in some respects was keen to share part of his power with the Liberals. Just before the end of World War II, Rivet left Colombia (having been given an appointment by the French Provisional Government of Charles de Gaulle), leaving behind him his creation, the Instituto Etnológico Nacional, and a well-organized group of disciples, as well as five European professors (Chaves Chamorro 1986). These people helped to consolidate the Instituto and, in the years that followed, determined the course of Colombian anthropology. It is interesting that, in 1944, when France was still trying to rise up from its ashes, the French Provisional Government provided funds to enable all the scholars working in the Instituto to undertake fieldwork.

Theoretical and political structures took on different forms in Colombian anthropology. A strong indigenista movement emerged and a private institution, the Instituto Indígena Colombiano, became active in trying to improve the situation of Colombian indigenous peoples; scholars working in the Instituto Etnológico were becoming acquainted with a variety of new influences including British functionalism, as well as the works of North American scholars such as R.Benedict, M.Mead, R.Linton and A.Kroeber (Chaves Chamorro 1986). Meanwhile, the Conservative Party was becoming stronger and the government was lurching towards the right. When L.Gomez became President in 1950 he destroyed the most important achievements of the previous liberal governments. His blatantly racist and anachronistic ideas permeated all levels of his political actions, and his anti-Indian and anti-black sentiments were clear to all. For him, the only way forward for Colombia was by emphasizing its Hispanic origins, and by systematically negating the population's indigenous and African roots.

Within academia the result was persecution, resulting in seven scholars abandoning the Instituto Etnológico Nacional, some of whom were helped by the Guggenheim Foundation to spend one or two years in the United States. Social anthropologists were the first to be marginalized in this way; archaeologists were the last—'el indio muerto pone menos problemas que el indio vivo' (a dead Indian poses fewer problems than a living Indian) (Chaves Chamorro 1986:168). The same pattern was to be repeated twenty years later under military governments in the Southern Cone.

Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff and Alicia Dussan were able to continue their work, first in the 1940s when they were based at the Instituto Etnológico Nacional and then, when Reichel-Dolmatoff became its Director, at the Instituto Etnológico del Magdalena on the Caribbean coast. During this time they not only carried out pioneering archaeological research at early pottery sites, but Reichel-

Dolmatoff also produced a monograph on the Kogi of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1950; Reichel-Dolmatoff & Dussan 1951; Reichel-Dolmatoff 1965). His systematic use of ethnographic analogy to interpret the archaeological record was marred by diffusionism, although not in such an extreme form as those of his predecessor Pérez de Barrada, or of Rivet (Gnecco n.d.). Reichel-Domatoff's influence on several generations of Colombian anthropologists remains significant today.

Neither Reichel-Dolmatoff nor Dussan joined those anthropologists who attempted to stand up to the Gomez government. Their attitude is bitterly remembered by a former colleague at the Instituto Etnológico:

> Reichel-Dolmatoff, a stranger to the political arena, was closer to the conservative party than to the liberals, with a strong aristocratic outlook. He managed to remain untouched by the political debates which broke out in Colombia at that time and his work was free of interference, nor was he affected by the political changes taking place since 1948…. His archaeological and ethnographic research paid no attention to the exploitation of the Indians, nor to land rights, nor to matters of wider educational import.
>
> (Chaves Chamorro 1986:188)

In 1953, the dictatorial style of L.Gomez, as well as internal contradictions within the Conservative Party, fuelled the military coup of Rojas Pinilla. A new era in the political life of Colombia started, and the first guerilla groups appeared.

The 1940s were also a time when North American archaeological influence focused its attention on the lowlands of South America, especially through the activities of Clifford Evans and Betty Meggers in Brazil (see Funari 1995). They undertook their first Brazilian fieldwork in 1948 (Meggers 1992a) and, between 1952 and 1953, they also undertook intensive fieldwork in British Guyana and Venezuela. In 1954, as a result of an invitation from Emilio Estrada, Evans and Meggers began research in two regions of Ecuador: the Napo basin and the Guayas coast. Subsequently, they also visited almost all other South American countries. Their overall aim was to elaborate a chronological and spatial framework for the low-lands of Latin America, and to investigate the peopling of these territories; their main analytical tool was Ford's technique of ceramic analysis (Ford 1962).

Meggers and Evans popularized their approach throughout South America, mainly through the free, wide distribution of the Spanish translation of their handbook (1969), *Como interpretar el lenguaje de los tiestos* (How to interpret the language of sherds). The other part of their approach was to obtain a large number of carbon–14 determinations, both from their own sites and also from sites excavated by local archaeologists. As a result, they and their South American associates were able to arrange the archaeological material of the lowlands into a complex system of traditions and phases. They then equated the

concept of 'series' developed by the North American archaeologist I.Rouse for Venezuela and the Antilles with their own 'traditions', as applied in Brazil (see Funari, Ch. 10, this volume), thus providing a 'common denominator for discussing ceramic distributions' (Meggers & Evans 1978:548).

Meggers and Evans were also very active in developing training programmes and workshops, both in the United States and in various South American countries. In this way they not only created a close-knit group of South American collaborators but they also facilitated major research grants. After 1964, the Smithsonian created its own research fund which was widely used to support several programmes such as the Palaeo-Indian programme. Despite the fact that most of the leaders of the Latin American 'Social Archaeology School' belonged to the group closely associated with them, Evans and Meggers have recently been criticized as having created a kind of feud which was 'the product of a political battle for territorial control of the archaeology of the area' (Roosevelt 1991:105). This debate has recently become openly political, and comments are no longer concerned only with 'purely academic' matters (see Funari 1991; Roosevelt 1991; Meggers 1992a; Meggers 1992b).

In Ecuador, post-war archaeology was shaped by cooperative research undertaken by Estrada and the Meggers-Evans team. As opposed to Jijón y Caamaño, Estrada was a successful businessman from the coastal city of Guayaquil, who 'was more interested in world trade and international yachting than in the archives of the Indies' (Collier 1982:8). Not surprisingly, therefore, he and his North American colleagues postulated a Jomon (Japanese) origin for the Valdivia culture, arguing that it must have arrived on the Ecuadorian coast as a result of long-distance maritime journeys. Although he died young, Estrada's work—which made full use of the recently invented radiocarbon dating technique as well as stratigraphic and seriational methods—together with that of Meggers and Evans, stimulated Ecuadorian archaeology, especially on the coast.

During the 1950s another North American scholar, Donald Lathrap, commenced research on the banks of the Peruvian Amazon, and came into personal conflict with Meggers and Evans. Lathrap proposed the tropical forest as the origin of the Valdivia culture, and stressed the importance of the Amazonian lowlands for ancient Andean civilizations (Lathrap 1973; Lathrap 1975). Less influential than his opponents, Lathrap criticized them for neglecting palaeo-dietary and stratigraphic studies, but he, too, regarded 'diffusion, migration and invasion as the main processes of prehistoric cultural change. Their main interpretive difference lay in the direction and timing of such movements' (Roosevelt 1991:107). Lathrap concentrated his research in Ecuador and Peru and influenced the archaeologists of the region. As a result, in the early 1980s a group of his North American students, along with a few exiled Argentine anthropologists, began teaching in the newly created Escuela de Arqueología de la Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral (ESPOL) (Alvarez 1986). This institution was founded by the Ecuadorian archaeologist Jorge Marcos (1986),

who had previously obtained his doctorate in Urbana, Illinois, under Lathrap's direction.

In Venezuela, local archaeologist R.Requena, who had already published the first extensive report on the archaeology of the Lake Valencia area during the early 1930s, was instrumental in bringing three North American archaeologists to Venezuela during the war: W.Bennett, A.Kidder II and C.Osgood (Cruxent & Rouse 1958). Later, Osgood was joined by Howard, and together they carried out a wider systematic survey of the country, laying the foundations for a very distinctively American culture-historical reconstruction. Just after World War II, another North American archaeologist, Irving Rouse, visited the country and a few years later started excavating with J.Cruxent, who was not only a prominent scholar but occupied important positions in the Museo Nacional de Venezuela and in the Universidad Central in Caracas. In 1958, Cruxent and Rouse published a complete report of the archaeology of Venezuela: 'a detailed chronology for Venezuela, in order to provide a systematic basis for organizing and interpreting the archaeological material. This chronology consists of a series of areas and periods' (Cruxent & Rouse 1958:12). Their main disagreement with Steward (1949) was with his conclusion that there had been a single centre in the Andes from which people and cultural influence spread down into Venezuela, resulting in the rise of cultural achievement. Cruxent and Rouse (1958:2) concluded, instead, 'that people and cultural influence of very distinct origins and quite different ages have come into our area, as much from the south as from the east and west…' Their 1958 monograph, with its closely argued definitions of sets of units (eg., style, complex, series) to organize archaeological material, was a landmark in the archaeology of Venezuela, leaving its mark upon subsequent research in the country. This intensive research carried out by North Americans also paved the way for Venezuelan archaeologists to study for their postgraduate degrees in the United States (e.g., Wagner 1967, based on fieldwork in the Carache area in western Venezuela).

During the early 1950s North American input was also felt in Chile, where the Director of the Universidad Nacional de Chile had personally encouraged the US State Department to send Richard Schaedel there to set up a Department of Anthropology in the university. Schaedel arrived in 1953 and his organization of the department reflected North American academic structures in all disciplines, including archaeology. He also formed the first group of Chilean professional archaeologists and carried out fieldwork with them between Arica and La Serena in the north (Munizaga 1991). A few years later Schaedel and his Chilean associates published a report on the current state of Chilean archaeology (Schaedel 1957).

Meanwhile a somewhat different shift took place in Argentina. After a short period of military government, 'semi-democratic' elections brought an American-style regime to the country, led by A.Frondizi. Under this government the discipline of anthropology (covering both cultural anthropology and archaeology) was created and given official status in 1958 in the universities of

La Plata and Buenos Aires. Although the professors that headed these departments had different orientations, it was the Vienna School that was still the dominant force (see Politis 1992). In this new atmosphere, A.R.González began to teach at La Plata University, having returned from the United States a few years earlier with a doctorate from Columbia University. Already influenced by the ecological ideas of J.Steward, and by the cultural-historical North American approach, he was one of the first scholars to spread Childe's ideas in Argentina. He worked first in the Central Hills at the famous site of Intihuasi (González 1960), where he proposed the first hunter-gatherer sequence, and later in the Northwest (González 1963), and his work introduced alternative views to subsequent generations of graduates. The open intellectual atmosphere, and the North American orientation which the government promoted, also had an impact on the world of archaeology. New ideas appeared, research centres were created or expanded, and the discipline held out possibilities for a professional career. Social sciences were viewed as a tool of development, and the model to pursue was that of the United States.

Once again, Frondizi's government was brought to an end by an army coup in 1961, but after a short period elections were again held (the Peronista party was still banned). In spite of receiving a low percentage of the votes the Radical Party won the election. Illia became President, and his government adopted a type of social-democratic approach, through which the universities regained their autonomy and new posts again became available in all disciplines, including archaeology, which benefited greatly from the democratic, scientific and educational policies of this administration. Moreover, the President personally supported the International Congress of Americanists and made it a central focus in the celebrations marking 150 years of national independence. The continuing academic freedom gave rise to new ideas and approaches in the field of archaeology. Theoretically speaking, Buenos Aires University still followed the Vienna School, since Menghin and his closest students, such as M.Bórmida, were still teaching there, but other universities, such as La Plata, Rosario and Córdoba, were exploring neo-evolutionism, North American culture-history and culture-ecological research programmes. In these universities bibliographies frequently included books or papers by Gordon Childe, Julian Steward, Leslie White and Gordon Willey. Anglo-American influences were significant and investigations carried out in the Northwest (where the archaeology is closely related to that of the Central Andes) reflected these approaches, although the investigation of the hunter-gatherers of the pampas and Patagonia was still in the hands of Austro-German diffusionists.

During the 1960s links between Argentinian and Spanish archaeologists emerged, as a legacy from the influence of the Vienna School scholars on the archaeology of Spain during the previous decades. As a result, several Argentinian archaeologists (e.g., Pedro Krapovickas, Antonio Austral and Mario Cigliano), although not necessarily associated with the Vienna School, spent some time in Spain. At the same time, Spanish journals were keen to publish articles

and monographs by Argentinian—or by Argentina-based European—archaeologists (e.g., Bórmida 1969, Cigliano 1966). In spite of this, there was no Spanish theoretical or methodological influence on the Argentinian archaeological community.

Unfortunately, the Illia government was too good to last, and was abruptly ousted by a new military coup in 1966. The new dictators, prepared to perpetuate their control *ad infinitum,* drove the country towards a North American-dependent economy. A number of scholars emigrated, including a few anthropologists, while others were made to resign their positions. Most of these were assisted by the National Council of Investigation (CONICET), a national institution that retained a certain amount of autonomy because of the international prestige of its advisory board. During this period of military rule a distinct political and scientific division emerged between the two main universities, which were also the two main research centres. The University of Buenos Aires was still strongly dominated by followers of the Vienna School. Theoretical alternatives were not available and only a few French methodological procedures (such as François Bordes' lithic typology) were able to penetrate this monolithic framework. In La Plata, archaeology became more and more culture-historically and ecologically oriented. Meanwhile, North American research in the Andes of Peru and Bolivia was providing the train to which Argentine archaeologists could hitch their wagon.

THE 1970S, ARCHAEOLOGY AND MILITARISM

The 1970s brought an era of military governments in South America. Although some countries, such as Argentina, had previously had a tradition of anti-democratic assumptions of power, it was during this time that right-oriented upper-class sections of South American societies reacted against the spread of left-wing ideas in the continent. Unable to gain power through democratic elections, and threatened by increasing guerrilla activity, they allied themselves with the military in order to gain control. While the military provided the force needed to suppress popular resistance, the section of upper-class society behind the military provided the foundation for conservative politics. The only exception was Peru, whose military government had a completely different orientation, since the military coup of 1968 was aimed at establishing 'state socialism' and producing revolutionary changes in the country (e.g., agrarian reform). In other countries, such as Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, Ecuador, Brazil and Bolivia, authoritarianism and repression characterized the military governments, which became highly dependent on the United States and exercised various kinds of violence. Only Colombia and Venezuela were able to survive this decade with democratic governments and maintain an atmosphere of freedom.

The 1960s witnessed the emergence of a strong national archaeological tradition in Peru. Under Luis Lumbreras, director of the Museo Nacional, a programme of archaeology was developed at the Universidad de San Marcos,

under the direction of Ramiro Matos. At the same time, the Universidad de San Marcos received the support of North American functionalist and neo-evolutionist oriented archaeologists, in the form of on-the-job training (Schaedel & Shimada 1982).

In the late 1960s a nationalistic military government took office under General Velasco Alvarado, under whose policies some North American archaeologists encountered difficulties after completing their research projects (Burger 1989). This Peruvian situation caused an expansion of North American research in Ecuador. When Velasco Alvarado lost power and was replaced by General Morales Bermúdez, the participation of foreign scholars was again promoted and for the next eight years North American archaeological research had a high profile. During the years 1977–83 'an average of 23 projects were authorized annually by the INC [Instituto Nacional de Cultura]; over two thirds of these were directed or co-directed by foreign scholars' (Burger 1989:43). The great majority of these came from North America, selecting project locations and research objectives based purely on academic criteria. During this period an important Spanish project in the Chinchero area, near Cuzco, was also launched under the direction of J.Alcina Franch.

In Ecuador, the military government of President Velasco Ibarra , who had been in power since 1963, ended abruptly with another military coup. The new government was directed by a junta headed by Rodríguez Lara. During this period there was an increasingly large influx of North American scholars, who developed research programmes in the three main regions of the country: the coast, the highlands and the tropical rain forest. In the coastal region, research carried out by Lathrap, Marcos and others, concentrated on the emergence of social complexity, mainly through the study of the Valdivia tradition. In the highlands, archaeological studies of hunter-gatherers were initiated by M.A.Carluci (1960, 1961), an Argentinian from the Universidad Central de Quito, and later, R.Bell (1960) and W.Mayer-Oakes (1963) from the University of Oklahoma became deeply involved in the area. These investigations, which focused on early human occupations and lithic studies, lasted for almost three decades and involved the local archaeologist Ernesto Salazar, a former Ecuadorian student of François Franf çois Bordes, who was registered in the doctorate programme of the University of Oklahoma (Mayer-Oakes 1986).

During this period European researchers came to Ecuador, bringing a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches (e.g., H.Bischoff from Germany, W.Bray from the United Kingdom). In 1970, J.Alcina Franch and M.Rivera set up a long-term research project in Esmeralda, a project which had a 'carácter multinterpretativo—historicista y ecológico cultural' (Alcina Franch 1972:40). In 1976, a handbook of Ecuadorian archaeology, *Ecuador prehistórico,* was published by Pedro Porras (Porras 1984, 2nd edition), who followed the Meggers-Evans approach. Like several other South American archaeologists, Porras had spent a year in the Smithsonian receiving training in pottery seriation (Meggers 1992a).

In Argentina the political situation underwent dramatic and rapid changes. Faced by increasing guerrilla activity and general popular dissatisfaction, the regime was forced to hold free elections in 1972, which were won by the Peronista party. H.Campora, who became President, was supported by the Peronista guerrillas and the left wing of the party during his short period in office (Campora had to resign after a few tumultuous months to allow Perón to be elected President for the third time). During the brief Campora government, Marxism spread through the sciences, especially the humanities. In social anthropology 'dialectical materialism' was seen as the approach necessary to understand present and past societies. In the field of archaeology, the ideas of Gordon Childe were once again taken seriously, especially those represented by his *What Happened in History?* and *Social Evolution* (on the basis of which two books, American archaeologists accused Childe of being a typical evolutionist (Trigger 1989)). Angel Palerm's ideas about the 'Asiatic mode of production' in Meso-America (1973) were intensively discussed, although attempts to find parallel developments in South America failed. In spite of all this, no profound changes occurred in archaeology, and Marxism provided only a cosmetic cover for a few culture-historically oriented research projects. Vienna School followers lost status and support in the University of Buenos Aires and for a short time a few of them were persecuted (students tried to subject them to popular 'academic' trials in an attempt to get them expelled from the university). During this period the culture-historical approach, and Steward's ecological approach, constituted the main alternative paradigms.

In the early 1970s, 'Argentine socialism' and the recovery of 'national identity' emerged as primary goals in Argentina. During this period the Argentine government organized an archaeological exhibition in Cuba as part of an integration programme with that country. In 1974 the Third National Archaeological Congress took place, characterized by the active involvement of students not only in archaeology but also in potitical issues. A few left-oriented Latin American archaeologists, such as José L.Lorenzo from Mexico and Lautaro Nuñez from Chile, also participated in the meeting, adding an international flavour to the revolutionary atmosphere which surrounded the Congress. The period during which these political claims emerged was too short, however, to allow archaeology to catch up.

Perón took office for a third time in 1973, and his policies quickly moved to the right. He condemned the guerrillas, while fascist elements emerged in the Peronista ideology, threatening the social sciences and paving the way for subsequent persecution. When Perón died, a year later, he was succeeded by the Vice-President, Isabel (his third wife). Her administration was fundamentally weak and she was unable to cope with the violent confrontation between the two wings within the party. Moving further and further to the right, with the support of para-military forces, her government drove the country towards a very difficult political and economic situation, culminating in the 1976 coup. The regime that took over in 1976 proved to be more violent than any previous one,

and was responsible for thousands of killings and for the development of sophisticated methods of torture and repression. Left-oriented social scientists had to go into exile in order to avoid being caught and tortured or killed by the army. Among those who were forced to flee the country were several archaeologists (mainly the first generation of A.R.González' students), while several archaeology students became *'desaparecidos'*. At least five young archaeologists went to other South American countries, following the same path that their Chilean colleagues had taken a few years earlier. A.R.González himself was dismissed from the university (although he maintained his position in CONICET) and support in the form of grants was discontinued. Several departments of anthropology were closed, and those that survived changed their curricula. By this time research in the Northwest had only a low profile. The surviving archaeologists, who turned their backs on Austro-German diffusionism, were oriented towards culture history, although they also discussed early ecological-systemic approaches (especially those by Kent Flannery and David Clarke).

In 1970, a significant political event occurred in Chile. The Unidad Popular party, with Salvador Allende as President, won the election and ushered in a short period of socialist government. Anthropologists were able to engage in open Marxist debate, but this debate was unable to transform the theoretical structure of Chilean archaeology. In 1973 a violent military coup, led by General Augusto Pinochet, overthrew the government of Allende, killing the President and resulting in the exodus of a large number of people. Archaeologists with strong Marxist convictions, such as Julio Montané and Felipe Bate, were let into Mexico and never returned to live in Chile. It was during this period that a few North American archaeologists were able to work in the country, including some students of Schaedel and Murra. These young scholars helped to change the orientation of Chilean archaeology from culture-historical reconstruction to an ecological-systemic approach. At a meeting held in the early 1980s, Primeras Jornadas de Arqueología y Ciencia, most Chilean archaeologists viewed the so-called 'New Archaeology' as the most fruitful approach to an understanding of past societies and the formulation of laws about human behaviour (see the debate in Arqueología y Ciencia Primeras Jornadas 1983). For them, archaeology was basically a social science, and the goal to which they aspired was 'scientific archaeology'. During this period one of Chile's prestigious senior scholars, H.Niemeyer, complained that most Chilean archaeologists had been self-trained, and his opinion was that the way to improve the quality of archaeology in the country was to bring in foreign professors (Arqueología y Ciencia Primeras Jornadas 1983:18).

In Uruguay, the development of archaeology took a different route during the period of military rule in the 1970s. The country had been influenced by the Vienna School, albeit second-hand, through Menghin and followers of the Universidad de Buenos Aires, and this led Uruguayan archaeologists to define a local derivation of the Austro-German diffusionism approach known as the

'Escuela de Buenos Aires' (Cabrera Pérez & Curbello 1992). This Vienna School approach shaped the work of the pioneer archaeologist Antonio Taddei, who collaborated with Marcelo Bórmida, an Italian-Argentine disciple of Menghin. Both researchers explained the past of the country in terms of the influx of successive waves of populations, each coming from different cultural 'circles'. During the rule of its military government, Uruguay received a French scientific team, sponsored by Unesco, to carry out rescue archaeology in the area about to be flooded by the Salto Grande dam. This project prompted the creation of a programme of archaeology at the Universidad de la República (Montevideo), and many students were involved in intensive fieldwork organized by French archaeologists under the direction of the Brazilian (French-trained) Niède Guidon. The project also gave rise to some opportunities for young scholars to pursue postgraduate studies in France. More significantly, the nature of the project encouraged these young scholars to adopt a distinctive approach which still characterizes the current practice of archaeology in Uruguay today. This approach includes, among other things, a deep concern for the preservation of the national archaeological heritage. Currently, the main archaeological project in the country, carried out in the Department of Rocha, is sponsored by the 'Comisión de Patrimonio Histórico, Artístico y Cultural de la Nación' which, together with the Universidad de la República, employs the majority of archaeologists in the country.

CIVIL RULE AFTER THE MILITARY

During the 1980s South America witnessed the recovery of democracy and was able to celebrate rights lost in earlier decades: those of freedom and plurality. The military, unable to administer and control these countries, and faced by popular dissatisfaction and pressure, gave up. New democratic governments took office and, in the field of archaeology, new dialogues developed in which multiple voices could be heard.

In those countries which did not undergo a right-wing military coup, a set of ideas based on a deliberate Marxist orientation began to emerge during the 1970s, which later developed into a 'Latin American Social Archaeology School'. Several early Marxist papers had provided the basis for the development of this school, which recognized, in the works of Gordon Childe, the foundation for archaeology as a social science (Vargas & Sanoja n.d.). Among the early Marxist writings were those by Peruvian Emilio Choy, which deeply influenced young Peruvian archaeologists of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Tabio's and Rey's (1966) book on the prehistory of Cuba, and Chilean Marta Harnecker's theoretical essays on French structural Marxism, inspired the Latin American Marxists. During the early 1970s, books written by Peruvian Luis Lumbreras (1974), and Venezuelans Mario Sanoja and Iraida Vargas Arenas (1974), became the seminal papers of the school. In 1975, at the 'Reunión de Teotihuacán' in Mexico, the members of this school of Latin American Marxists

sought to establish a radical programme for archaeology (Lorenzo, Pérez Elías & García-Bárcena 1976; McGuire 1992).

There were several reasons why the main meetings, and most discussions of Latin American social archaeology, were held in Mexico. The country had a long tradition of taking in left-oriented, persecuted politicians, including Trotsky. It had also welcomed republican veterans from the Spanish Civil War, among whom were the anthropologists Pedro Armillas, Pedro Carrasco and Angel Palerm, who were eager to discuss the ideas of Childe, as well as general Marxist issues (Mirambell & Pérez Gollán 1989). Mexican governments were always ready to accept Marxism within the academic environment, and Mexican universities gave posts to exiled archaeologists from Chile and Argentina, after the military coups in those countries. Thus (and to a great extent thanks to the efforts of Childe's former student, José Lorenzo), José Pérez Gollán from Argentina, and Julio Montané and Felipe Bate from Chile, found, in the Instituto Nacional de Arqueología e Historia (INAH), a congenial environment in which to pursue their careers. Mexico then hosted a series of conferences, culminating in 1975 (and see above) with the 'Reunion de Teotihuacán' (Lorenzo, Pérez Elías & García-Bárcena 1976).

Peru also emerged as a centre of debate, after the 'Congreso del Hombre Andino' and the publication of the very influential writings of Luis Lumbreras, who strongly advocated the social practice of archaeology as a tool with which to fight for indigenous and oppressed peoples' rights. At this time the research objectives of the early Latin American social archaeologists were focused on two main goals: the conceptual discussion of historical materialism applied to archaeology, and the interpretation of archaeological data in the light of historical materialism (Vargas & Sanoja n.d.).

By the end of the 1970s a certain amount of unease began to surface as a result of the lack of resolution in the wider debate of Marxist theory, and some archaeologists, such as José Lorenzo and Angel Palerm, grew weary of the rhetoric (McGuire 1992). On the other hand, a group of Latin American social archaeologists, including Luis Lumbreras, Manuel Gándara, Mario Sanoja, Marcio Veloz Maggiolo, Iraida Vargas and Felipe Bate, formed the 'Grupo Oaxtepec'. Dissatisfied with Marxist debate of the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., Sanoja & Vargas 1978; Bate 1978; McGuire 1992), they claimed to be committed to the analysis of the historical process in order to explain the history of the peoples of Latin America (Veloz Maggiolo 1984). Their theoretical framework was historical materialism, while their methods were derived from dialectical materialism (Bate 1977). The Oaxtepec group 'strongly rejected French structural Marxism, especially its ideas that modes of production can exist as separate entities that come into articulation' (McGuire 1992:67). The group attempted to reformulate historical categories and to develop the existing theoretical potential of others, such as 'mode of life' and 'mode of work' (Vargas & Sanoja n.d.). They also proposed the use of concepts such as 'mode of production' and 'socio-economic formation', because they felt that categories derived from traditional

ethnology were not viable or adequate for the understanding of pre-class societies (Veloz Maggiolo 1984; Sanoja & Vargas Arenas 1992).

Perhaps surprisingly, this school has accepted 'Ford's Method' for pottery seriation not only as a way to order chronological sequences, but also as a source of clear dialectical data (Veloz Maggiolo 1984). 'Ford's Method' is thus claimed to be 'the most efficient method to enable clear inferences to be made about cultural patterns in tropical archaeology' (Veloz Maggiolo 1984:11). In this sense, paradoxically, the strong influence of Meggers and Evans remains evident.

Although the Latin American social archaeologists were well known outside Latin America (especially in the United Kingdom and Spain, and through the widely distributed *Boletín de Antropología Americana*), inside their own countries, and in the region as a whole, their ideas were not as influential as they might have appeared. In Venezuela and Peru, far from being a dominant paradigm, this school competes with culture-historical and adaptationist-orientated research programmes. In Argentina and Chile (where the military governments would have made any Marxist approach very difficult), other approaches are explored, especially by those involved in the archaeology of hunter-gatherers. There, for those who wish to break away from the Vienna School influence, or to move away from culture history, the only viable option was seen to be a neo-positivist, ecologic-systemic approach (without any claim for a dialectical relationship between the present and the past).

Although Colombia was not ruled by a military dictatorship, the political life of the country was far from quiet. In fact, in the last decade, as a result of continuing social tension and the confrontation between the guerrillas and the military forces, high levels of public violence have been the order of the day. In spite of this, there have been no dramatic political changes in the country. During the 1960s four Departments of Anthropology were created, two in Bogota, one in Medellín and one in Popayán, producing an increased number of professional local archaeologists. In 1971 the Fundación de Investigaciones Arqueológicas Nacionales (FIAN) of the Banco de la República was created (Gnecco n.d.), which became the main institution for sponsoring and disseminating archaeological research in Colombia. The new generation of young archaeologists still maintained some of the traditions originally nurtured by Rivet and Reichel-Dolmatoff, but in the last decade an ecologic-systemic approach has become more popular. Moreover, since doctorate programmes are not available in local universities, several graduate students have obtained post-graduate degrees in the United States. During the 1970s and 1980s several North American teams, in particular from the University of Pittsburgh, were admitted to the country to develop long-term research projects with local archaeologists, mainly from the Universidad de los Andes. Another foreign influence, firmly based in a culture-historical and ecological framework, stems from the British archaeologist, Warwick Bray, who, with local collaborators, has been carrying

out intensive research in the country in recent decades (Bray & Moseley 1976; Bray, Herrera & Schrimpff 1981; Bray, Herrera & Schrimpff 1983).

In Argentina, at the very end of 1983, the Radical Party won the national elections and Raúl Alfonsín became President. His administration, which could be characterized as a kind of social democracy, introduced a climate of academic freedom. Universities again became autonomous, curricula were radically changed (by the up-dating of themes, theory and methodology), directors in research institutes were replaced and, in general, plurality of ideas and alternative views were promoted. CONICET opened up a large number of new posts for young scholars, and brought back the archaeologists exiled in 1976. The Alfonsín government concentrated its cultural policies on developing the social sciences and on the democratization of knowledge. As a consequence, three new departments of archaeology were created in medium-sized universities, while three more were re-opened in other universities. New positions were made available and a large amount of funds was allocated to the consolidation of studies in the country.

The archaeology of Argentina during the mid-1980s was characterized by an expansion of investigations concerning pre-Hispanic hunter-gatherers in most regions of the country. Most of this research was carried out using an eclectic ecologic-systemic approach, basically because the so-called 'New Archaeology' was the more familiar school since it had been developed locally over the previous years. During this period, publications by Schiffer (1976), Binford (1977, 1978, 1981), Kirch (1980) and other North American processual archaeologists provided the theoretical foundations for changing research strategies and they stimulated much debate. The 'New Archaeology' also provided methodological tools for carrying out regional research and placing it on the agenda of international discussion. With the return of the exiled archaeologists interest in the Northwest, and in the archaeology of complex societies, was reinforced. These archaeologists began a long-term project in Catamarca, Tucumán and Jujuy, but free from strong theoretical influence from the North American ecological-systemic approach of the 1980s. Although some of them had been earlier involved in the Latin American 'Social Archaeology School', this approach is currently absent from their scientific orientation. Some concepts deriving from the Vienna School are still present in archaeological discussions about the pampas and Patagonia but this approach has lost part of its scientific and political influence. Instead, Argentine archaeology of the 1980s and 1990s is characterized by active and fruitful discussion between adherents of alternative viewpoints.

CONCLUSIONS

Although archaeology in Spanish South America has been characterized by a rather heterogeneous development, some similarities can be identified. First, in spite of the Spanish colonization of the continent and the existing Spanish

tradition there has been little if any Spanish impact on the development of archaeology and on the present theoretical structure of the discipline in South America. Spanish archaeologists have visited the continent and some have undertaken research (e.g., J.Pérez de Barrada in Colombia, J.Cruxent in Venezuela, S.Canals Frau in Argentina , J.Alcina Franch in Ecuador and Peru), or have written large textbooks (Alcina Franch 1965), but they have left no distinctive traces in South American archaeology. There is no Spanish footprint that can be recognized in the archaeology of the region. Despite the occasional Spanish fellowships for South American scholars, and despite receiving visiting professors from South America, this exchange has been neither systematic nor frequent. Even though some Argentine and Peruvian archaeologists have occasionally published in Spanish journals (e.g., *Ampurias, Trabajos de prehistoria, Revista de antropología americana*), the Spanish-South American dialogue can only be characterized as circumstantial and intermittent.

The reasons for the absence of theoretical and methodological Spanish influence in South America seems to be twofold. First, there has been no strong conceptual innovation or discussion originating from Spain; in this sense the Spaniards were consumers rather than producers. As stated by Alcina Franch (Alcina Franch 1975), archaeology in Spain between 1940 and 1970 was characterized by a lack of theoretical orientation and coherent research programmes as well as by unswerving adherence to historicist interpretation (see Vásquez Varela & Risch 1991). Furthermore, while the Franco regime (1939–75) held sway, Spain was virtually isolated from the debating of foreign theories, especially those of a Marxist orientation. During this time the culture-historical perspective was dominant and the main influences came from German archaeology, while Spanish archaeology continued to follow pre-war theoretical approaches (Díaz-Andreu 1993). Only in the last decade, as a consequence of the social and political changes in Spain, has it been possible to identify thoughtful debate in a contemporary context in that country (Vázquez Varela & Risch 1991). This debate involves not only processualist ideas, but also a variety of approaches such as ‘critical theory’, structuralism and Marxism. This set of stimulating ideas is only now beginning to surface in debates in South America.

Second, when archaeology became a scientific discipline in the continent, South America was no longer under Spanish political and economic control. Some aspects of twentieth-century Spanish intellectual life, such as literature and philosophy, certainly influenced South American societies but the impact of this was generally confined to the arts and humanities, and did not make itself felt within the social sciences.

It is probable that indirect Spanish influence came to the fore in Mexico and later affected the work of some Andean archaeologists. It was in Mexico that the few long-term Spanish projects in South America were concentrated, which promoted a certain amount of exchange between Mexican and Spanish archaeologists. Mexico had also taken in several Spanish Civil War veterans who left a mark on the anthropology and archaeology of the country (Mirambell &

Pérez Gollán 1989) by promoting two main trends. First, they set in motion discussion of Marxist ideas. Second, they helped spread Childe's ideas during a period of strong North American influence by discussing them and confirming their relevance in the context of South America. The papers written by Armillas and Lorenzo debating Childe's concept of a 'Neolithic Revolution', and its application to American sites, were widely discussed by Andean archaeologists. Although the path is difficult to trace clearly, the dialogue of the Spanish Republicans helped to give a social dimension to the local archaeology of Spanish South America and, along with other contributions (such as the Marxist orientation and the earlier *indigenista* movement), paved the way for the later development of the Latin American Social Archaeology School.

In the last decade attempts have been made by Spain to restore economic and intellectual links with its former colonies in the continent. Nowadays there is considerable Spanish investment, especially in the purchase of South American state companies which are in the process of being privatized. Along with this attempt a few collaborative projects have been inaugurated in the past decade, so as to take advantage of the large amount of money allocated by the Spanish government to celebrate the fifth centennial of the discovery of America. However, these projects have been very localized and the Spanish presence is noticeable only where fieldwork is being carried out. They have not yet influenced the conceptual framework of South American archaeology, nor have they promoted any new debate.

A second conclusion is that South American countries initially received some evolutionist ideas from Europe but later, as a result of the impact of theories deriving mainly from North America and secondly from the United Kingdom, Germany and Austria, fell into line with the world trend towards a more diffusionist and historical perspective. This reflects South America's position on the international stage under the political and economic dominance of the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States at the end of the last century. At the beginning of the century the United States strengthened its position in the continent and played a hegemonic role after World War II. This is reflected to some extent by the easy and sometimes uncritical adoption of theories and methods from the central powers during this time. It is also important to note that some of the most influential local archaeologists in the region, from J.Tello to A.R.González, received some of their training in the United States, which resulted in rapid diffusion of North American ideas into South America. Even the Latin American 'Social Archaeologists' were caught up in this trend and maintained ongoing affiliations with North American institutions. It is important also to note the continuing funding that has been allocated by North American agencies to support archaeological research in South America. Typical examples of this are the National Science Foundation, the National Geographic Magazine, the Guggenheim Foundation, the Wenner-Gren Foundation and the Fulbright Commission, which sponsor projects located in South America and support the training of local archaeologists in the United States. Although most of the

research funding is given to North Americans, some money also reaches South American scholars who adapt to North American standards. No other country in the world has provided and maintained such fundamental economic support since World War II.

Associated with such North American control in the region during the 1970s and 1980s there emerged an ecological-systemic approach in South America. In some countries such as Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay, US domination led to dependence on the military government. It was during this period that large foreign debts were accumulated, and the servicing of these debts has, and will, compromise future generations. Of course, the principal lending institutions are North American.

The 1970s and 1980s was a time of broad expansion of theoretical and methodological discussion in both the United States and the United Kingdom, although British debate was less influential for three main reasons. First, the discussion involved only a few British processual archaeologists (e.g., D.Clarke (1968, 1972), C.Renfrew (1982)) and was less intense in the United Kingdom during the 1970s. Second, British case studies and examples were generally not applicable in the South American context, while North American ones were more closely relevant. Third, the United Kingdom exercised little political and economic influence in South America at this time. Therefore, British intellectual achievements were less widely known in the region.

Those countries, such as Mexico, Peru, and to some extent Colombia, which did not suffer right-wing military coups and whose indigenous peoples' traditions were somewhat stronger, were less keen on the new ecological-systemic approach. Paradoxically, Mexico and Peru are two countries where North America has concentrated more research and resources and, as a consequence, the archaeology of both areas is better known than that of other parts of South America. In these two countries, archaeology is used as a means to dignify the pre-Columbian past and to promote nationality based on the pasts of the indigenous people. In both countries Childe's ideas provided the background for the development of Latin American 'Social Archaeology'.

There were also French influences on the development of archaeology in Spanish South America, though these are difficult to trace. During recent decades such theoretical approaches continued separately from Anglo-American trends, a situation which Audouze & Leroi-Gourhan (1981) called 'continental insularity'. During, and following, World War II French influences were brought to bear on Colombian archaeology both in the form of Rivet's diffusionism and Mauss's sociological approach. More recently, French influences have been apparent at three levels: technical, analytical and theoretical. At the technical level, French archaeologists introduced sophisticated and rigorous excavation techniques into the region, especially in the Andes (see, for example, Lavallée, Julien, Wheeler & Karlin (1985)), and in Colombia and Uruguay. At the level of analysis, François Bordes' (1950, 1961) widely followed typology of the European Palaeolithic was very influential among archaeologists working in

lithic studies. The Bordes also trained some South American students in Bordeaux. At the level of theory, French influences have been far more diffuse, deriving basically from the structuralist and semiotic interpretations put forward by Leroi-Gourhan (1965). In spite of the fact that France has had very little economic or political influence in South America during this century, the intellectual and political elites have constantly admired the French intellectual style. It is this tradition that has been mainly responsible for the diffusion of French views among South American archaeologists.

North American involvement, and to a lesser extent that of West European countries, can be seen from two contrasting perspectives. One is that the presence of North American researchers in South America has been an example of cultural imperialism, in which South America has served as a laboratory for the testing of ideas and methodologies, or as an appropriate venue for the training of North American students. Likewise, such involvement can be seen as an example of cultural imperialism by which American appropriation and manipulation of knowledge of the past has ignored the peoples' own traditional perceptions. The other perspective is a neutral one in which North American research is seen as the consequence of scientific interest, free of any political motive. From this perspective, North American involvement has had a positive connotation, permitting expanded knowledge of the archaeology of the region.

This issue has been raised by Ponce Sanguinés (1978), Lorenzo (1981), Trigger (1984), Bray & Glover (1987), Lowenthal (1990) and others, but debate still has a low profile and is not seen to be of central contemporary archaeological concern. However, if one agrees with Lowenthal that:

> In discovering, correcting, elaborating, inventing and celebrating their stories, competing groups struggle to validate present goals by appealing to continuity with, or inheritance from, ancestral and other precursors…In this search archaeologists form part of the cadre of historians, social scientists, and other scholars increasingly pressed to defend or resist claims to this or that interpretation of the past.
>
> (Lowenthal 1990:302)

then it becomes clear that the histories about the past of South America have political implications. In this case, they are coloured by a North American and European perspective and were designed, consciously or not, to satisfy the needs of western scholarships. Certainly, the agenda has not been set in South America. Research topics, objectives and methodologies have basically been produced in the United States and secondly in Europe. From there, they have been introduced into South America, and viewed as parameters for the scientific validation of local research. Standards regarding what is right or wrong, out of date or fashionable, methodologically correct or incorrect, are established outside South America.

European post-processual approaches (e.g., Kristiansen 1984a, Kristiansen 1984b; Hodder 1986; Shanks & Tilley 1987a; Shanks & Tilley 1987b,) are only just beginning to have any influence, due to their European origins outside the orbit of strong socio-political and intellectual influence from the United Kingdom or Scandinavia, and because the anti-positivist reaction to other archaeological approaches has already been exploited by the Latin American Marxists. Nevertheless, in Latin America there is now some interest regarding the use of the past by the dominant social classes, as well as questions about the way that archaeological knowledge is built up, and how subjectivity (derived from both personal and political sources) affects ways of interpreting the past. Debate is beginning to focus on the relationship between the development of regional archaeological traditions and the political and social contexts in each of the countries concerned.

Archaeology in Spanish South America has changed over the last hundred years, not only as a result of the transformation of the position of the continent within the world political arena, but also as a result of changes in the nature of the academic power structure. Härke (1995:48) makes a very telling point: 'The young German scholar makes his reputation by following in the steps of his academic teacher, in marked contrast to the British system where the young scholar would attempt to make his reputation by demolishing his teachers.'

The South American situation is somewhere in between. A young South American archaeologist who criticizes the teacher very early on will be seen as ungrateful and eager to make a career based on the demolition of contributions by older colleagues. In such an event, the 'old boy network' would probably succeed in meting out punishment. Yet, if the teacher's ideas are followed too closely, the accusation will be of being too conservative and out of date, and the academic community will not be supportive. Thus, it can be seen that change in theory and methodology in South American archaeology is based on the adoption or development of a new conceptual framework in a gradual way and, preferably, not too early in an archaeologist's career.

So far in the history of South America there has been no such thing as a school of 'indigenous archaeology', if that implies a way of thinking and practising archaeology which has not been been derived from western archaeology. Most South American archaeologists continue to practise culture-historical reconstruction, elaborating empirical generalizations in their countries, or trying to apply neo-evolutionary and adaptative concepts, with a high degree of eclecticism, to their own specific research problems. South American archaeologists are also still trying to fill gaps of information, by constructing cultural sequences for large areas where archaeology only began very recently. South American archaeology has often been forced to pursue its research in unstable political situations, and very often against a background of an unpredictable academic situation. In such a context, the production of theory is usually seen as a 'foreign country', while daily practice is a means to survive and, at least, to keep some dreams alive.

NOTES

1 This chapter cannot attempt to cover all the countries of Spanish South America in the same amount of detail. My choice of examples to be discussed is arbitrary, based on the extent of my personal knowledge and the information I could access; this is the reason for the extended treatment given to Argentina, Colombia and Peru. I have also tried to discuss some events relevant to countries such as Venezuela and Chile, which are not treated in depth in this chapter. The main objective has been to single out some of the common elements in the development of archaeology in Spanish South America and to explain the traditions peculiar to some countries of the region.

2 He based his conceptual framework on the systematic organization given to the *Kulturhistorische Methode* by Graebner (1911) and on the set of papers written by the same author along with W.Schmidt and W.Foy in the journal *Anthropos* from Vienna and *Ethnologica* from Cologne. He also recognized the work of F.Ratzel and L.Frobenius as the predecessors of the Vienna School. In his theoretical approach, Imbelloni developed the idea of 'culture' as an abstract entity approached through ethnology, and discussed how to define 'cultures' after the examination of their 'sensitive products, that is to say, the mass of goods' (Imbelloni 1936:33).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author, who takes full responsibility for what is written in this chapter, thanks José A.Perez Gollán and Peter Ucko for their useful comments and suggestions; also Gilbert Marshall for his help in translating.

An early version of this chapter was written at the Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, while the author was Visiting Professor thanks to a grant given by the British Council and Fundación Antorchas (Argentina). I thank both institutions as well as the University, for their generous support of my research.

REFERENCES

Alcina Franch, J. 1965. *Manual de arqueología americana.* Madrid: Aguilar.

Alcina Franch.J. 1972. La antropología americanista en España: 1950–1970. *Revista española de antropología americana (Trabajos y conferencias)* 7, 2–53.

Alcina Franch, J. 1975. La arqueología antropológica en España: situación actual y perspectivas. In *Primera reunión de antropólogos españoles—Sevilla 1973,* 47–62. Sevilla.

Alvarez, S. 1986. Presentación. In *Guía histórico informativa, Centro de Estudios Arqueológicos y Antropológicos de la ESPOL* (no editor), 3–8. Guayaquil: EQ Editorial.

Ambrosetti, J. 1897. La Antigûa ciudad de Quilmes (Valle Calchaqu). *Boletín Instituto Geografía Argentino* 17, 33–70.

Ambrosetti, J. 1902. El sepulcro de 'La Paya' ultimamente descubierto en los Valles Calchaquíes (Provincia de Salta). *Arqueología argentina* 1, 119–48.

Ambrosetti, J. 1906. *Exploraciones arqueológicas en la Pampa Grande (Provincia de Salta).* Buenos Aires: Publicaciones Sección Antropología de la Facultad de Filosofia y Letras.

Ameghino, F. 1880. *La antigüedad del hombre en el Plata.* Paris & Buenos Aires: G.Masson.

Arenas, P. & E.Baffi 1991–2. José Imbelloni: una lectura crítica. *Runa* 20, 167–76.

Arnold, B. 1990. The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64, 464–78.

Audouze, F. & A.Leroi-Gourhan 1981. France: a continental insularity. *World Archaeology* 13, 170–89.

Bate, L.F. 1977. *Arqueología y materialismo histórico.* Mexico: Ediciones de Cultura Popular.

Bate, L.F. 1978. *Sociedad, formación económico social y cultura.* Mexico: Ediciones de Cultura Popular.

Bell, R. 1960. Evidence of a fluted point tradition in Ecuador. *American Antiquity* 26, 102–6.

Bennett, W. 1945. Interpretations of Andean Archaeology. *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2, 95–9.

Bennett, W., E.Bleiler & F.Sommer 1948. *North West Argentine Archaeology.* New Haven: Yale University Publications in Anthropology.

Binford, L. (ed.) 1977. *For Theory Building in Archaeology: essays in archaeology.* New York: Academic Press.

Binford, L. 1978. *Nunamiut Ethnoarchaeology.* New York: Academic Press.

Binford, L. 1981. *Bones, Ancient Men and Modern Myths.* New York: Academic Press.

Bird, J. 1938. Antiquity and migrations of the early inhabitants of Patagonia. *Geographical Review* 28, 250–75.

Bird, J. 1943. Excavations in northern Chile. *Anthropological Papers, American Museum of Natural History* 38, 171–318.

Bird, J. 1946. The archaeology of Patagonia. *The Handbook of South American Indians* 1, 17–24.

Bollaert, W. 1860. *Antiquarian, Ethnological, and Other Researches in New Granada, Equador, Peru and Chile.* London: Trübner & Co.

Boman, E. 1908. *Antiquités de la region andine de la république Argentine et du désert d'Atacama.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Bordes, F. 1950. Principes d'une méthode d'étude des techniques de débitage et de la typologie du Paléolithique ancien et moyen. *L'Anthropologie* 54, 19–34.

Bordes, F. 1961. *Typologie du Paléolithique ancien et moyen.* Bordeaux: Institut de Préhistoire de l'Université de Bordeaux.

Bórmida, M. 1969. El Puntarrubiense. *Trabajos de prehistoria* 26, 1–116.

Bray, W. & I.Glover 1987. Scientific investigation or cultural imperialism: British archaeology in the Third World. *Institute of Archaeology Golden Jubilee Bulletin* 24, 109–25.

Bray, W.L.Herrera & M.Schrimpff 1981. (No title). *Procalima* 2, 1–22.

Bray, W., L.Herrera & M.Schrimpff 1983. Report on the 1981 field season in Calima. *Procalima* 3, 2–30.

Bray, W. & E.Moseley 1976. Una secuencia arqueológica en las vecindades de Buga, Colombia. *Cespedecia* 5, 55–78.

Burger, R.L. 1989. An Overview of Peruvian Archaeology (1976–1986). *Annual Review of Anthopology* 18, 37–69.

Cabrera Perez, L. 1988. Arqueología de rescate en el este Uruguayo. Departmento de Rocha. Unpublished paper delivered to the Universidad Nacional de la Plata.

Cabrera Pérez, L. & M.Curbello 1992. Patrimonio y arqueología en el Uruguay: Hacia el reconocimiento de un pasado olvidado. In *Arqueología en America Latina hoy,* G.Politis (ed.), 45–56. Bogota: Banco Popular.

Carluci, M.A. 1960. El Paleoindio en el Ecuador, I Industria de la piedra tallada. *Publicaciones del Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia,* Seccion Antropología 3–41.

Carluci, M.A. 1961. La obsidiana y su importancia en la industria lítica del Paleoindio ecuatoriano. *Boletín de informaciones científicas* 11, 19–36.

Chaves Chamorro, M. 1986. *Trayectoria de la antropología colombiana.* Bogota: Guadalupe.

Cigliano, E. 1966. La cerámica temprana en America del Sur. El yacimiento de Palo Blanco. *Ampurias* 28, 163–70.

Clarke, D.L. 1968. *Analytical Archaeology.* London: Methuen.

Clarke, D.L. (ed.) 1972. Models and paradigms in contemporary archaeology. In *Models in Archaeology,* Clarke, D.L. (ed.), 1–60. London: Methuen.

Collier, D. 1982. One hundred years of Ecuadorian archaeology. *Primer simposio de correlaciones antropológicas Andino-Mesoamericano,* Marcos, J. & P.Norton (eds), 5–33. Guayaquil: Escuela Politécnica del Litoral.

Cruxent, J.M. & I.Rouse 1958. An archeological chronology of Venezuela. *Social Science Monographs* 1, 2–39.

Dagget, R. 1992. Tello the press and Peruvian archaeology. In *Rediscovering our Past: essays on the history of American archaeology,* J.E.Reyman (ed.), 191–202. Hampshire: Avebury.

Debenedetti, S. 1912. Influencias de la cultura Tiahuanaco en la region del noroeste argentino. *Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires* 17, 326–52.

Díaz-Andreu, M. 1993. Theory and ideology in archaeology: Spanish archaeology under the Franco regime. *Antiquity* 67, 74–82.

Durán, E. 1977. Biografía de la Dra. Grete Mostny G. *Actas del Congreso de Arqueología de Chile* 1, 8–15.

Figueira, J.H. 1892. Los primitivos habitantes del Uruguay. In *Uruguay en la Exposición Histórico-Americana de Madrid, Memoria,* 121–221. Montevideo.

Ford, J. 1962. *A Quantitative Method for Deriving Cultural Chronology.* Washington: Pan American Technical Manual.

Funari, P. 1991. Archaeology in Brazil: politics and scholarship at a crossroads. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 5, 122–32.

Funari, P.P.A. 1995. Mixed features of archaeological theory in Brazil. In *Theory in Archaeology,* Ucko, P.J. (ed.), 236–50. London: Routledge.

Gnecco, C. n.d. A critical appraisal of Colombian archaeology. Unpublished manuscript.

González, A.R. 1960. La estratigrafía de la gruta de Intihuasi (Pcia. de San Luis) y sus relaciones con otros sitios precerámicos de Suramérica. *Revista del Instituto de Antropología. Universidad Nacional de Córdoba* 1, 1–302.

González, A.R. 1963. Cultural development in northwestern Argentina. In *Aboriginal Cultural Development in Latin America: an interpretative review,* Meggers, B.J. & C.Evans (eds), 103–18. Washington: Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collection.

González, A.R. 1985. Cincuenta años de arqueología del noroeste Argentino (1930–80): apuntes de un casi testigo y algo de protagonista. *American Antiquity* 50, 505–17.

González, A.R. 1991–1992. A cuatro décadas del comienzo de una etapa: apuntes marginales para la historia de la antropología Argentina. *Runa* 20, 91–110.

Graebner, F. 1911. *Methode der Ethnologie.* Heidelberg: Winter's Universitatsbuchhandlung.

Halperin Donghi T. 1972. *Historia contemporánea de America Latina.* Madrid: Alianza.

Härke, H. 1991. All quiet on the western front? Paradigms, methods and approaches in West German archaeology. In *Archaeological Theory in Europe: the last 3 decades,* I.Hodder (ed.), 187–222. London: Routledge.

Härke, H. 1995. 'The Hun is a methodical chap': reflections on the German tradition of pre- and proto-history. In *Theory in Archaeology,* Ucko, P.J. (ed.), 46–60. London: Routledge.

Hodder, I. 1986. *Reading the Past.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Humboldt, A.von 1814. *Researches concerning the Institutions and Monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America,* translated by H.M.Williams. London: Longmans.

Imbelloni, J. 1924–5. Estudios de morfología exacta. Parte III. Deformaciones intencionales del cráneo en Sudamérica. Polígonos craneanos aberrantes. *Revista del Museo de La Plata* 28, 329–407.

Imbelloni, J. 1933. Los pueblos deformadores de los Andes. La deformación intencional de la cabeza como arte y como elemento diagnóstico de las culturas. *Anales del Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales Bernardino Rivadavia* 37, 209–54.

Imbelloni, J. 1936. *Epítome de culturología.* Buenos Aires: Humanior.

Izumi, S. & K.Terada 1966. *Andes 3: Excavations at Pechiche and Garbanzal, Tumbes Valley, Perú.* Tokyo: Kadokawa.

Izumi, S. & K.Terada 1972. *Andes 4: Excavations at Kotosh, Perú, 1963 and 1966.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo.

Jijón y Caamaño, J. 1951. *Antropología Prehispánica del Ecuador: resumen 1945.* Quito: Prensa Católica.

Kirch, P. 1980. The archaeological study of adaptation: theoretical and methodological issues. In *Advances in Archaeological Methods and Theory 3,* M.Schiffer (ed.), 101–56. New York: Academic Press.

Kristiansen, K. 1984a. Danish archaeology in the 1980s. *Journal of Danish Archaeology* 3:205–13.

Kristiansen, K. 1984b. Ideology and material culture: an archaeological perspective. In *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology,* M.Spriggs (ed.), 72–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kroeber, A. 1927. Coast and highland in prehistoric Peru. *American Anthropologist* 29, 625–53.

Kroeber, A. 1944. *Peruvian Archaeology in 1942.* Chicago: Viking Fund Publication in Anthropology.

Lafón, C. 1958–9. Salvador Canals Frau. Biografía. *Runa* 9, 405–13.

Larco Hoyle, R. 1938–9. *Los Mochicas,* vols 1 & 2. Lima: Casa Editora 'La Crónica'.

Larco Hoyle, R. 1946. A culture sequence for the North Coast of Perú. In *The Handbook of South American Indians,* vol. 2, Steward, J. (ed.), 149–82. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology.

Latcham, R. 1928. *La prehistoria chilena.* Santiago: Comisión Oficial Organizadora de la Concurrencia de Chile.

Lathrap, D. 1973. Summary or model building: How does one achieve a meaningful overview of a continent's prehistory? Review of Gordon Willey's 'An Introduction to American Archaeology, vol. 2 South America'. *American Anthropologist* 74, 1755–67.

Lathrap, D. 1975. *Ancient Ecuador: culture, day and creativity, 3000–300 BC.* Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.

Lavallée, D., M.Julien, J.Wheeler & C.Karlin 1985. *Telarmachay, chasseurs et pasteurs préhistoriques des Andes.* Paris: Editions ADPF.

Leroi-Gourhan, A. 1965. *Le geste et la parole II. La mémoire et les rythmes.* Paris: Albin Michel.

Liberani, I. & R.Hernández 1877. *Excursión arqueológica en los valles de Santa María, Catamarca, 1877* (2nd edition). Tucumán: Universidad de Tucumán.

Lorenzo, J.L. 1981. Archaeology south of the Rio Grande. *World Archaeology* 13, 190–208.

Lorenzo, J., A.Pérez Elías & J.García-Bárcena 1976. *Hacia una arqueología social: Reunión de Teotihuacan.* Mexico, INAH.

Lowenthal, D. 1990. Conclusion: archaeologists and others. In *The Politics of the Past,* Gathercole, P. & D.Lowenthal (eds), 302–14. London: Routledge.

Lumbreras, L.G. 1974. *La arqueología como ciencia social.* Lima: Hista.

Marcos, J. 1986. La investigación y enseñanza de la arqueología en el Ecuador. In *Guía histórico informativa Centro de Estudios Arqueologícos y Antropológicos de la ESPOL* (No editor), 41–48. Guayaquil: EQ Editorial.

Mayer-Oakes, W. 1963. Early man in the Andes. *Scientific American* 208, 117–128.

Mayer-Oakes, W. 1986. El Inga. A Paleo-indian site In the Sierra of Northern Ecuador. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 76, 1–235.

McGuire, R.H. 1992. *A Marxist Archaeology.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Medina, J.T. 1882. *Los aborígenes de Chile.* Santiago: Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico J.T.Medina.

Meggers, B.J. 1992a. Cuarenta años de colaboración. In *Prehistoria sudamericana: nuevas perspectivas,* B.Meggers (ed.), 13–26. Santiago de Chile: Taraxacum.

Meggers, B.J. 1992b. Amazonia: Real or counterfeit paradise?. *Review of Archaeology* 13, 25–40.

Meggers, B.J. & C.Evans 1969. *Como interpretar el lenguaje de los tiestos: Manual para arqueólogos.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Meggers, B.J. & C.Evans 1978. El uso de secuencias cerámicas seriedas para inferir conducta social. *Primeras Jornadas de Arqueología del Caribe* 1, 11–32.

Mirambell, L. & J.Pérez Gollán 1989. Semblanza de José Luis Lorenzo. In *Homenaje a José Luis Lorenzo,* L.Mirambell (ed.), 7–40. Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia.

Mostny, G. 1954. *Culturas precolombinas de Chile.* Santiago: Editorial del Pacífico.

Mostny, G. 1971. *Prehistoria de Chile.* Santiago: Editorial Universitaria.

Munizaga, C. 1991. Discurso pronunciado en homenaje a don Richard Schaedel. *Actas del XI Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Chilena* 1, 11–13.

Nordenskiöld, E.B. von 1913. Urengraber und Mounds im Bolivianischen Flachlande. *Baessler Archives* 3, 205–55.

Orellana, M. 1974–1975. Friedrich Max Uhle y la prehistoria de Chile. *Boletín de prehistoria de Chile* 6/7, 7–29.

Outes, F. 1908. Arqueología de San Blas (Provincia de Buenos Aires). *Anales del Museo Nacional de Buenos Aires* 9, 249–75.

Outes, F. 1909. Sobre una facies de los instrumentos neolíticos bonaerenses. *Revísta del Museo de La Plata* 16, 219–39.

Outes, F. 1916. Las placas grabadas de Patagonia, examen crítico del material conocido y descripción de nuevos ejemplares. *Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires* 32, 611–24.

Patterson, T.C. 1989. Political economy and a discourse called 'Peruvian Archaeology'. *Culture and History* 4, 35–64.

Palerm, A. 1973. *Obras Hidraulicas Prehispanicas en el Sistema Lacustre del Valle de Mexico.* Mexico; Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia.

Podgorny, I. & G.Politis 1989. Qué sucedió en la historia? Los esqueletos araucanos del Museo de La Plata y la Conquista del Desierto. Pre-circulated Papers, *Archaeological Ethics and the Treatment of the Dead.* University of South Dakota.

Politis, G. 1988. Paradigmas, modelos y métodos en la arqueología de la pampa bonaerense. In *Arqueología argentina contemporánea,* Yacobaccio, H. (ed.), 59–107. Buenos Aires: Búsqueda.

Politis, G. 1992. Política nacional, arqueología y universidad en Argentina. In *Arqueología en América Latina hoy,* G.Politis (ed.), 70–87. Bogota: Banco Popular.

Ponce Sanguinés, C. 1978. *Apuntes sobre desarrollo national de arqueología.* La Paz: Instituto Nacional de Arqueología.

Porras, P. 1984. *Arqueología del Ecuador.* Quito: Artes Gráficas Señal.

Reichel-Dolmatoff, G. 1950. Los Kogi: una tribu indígena de la Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia. *Revista del Instituto Etnológico Nacional* 4, 1–319.

Reichel-Dolmatoff, G. 1965. *Colombia.* London: Thames & Hudson.

Reichel-Dolmatoff, G. & A.Dussan 1951. Investigaciones arqueológicas en el Departamento del Magdalena: 1946–1950. Parte 1: Arqueología del río Ranchería; Parte 2: Arqueología del río César. *Boletín de arqueología* 3, 1–334.

Reichel-Dolmatoff, G. & A.Dussan 1965. Momil: excavaciones en el río Sinú. *Revista colombiana de antropología 6,* 31–156.

Renfrew, C. 1982. Explanation revisited. In *Theory and Explanation in Archaeology: the Southampton conference,* Renfrew, C., M.Rowlands & B.Seagraves (eds), 5–23. London: Academic Press.

Restrepo, V. 1895. *Los Chibchas antes de la conquista Española.* Bogota: Imprenta de la Luz.

Rivera, M. 1983. Junius B.Bird, personalidad en las contribuciones científicas arqueológicas en Chile. *Chungará* 10, 15–20.

Rivero, M. de & J.D.Tschudi 1851. *Antigüedades peruanas.* Vienna: Inst. Litogr. Leopoldo Muller.

Roosevelt, A.C. 1991. *Moundbuilders of the Amazon: geophysical archaeology on Marajo Island, Brazil.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Rosen, E. von 1904. *Archaeological Researches on the Frontier of Argentina and Bolivia in 1901–1902.* Stockholm: C.E.Fritze.

Rosen, E.von 1924. *Popular Account of Archaeological Research during the Swedish Chaco-Cordillera Expedition, 1901–1902.* Stockholm: C.E.Fritze.

Sanoja, M. & I.Vargas Arenas 1974. *Antiguas formaciones y modos de producción venezolanos.* Caracas: Monte Avila.

Sanoja, M. & I.Vargas Arenas 1992. Revision crítica de la arqueología suramericana. In *Prehistoria sudamericana: nuevas perspectivas,* B.Meggers (ed.), 35–43. Santiago de Chile: Taraxacum.

Schaedel, R. 1957. *Arqueología chilena.* Santiago de Chile: Universidad de Chile.

Schaedel, R. & I.Shimada 1982. Peruvian archaeology, 1940–80: an analytic overview. *World Archaeology* 13, 359–71.

Schiffer, M. 1976. *Behavioral Archaeology.* New York: Academic Press.

Schobinger, J. 1971. El Instituto de Arqueología y Etnología: 30 aniversario (1940–1970). *Anales de arqueología y etnología* 24/30, 256–91.

Shanks M. & C.Tilley 1987a. *Re-constructing Archaeology: theory and practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shanks, M. & C.Tilley 1987b. *Social Theory and Archaeology,* London: Polity Press.

Steward, J. 1946–1950. *The Handbook of South American Indians,* 6 vols. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology.

Steward, J. 1949. South American cultures: an interpretative summary. In *The Handbook of South American Indians,* vol. 5, Steward, J. (ed.), 669–772. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology.

Tabio, E. & E.Rey 1966. *Prehistoria cubana.* Havana: Academia de Ciencias.

Tello, J. 1967. *Páginas escogidas.* Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.

Torres, L.M. 1911. *Los primitivos habitantes del Delta del Paraná.* La Plata: Universidad Nacional.

Toscano, A. n.d. Pasado y presente de la arqueología uruguaya (1874–1990), consideraciones teóricas e institucionales. Unpublished manuscript.

Trigger, B.G. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19, 355–370.

Trigger, B.G. 1989. *A History of Archaeological Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsude, H. 1995. Archaeological theory in Japan. In *Theory in Archaeology,* Ucko, P.J. (ed.), 298–311. London: Routledge.

Tylor, E.B. 1871. *Primitive Culture.* London: John Murray.

Uhle, M. 1918. Los aborígenes de Arica y el hombre americano. *Revista chilena de historia y geografía* 31, 33–54.

Uhle, M. 1922a. *Fundamentos etnicos y arqueología de Arica y Tacna.* Quito: Imprenta de la Universidad Central.

Uhle, M. 1922b. Influencias mayas en el alto Ecuador. *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Historia* 4, 205–46.

Uribe, C. 1987. Un antropólogo sueco por Colombia: Gustaf Bolinder. *Boletín del Museo del Oro* 18, 3–18.

Vargas, I. & M.Sanoja n.d. Archaeology as a social science: its expression in Latin America. Unpublished manuscript.

Vásquez Varela, J.M. & R.Risch 1991. Theory in Spanish archaeology since 1960. In *Archaeological Theory in Europe: the last 3 decades,* I.Hodder (ed.), 25–51. London: Routledge.

Veloz Maggiolo, M. 1984. La arqueología de la vida cotidiana: matices, historia y diferencias. *Boletín de Antropología Americana* 10, 5–21.

Wagner, E. 1967. The prehistory and ethnohistory of the Carache area in western Venezuela. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* 71, 11–15.

Whitaker, A. & D.Jordan 1966. *Nationalism in Contemporary Latin America.* New York: Free Press.

Willey, G. 1946. The Virú Valley Program in Northern Peru. *Acta Americana 4,* 224–38.

Willey, G. & P.Phillips 1958. *Method and Theory in American Archaeology.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Willey G. & J.Sabloff 1980. *A History of American Archaeology.* San Francisco: W.H.Freeman.

Zeballos, E. 1960. *Viaje al país de los araucanos.* Buenos Aires: Hachette.

Zeballos, E. 1978. *La conquista de la quince mil leguas.* Buenos Aires: Coni.

Zerda, L. 1882. *El Dorado,* 2 vols (2nd edn 1972). Bogota: Banco Popular.