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This thesis is the result of a research project supported by Sida/SAREC, the Swedish Agency for Research Co-operation with Developing Countries. Contacts and activities between Sida/SAREC and the state University of La Paz in Bolivia, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés (UMSA), were initiated in 1998 and a bilateral research co-operation agreement was signed in July 2000.

Two ecologically different regions in Bolivia were chosen for Sida/SAREC support: one in the Altiplano of Oruro, and the other in the Chapare area near Cochabamba. The Altiplano area was to be the responsibility of UMSA – La Paz, and the region of the Lake Poopó and Desaguadero River in the Bolivian plateau (Altiplano), was selected as the research area (Figs. 1.a–c). The programme was intended as a multidisciplinary basis for policy recommendations for a sustainable development of the region. Institutional support and research training were stated as the main objectives of Sida cooperation, and three project areas for UMSA were approved:

Area I: Strengthening research management at UMSA

Area II: Natural Science and Technology, involving:
A  Research on plant biodiversity (Natural Products Chemistry)
B  Research on Microbial Biochemistry (Biotechnology)
C  Development of Chemical Process Technology
D  Water Resources Management (Hydrology/Hydraulics/Hydrochemistry)

Area III: Social Science and Humanities, involving:
A  Interethnic relations (History)
B  Aymara Encyclopaedia (Linguistics)
C  Habitat in Andean region (Habitat/Architecture)
D  Cultural Autodedefintion (Anthropology/Archaeology)

The research project approved for the Institute of Anthropological and Archaeological Research (IIAA) at UMSA, generally defined as Cultural Autodefinition in the Poopó area, was called The Territoriality in the Desaguadero and Poopó Region from an Internal View. The research objectives aimed at the creation of a logical framework to facilitate the integration of various disciplines, together with an active participation of members of the communities covered by the project, while carrying out a holistic study of the ‘spatial reality’ of the local people (p.19 of Project Abstract). Furthermore, the methodologies to be created through this particular approach were intended as a point of departure for new directions within archaeological and anthropological research, as well as ‘be instrumental in the auto-definition of needs and identities of different ethnical groups forming part of the Bolivian reality’ (ibid.)

The capacity building objectives of the project, aimed at the training/education of two PhD candidates, as well as the engagement into the project of students as research assistants ‘in order to further strengthen the research area’ (ibid.). Therefore, financial support was granted in support of:

a) Strengthening of the Institute of Anthropological and Archaeological Research (IIAA) by means of funds for purchasing equipment destined to archaeological and anthropological research activities

b) Training/education of two PhD candidates selected among UMSA teachers in Anthropology and Archaeology. Research training to a PhD degree was facilitated in Sweden through the Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, at Uppsala University.
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(Ay.) Aymara
(E.) English
(Gr.) Greek
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(mt): My translation

(N.) Nahuatl, a dialect of the Nahu language spoken in Mexico at the time of arrival of the Spanish. The Nahua people were the largest group found in México in the 16th century and their language was spoken in the territory covering Mexico-Tenochtitlan up to present Veracruz, Hidalgo and Guerrero. Nahuatl is said to have been the official, commercial and cultural language of the Aztec empire.

(Q.) Quechua or Qhishwa language, also known as Runasimi: literally ‘the language of people’.

(Sp.) Spanish

(T.) Taino. Taino words were introduced by the Spaniards from the West Indies. A language from the Arawak family, it was spoken by the Taino people (now extinct), who lived in La Española, Cuba, Puerto Rico and Jamaica when the Spanish conquerors arrived.

ACRONYMS

ASUR: Antropólogos del Surandino
COMIBOL: Corporación Minera de Bolivia
CSUTCB: Confederación Sindical Unica de Trabajadores Campesinos de Bolivia
FIA: Fundación Interamericana
FIS: Fondo de Inversión Social
INRA: Literally ‘Instituto Nacional de Reforma Agraria’. In the text: a law recently implemented referred to land use and ownership (1995).
MUSEF: Museo Nacional de Etnografía y Folklore
NGO: Non Governmental Organisation
PLANE: Plan Nacional para Empleo de Emergencia
TCOs: Tierras Comunitarias de Origen
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
VAIPO: Viceministerio de Asuntos Indígenas y Poblaciones Originarias
LOCAL CAMELOIDS

Alpaca (Lama pacos)
Guanaco (Lama guanicoe)
Llama (Lama glama)
Vicuña (Vicugna vicugna)

LIST OF NAMES FREQUENTLY QUOTED IN THE TEXT

Pedro Santos Willka
The name of the mountain located south of Lake Poopó from where the whole community of Pampa Aullagas spreads out towards the west, northwest and southwest.

San Miguel Arcángel
The patron saint of Pampa Aullagas, portrayed in the town church

Maximo Cayo and Juan Cayo
Described as ‘Aymaras’ from ayllu Sakatiri, Sato community

Julián Choque
His settlement, Calar Vintu, was the place where his kin had also settled:
- Pedro Flores Mauricio – connected to the Mauricio family from Puñaq, thus related to Julián Choque’s wife
- Barbara Conde Mauricio (born in Puñaq), Julián Choque’s wife
- Eusebio Choque, Julián Choque’s father
- Concebida Moya, Julián Choque’s mother
- Crisanto Moya – Julián’s mother’s brother
- Apolinar Choque – Julián’s elder brother
- Severo Choque – Julián’s elder brother’s son who moved to Llapallapani

1) People living in Asurcollu
Máxima Chaparro Morales (jilaqta, she comes from klpata), inhabitant of Asurcollu since she was married to Doroteo Calle
Cristina Cayo, originally from Sato, married to the brother of Máxima’s husband, i.e. Atanasio Calle
Román Calle, a cousin for the children of Máxima Chaparro Morales
Eusebio Calle, was the father of Atanasio, Lucia, Doroteo, Luisa and Fernanda Calle.
Atanasio and Doroteo Calle, the male brothers, were married to Cristina Cayo and Máxima Chaparro respectively.

2) People living in Challapuju
Zenón Rosales, the keeper of the llamas and sheep while the Calle brothers were in Oruro, has a wife and children

3) People living in Challapuju
Teodoro Lázaro
4) People living in *Tola Collu*
Apolonia Willka

5) People living in Añawani, ‘ancient *Silupata*’
Familia Morales inhabit the area and we met Sofía Morales

6) People living in *dransirka*
Florinda de Rosales and Jose Rosales

7) People living in *Neva Torida*
Sergio Rosales Pizarro lives there with his brother who is deaf and mute

8) People living in *Kalpata*
Dionisia Cari de Chaparro told us that she and the family of her mother-in-law were the only people left in the place, the rest having migrated or died. The Chaparros and the Condoris are the families who belong to this community

9) People living in *Bella Vista*
Pizarro are the families that belong to this community, also known as Ucatuju or *Ukatuju*

10) People living in *Kqasa*
Chaparro are the members of this community. Lucas Chaparro and his daughter-in-law, Justina, married to Eduardo Chaparro, his son – all cousins of Máxima Chaparro

11) People living in *Lupikipa*
Castillo are the members of this community
Life is a journey, and happiness is not a destination in this journey: it is just a way of travelling. A German friend visiting Bolivia at the same time I was doing my last year of fieldwork in the Poopó area (July 2003), brought a T-shirt as a present for my daughter Liliana with these words. They inspired in me the realisation that the journey, as it were, takes us, furthermore, to crossroads. These, the crossroads, are as many as the decisions we make in life; but it is the bridges we cross that mark us forever. I had to cross some bridges while on my journey, mostly in the recent years and, had it not been because of the circumstances I would certainly have missed the opportunity to understand the meaning of happiness. I was told that I needed to be angry to be able to write the last chapter and finish the thesis. It did not happen. I was told, furthermore, that I would know when the thesis was finished because, they said, I was going to feel that I hated it. It never happened. It is not, on the other hand, that I fell in love with my thesis but just that I had already realised that, as I was given a one-time chance, I just had to take it. How could I have refused? Even more important, having had the chance to make it in Sweden, within a dreamed environment where peace of mind, freedom for developing one’s ideas and lots of information were at the reach of my hand, how could I have hated it? Or felt angry ever? It was too late for that because those kinds of feelings were the ones that darkened to me before I was given this chance.

Some words of gratitude and appreciation are therefore in order for people who became part of my recent experiences in this journey, one of which resulted in what is now called a Thesis by my supervisors. In Bolivia, where it all started, there was Freddy Michel Portugal, one of my classmates in undergraduate studies in Anthropology, then Director of the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology where I was teaching, who supported me through and through. However, had I not had the support of some of my students, who acted not only as assistants but also as caring friends, little would have been achieved so that I acknowledge, from the bottom of my heart, the debt I have with Aida Ferreyra, always ready to take care of the details that I tend to neglect, helping me in finding the balance needed for carrying on the research while dealing with all the so-called logistic aspects of it. Monica Sullka, Denise Rodas, Silvia Blanco and Susana Zuazo were also, and still are, dear to my heart because of the many ways in which they supported me: Susana took care of the digital form of some of the drawings that Mónica made together with Aida who, furthermore, revealed herself as a fantastic and competent compiler of all things related to descriptions. And the same goes to Denise and Silvia, the archaeologists of the team. Silvia passed away in September 2005, when I was finishing the first draft of the thesis, leaving us all sad because of the circumstances in which she died; she was only 22.

In Sweden I found not only the conditions for doing research, but also some of the loveliest people I had met outside my country. There are no good enough words to describe what Paul Sinclair means to me, so I will just say this: when he came to Bolivia one day in December of 2000, he opened the possibility for me to come to Sweden and to do research as a PhD student. Paul, and after a while Frands Herschend, took the chance in respect of me by offering support and helped me with all their wisdom and extraordinary abilities by becoming my supervisors at the University of Uppsala. The generosity of both overwhelmed me and made me understand that it is possible to dream of a better world by challenging the way of accumulating knowledge and thus widening our perspectives. We had good times. We had hard times. It was life. And I learnt to appreciate people that make things happen. But that was not all for what would Sweden mean to me were it not because of the people that gave me another kind of room in Uppsala, by means of their warm words and generous hearts! Anneli Ekblom, Bo Gräslund, Anneli Sundkvist, Anna Karlström, Sara Hagström were among the first ones in trying to help me feel “at home” while in their country, Bosse Gräslund becoming a sort of “guardian angel” for me when the winter started to treat me wrong and I broke my wrist. Then I met Cecilia Lidström Holmberg, so dear to my
heart as the kind of person I could talk to and have with interesting discussions on not only those matters one would call strictly academic. Lucky me, Cia also gave me room to share the stuff that, making such a large part of anyone’s life, tends to be ignored just because it is seen as “so personal”. This, however, has a definitive bearing in whatever “intellectual” endeavour a PhD student for example has to go through. To leave Sweden is therefore enormously hard particularly when it comes to leave people like these…

But there are also Susanna Eklund and Andreas Hennius, and Fredrik Andersson, Carl-Gösta Ojala (C-G), Charlotta Widmark, Svante Norr, Johan Hegardt, Michel Notelid, Åsa Larsson, Fredrik Hallgren, Britt-Marie Eklund, Anna Källén, Amélie Berger, Ingrid Karlsson, Alex Sanmark, Kalle Lindholm, Annika Larsson, Maija Lindroos, Gunnel Cederlöf, Daniel Löwenborg, Kjel Knutsson, Helena Knutsson, Anne-Sofie Gräslund, Lena Hallbäck… they all have to know how dear to my heart they will remain. They gave me a reason to believe that, no matter how cold, dark, hostile a Swedish winter can be, I couldn’t be bothered because I had them to count on and to light me up! Some special words for Christina Bendegard, Markku Pykkonen and Alicja Grenberger who gave me the kind of support a PhD student is in need of when faced to the final stage of presenting the thesis and I am grateful to them because of that. They are dear to my heart each in a particular way. Elisabet Green, Maria Lund and Eva-Lena Wahlberg helped me with the annoying administrative matters. Indeed, the whole journey turned out a happy one just because all of them were there…

And among those who are here and there, David Haquim and Liliana Haquim are my dearest ones in the world. I took this chance not only because of you but also as a way of being here (and there) for you too.
CHAPTER I
DEFINING THE RESEARCH FIELD

Introduction

The journey you will read about here took me to and through some particular places while coming from others no less decisive. In this way, it can also be described as a process. While travelling in this life, it is not always apparent that you perceive neither the process nor the destination: You just know that you have started and suddenly, there you are, going into the experience that your way of living will turn into a journey.

I chose Anthropology as a discipline for my undergraduate studies and, for a while, I fulfilled some of my needs in respect of the questions I had. However, my interest in other fields of knowledge remained unabated. Yet, it can be said that my reasons for making an incursion into a research field that pretended to involve not only Anthropology but also Archaeology, History and other disciplines, had to do with the fact that I was not completely independent about the physical area chosen for the research. The regions of the Desaguadero and Poopó as a research area were selected by Swedish and Bolivian academic authorities, and a general subject related to Territoriality in these watercourses was established. The primary goal, as claimed by the general document on the research project established for the University in La Paz, was the identification in the area “of needs and identities of different ethnical groups forming part of the Bolivian reality” (Cf. p. 19 of Sida/SAREC/UMSA Project Abstract, 2000).

Problematic as this objective was, it became clear that a general understanding of the population in the area was to be pursued and I set out to learn as much as I could about the subject.

Why Anthropology?

Understanding what we call this world in a very general manner was for me a way of understanding not only what I found in my world, but also the way in which it was fashioned. People, things and nature were all fascinating sources of knowledge that I pursued and tried to accumulate, to digest, to interpret, to understand. Why? I cannot claim any specific reason, but just mention that maybe it was because I wanted to feel at ease while in awe in the middle of so many fascinating things.

I discovered that this, when formally approached, is called Science or, more specifically, Research and, within it, I discovered a corner called Anthropology. It came to me, as many of the things that happened in my life, and I took the chance. Not without fears or a strange feeling of not being sure of what I was after. Becoming a student in Anthropology happened late in my life, when I had reached the age at which most people are starting to reap the fruit of efforts invested in the fields of their professional careers.

Why Anthropology? At the beginning, when my school days were almost over and I had to think about my future and career, as they call the disciplines in Bolivia, Architecture was part of my student dreams. It could not be possible then and when the possibility became apparent, to be a student again was not in my plans. The choice was mine, and from that comfortable position, I had to think how to do my best to fulfil new dreams. As my thirst for knowledge was
not becoming any less strong, a discipline like History seemed a logical choice but at the same
time and just by chance I discovered that Anthropology was new as a possibility in the public
University, and as such, people like me were most welcome. Soon I realised that no other option
could have been better for I fell in love with almost all of the subjects within that discipline.
Anthropology led me to not only grasping some of the mysteries of human behaviour, but also
interrelatedness, connectedness and surroundings. Every new step into this field of knowledge
was as if facing a multiplicity of new doors opening in front of me, making it hard to take
decisions for I, of course, wanted to walk through them all.

Why Archaeology?

This is a different story. When chances open in front of you, either you take them or you are
taken by them. One day in the middle of the first December of the new millennium (2000), Paul
Sinclair came to Bolivia. He had asked for a meeting and I was, by the time, in charge of the
Institute-to-be for Anthropological and Archaeological Research. I had been supporting our
Institute in order to be granted Sida/SAREC funds for research activities and had also qualified
to obtain a scholarship to obtain a PhD degree. The system of public Universities in Bolivia is
only recently developing postgraduate possibilities for those who would be interested in
attaining PhD degrees, and the disciplines of Anthropology and Archaeology had so far none. A
decision had to be taken in respect of the choice for a University that would support our newly
created programme for PhD students. That is how Sweden and Uppsala University turned out to
be a possibility for the Bolivian programme.

However, it was not until I also met Frands Herschend that Archaeology became part of this
story: the story about my research and the experiences gained as a researcher. It soon became
clear that to learn more in this quest for knowledge, interdisciplinarity was an obvious way. I
had tried it previously, while working at a local Institution called DINAAR (Dirección Nacional
de Antropología y Arqueología) in La Paz, where I attempted to make the liaison, non-existent
so far, between anthropological and archaeological research. It did not work, owing to a host of
reasons that I attempt to explain briefly in the chapter dedicated to outlining the research
problems.

Archaeology in particular, as a discipline that “attributes material record to particular past
peoples”, together with the possibility of helping in tracing “the genealogy of present peoples
back to their imagined primordial origins” (Cf. Jones 1997, p. 1 i.a.) seemed then the perfect
match, together with Anthropology, in my quest for learning more about the population in Lake
Poopó. Thus, when Frands Herschend mentioned that a combination of both disciplines might
help in my research objectives, I could not but agree with the suggestion. The result is no doubt
the consequence of the chance these people gave to me.

The subject

In 2000, what I knew about Lake Poopó and its surroundings was almost non-existent.
Following my inclination in the anthropological fields, I had once written a paper connected
with the population of the area known as Uru (1998), where the intention was to portray
concern in respect of their environment and the means for their subsistence. At the time, I was
ignorant of many of the aspects that had created the idea of these people as one of the so-called
ethnic groups, described as peculiar by some anthropologists because of their alleged
subsistence linked to water courses that were at the basis of their identity. All I knew then was
that at the beginning of the 20th century, a need was propagated to recover all aspects related to
their culture for, it was feared, they would soon disappear as had many other “ethnic groups”
around the world (Créqui-Montfort et Rivet 1925–27; la Barre 1946; Métraux 1954, 1967;
The Urus, described as “ethnics” (Cf. Banks 1996), and as the primordial inhabitants of the Andes, as the remnants of some beings whose origins went back into a time “of darkness”, as the “defeated of the defeated”, were to me already not only an anthropological but also an archaeological, historical, even psychological and of course philosophical challenge. I was not going to resist the idea of trying to understand how the concept became a construction.

Consequently, the literature I selected aimed to cover the anthropological, archaeological, historical, geographical and even geological and environmental aspects of the area. I also attended conferences, seminars and lectures related to the subject. I visited the region many times, held meetings and exchanged ideas with people who lived in the area and those who had previous experience in the topic. Briefly, I tried to gather as much information as possible, and combined this with fieldwork during 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 (Sáenz 2000–1, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e).

I have to add that to investigate and study the “ancestry” of the Urus has been similar to elaborating a genealogy. A genealogy in the sense that, for example, Foucault (1982, 1991, 1996, 1998) gives to the term, that is, to conduct the analysis starting from a current question or issue. This requires a meticulous analysis of the mediations, an isolation of the plot – the weft – a follow up of the threads, a definition of the conformations and its transformations, its incidence on the object of study, the rethinking of the concepts that allow for a definition. All this helps in revealing not only what we know but also what power lies behind our actions, and what ethics sustain our ideas (Foucault 1991, p. 8). My tools for this were the various disciplines I have tried to draw from, and the result can be described as an attempt of exposing what the tools helped me to “dig” on the one hand, but also to interpret and then to understand. I thought I had found what I called contradictions, and then paradoxes and then, I realised, they all were part of an explanation of the construction of an ethnic group, of its conformation.

The method

Being one of my main interests to understand people interacting in their worlds and with the world of others, thus creating in the process the material and symbolic boundaries (Cf. Mintz 1985b in: Trouillot 1991, p. 44) that are found between human groups, I found no better way for this than to interact with people. I tried to listen as carefully as I could to what they have to say, especially when they are eager to mention the reasons for what they do or do not or are careless about. I could never get an understanding of any of these things had I adopted the “detached” position of the idealised “scientist” (Latour 2002a, 2002b, 2003a, 2003c). At best, I would have been able to describe the efforts that (ant-like) people living in societies seem to display to the naked eye, but if it had to be only through observation, even if this was “participant” (Malinowski 1989), I could have never been able to understand some of the reasons why they do what they do. Bourdieu supported my perspective, saying:

You have read it in the texts on epistemology, in the savants’ memoirs, the “humbleness of the wise people” is always mentioned there. That may seem stupid, but it is utterly true. It is a scientific virtue because it means that you take your time, that you submit yourself to the facts, that you crash into the silliest facts, that you do not use low cunning. (mt)

It can be said that my method was based on interaction, on exchange of ideas, opinions, comments, on asking and being asked, not once but as many times as the chance allowed for a possibility. It was also based on remaining silent, on letting things flow, on trying to make the others feel as comfortable as possible in my presence, in trying always to not forget we are only humans. I believed this could perhaps lead me to gather some explanations; to allow less restrictive/narrow ways of approaching people and facts; to shed some light over the mystery
that human activities seem to keep under the disguise of many of the analytical constructions of
the academics (Cf. Banks 1996).

For long, we have become used to accepting the conventional boundaries created among
disciplines, and thus have claimed incompetence every time trespassing of such boundaries was
perceived. We even seem to act likewise in respect of other aspects of life: Our notion of
boundary is everywhere; therefore, “ethnic groups” are some of those “others” in respect of
“us”, the “modern” people, the secular society, contrasted to “traditional” peoples who still
live by some rules and beliefs we no longer seem to consider as valid. Why should the otherness
be seen as ethnic in relation to our so-called modern society? How can we understand our social
reality while not avoiding the usual keeping-an-eye-closed to most of its components (which is
what academic disciplines force upon us when inducing compartmentalised knowledge)?
Approaches from single disciplines, while helpful, are but a step in respect of a wider
understanding of what we call realities, the parts of which are mostly concealed and thus, more
often than not, non-existent for disciplinary purposes or academic analysis (Günther & Folke
1993).

Therefore, another aspect of my method has been the attempt to use other contributions
from disciplines. By drawing from anthropology and archaeology as well as history, sociology,
geo graphic or geology, I tried to bridge gaps, to contrast knowledge gathered within each
discipline, to complement knowledge offered by one or lacking in another and to understand the
reach as well as the depth of the explanations offered. Source criticism, however, has been my
companion on the journey in order to avoid being misled or getting lost in the particularities of
every discipline and to keep myself on the wary side, in order to contrast the information that
they supplied, and that I analysed, with my perceived reality.

My point, after all, has been once again to prove that knowledge, while being an
accumulative process, is also a feedback routine intended to help that which we call Science, in
the quest for understanding as many aspects of our reality as humanly possible. Science, in this
process, is the option we have in the so-called western world for shaping our knowledge through
method and theory. I come from a place in the world that has been engulfed in the adventure
called Science as of the 16th century. The world, or whatever “worlds” that existed there before
the Spaniards came, was turned upside down when they began to rule. Whatever knowledge the
local inhabitants possessed was taken, at best, or abandoned at worst in line with the interests of
the conquerors. They were after the riches they expected to obtain in order to alleviate their
problems in a Renaissance Europe, for their idea about wealth was prosaic and consisted of gold
and properties. They did not come in search of knowledge. Knowledge accumulated on how to
navigate long distances, for instance, helped them for a while but once they reached the lands
they sought, they used every aspect of their system of knowledge to extract what they
considered of importance to themselves.

“Western” science and customs that by and large lead to traditions came to be part of
present Bolivia, first in the form of 16th century Christian religion and beliefs, administrative
and political systems, language and values. Almost all local knowledge and customs that the
Chroniclers described went unappreciated. The exception was goods such as particular food
transported to the so-called Old World, for example potatoes, that became staple food for many
shortly after. From colonial times onwards, knowledge and the ways of acquiring it and putting
it into practice have undergone parallel if not similar routes with what later happened in Europe.
It even became fashionable to behave like in European courts, as the local viceroys considered
themselves – not wrongly – local kings (Lockhart 1968). Whatever happened in Europe, and
particularly in the Spanish court, had a bearing on the new local elite, and after their demise, the
new leaders, now independent from the Spanish yoke, found it only natural to continue in a
similar style.

After almost five hundred years of Spanish and European influence, traditions and ways of
understanding knowledge and its accumulation, it should therefore come as no surprise that few
if at all of the local knowledge remained preserved in the Bolivia that came to exist as such in the
early 19th century. What was favoured, instead, was what was viewed as what we now
broadly call the “‘western scientific approach’” in understanding the world. Thus, this research
is inevitably influenced by the context of “‘western” academic lines of thought. It draws from
“western” science accumulated in knowledge about the local reality, and takes into account a variety of approaches that resulted among others in publications related to the area of my research. However, again I argue, it is also critical, especially of the limitations of a science that claims objectivity, for instance by dismissing local knowledge as subjective. I maintain, nevertheless, that Science is able to endure critique and thus correct some of its deviations. My method also tries to expose the way in which Science, while a valuable tool for research, is also restrictive in that it induces researchers to confine their view within a narrow perspective, that of their disciplines.

A note on sources and translations

The research could not have gone any further without the support of previous work on the topic. I have tried to cover a part of it, the demonstration of which is the Reference List that forms part of this thesis. However, some of the texts have been more helpful than others, as well as more enlightening or more contrasting. These have been more frequently quoted, extensively or in part, or else used as inspiration for the ideas that resulted in this text.

I owe much to the dedicated work Nathan Wachtel accomplished in my country. His paper of 1978 “Hommes d’Eau: Le problème Uru – XVIème et XVIIème siècle”, published in the Journal Annales of the École d’Hautes Études Sociales, from Paris, first helped me understand what Wachtel calls “the Uru problem” (1978). It made me realise the importance of a multidisciplinary approach, which, though undertaken by some, remains a challenge in the academic world. However, he also helped me with other analytical insights that had inspired his book of 1990, Le retour des ancêtres. Les indiens Urus de Bolivie XXe – XVe siècle. Essai d’histoire regressive. Here he establishes an ample ethnography of the Urus of Bolivia, using what he calls regressive history, i.e. an approach that starts from what can be found in the present and then moves towards the past with the help of the historical record available on the subject. His paper of 1982, The Mitimas of the Cochabamba Valley, was also of great help in visualising more exactly what the “Uru problem” was about, but when he went back to the Chipayas and wrote his Gods and Vampires. Return to Chipaya, in 1994, I could see the despair of the ethnographer, while his “object of study” vanished in the air, taken by the changes time brings about.

Arthur Posnansky was significant to contrast the current perspective about Urus, and his 1938 work Anthropology and Sociology of the Inter-Andean Races and adjacent regions (my translation) enlightened me in the views that prevailed in anthropology in the early 20th century, particularly when e.g. phrenology was seen as an important tool to devise models of difference between humans. His attempts to describe the residents of Panza, an island in Lake Poopó, made me think of a Malinowski in the Andes. I have also analysed the writings of those who describe themselves as Urus, and dwelled particularly on two considered as landmark reference in the literature on the subject, Daniel Moricio and Lucas Miranda (Miranda & Moricio 1992). They also helped me in pointing at the contrasts that emerged when compared with traditional descriptions of Urus but more importantly, were the living proof of what has been made popular about the so-called Uru identity, which draws from the elaboration of the so-called Aymara identity as a reference.

Thomas Abercrombie (1991, 1992, 1998) was unquestionably my main inspiration and I have quoted him extensively while sharing (and understanding) his concern with what he calls “amnesia” in historical aspects of some Bolivian inhabitants. His 1998 Pathways of Memory and Power: Ethnography and History among an Andean People has been crucial for my positioning in respect of the problem to be approached in the research. Johannes Fabian (1983, 1990, 1991, 1996, 1998), Siân Jones (1997) and Marcus Banks (1996) were also significant to my understanding of the way in which both anthropology and archaeology construct their explanations.
The seminal study carried out by Graziano Gasparini and Luise Margolies on Inca Architecture (1980), has been invaluable for my understanding of the way the people that inhabited the Andes lived before the arrival of the Spaniards.

All the theoretical cogitation in this text is my responsibility, but I am indebted to many who preceded me in this effort. Pierre Bourdieu (1975, 1977, 1979, 1987, 2000, Bourdieu & Wacquant 2000) provided tools to understand the ways in which distinction, i.e. difference is created, who create these and how, and the values and symbols connected with them. His criticism of his own work has been inspiring and showed me the way to the humble scientist that is all too often derided. If we do not learn to “crash into the silliest facts” as he claims (2000), we can hardly hope to learn at all. On another level, Zygmunt Bauman (1998, 2001) helped me with his sociological perspective on globalisation (1998), i.e. inclusion vs. exclusion, and thus the reasons for the importance that ethnicity has claimed, paradoxically, in a globalised world. If Edward Said’s ideas on Orientalism (1978) and Clash of Definitions (2000a) among others had not come my way, I would have missed him greatly as I do anyway, after he left us without more of the clarity of his ideas (1982, 1989, 2000a, 2000b).

Bruno Latour became, however, the key to grasping in a better way the problem I saw in the topic of my research. I read his Pandora’s Hope (1999) only when I had finished the first manuscript of the thesis and I owe with deep thanks the reference to Professor Paul Sinclair. Latour helped me in recovering the smiles in my face, because reading him is a lot of fun but he is also remarkable for his depth in approaching what we call Science (1998, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2006, Bowker & Latour 1987). He actually proves Bourdieu’s words about the “humbleness of the wise” (2000) as well as Huxley’s words when he recommended that we should

“Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses nature leads, or you shall learn nothing.” (From The Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, in: Anderson 1984)

In addition to the works presented as sources, I have also consulted numerous other reference books and texts that I considered useful and or interesting for the study. I have translated all the parts that were not originally written or described in English, when the need to quote them became apparent.
CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEMS

Introduction

To cross the distance (Sáenz 2002 [1973]) that separates the researcher from the topic of the research involves being aware of a couple of problems and, contrary to what might be expected, I will deal with these problems before the topic itself is perceived as purporting a problem. The problems are those of the researcher and those of the research. Each of these levels expands, in turn, into a set of other problems. Although this is common knowledge for research activities, bear with me while I attempt to point at the particular set in which my problems were located.

The Researcher

The specific context where I had to investigate was connected with the reasons for why I tried to take the challenge of doing research from a multidisciplinary perspective. I will try to formulate the researcher’s problems, as I see them, through a questionnaire. One of the obvious questions is the kind of context that has led me to do research from a multidisciplinary perspective, but the answer is already given in Chapter 1, where I describe why I used Anthropology and Archaeology, as well as other disciplines, as references for the framework of my research. The following chapters will contain further discussions. Here, I consider another set of connected questions, ending with a brief discussion of why these are termed problems for the researcher.

The basis of the social structure in Bolivia

What is the basis of the social structure in Bolivia? In other words, how does the researcher relate to local cultural expressions, values and ideas?

The present social structure in Bolivia can be traced back to the Spanish colonial settlers. They left a legacy consisting of a structural organisation of the space and the political socio-economic system, which affected the original situation prior to the 16th century. It should be remembered that the government that took office in 1825 and which initiated the Republican period, mainly consisted of Spanish speaking people who were largely sympathetic to the then en vogue liberal ideals, that of integration of the indigenous population into the (Bolivian) ‘‘nation’’ (Acta de Constitución de la República de Bolivia). In practice, this meant that those identified as ‘‘Indians’’ by the demised Spanish colonial regime should be absorbed as Bolivians from then on. At the same time, this entailed ignoring previous differences in language, beliefs, social organisation, ways of dressing, that were apparent particularly in the rural areas of Bolivia.

Positivism, Evolutionism and Social-Darwinism were amongst the most influential schools of thought in the Bolivia of the 19th and early 20th centuries. A variety of explanations were issued to describe the situation concerning local development and organisation of society and political-economic power. Most of them depicted those seen as native population as ‘‘backward’’ in relation to the societal ideal of ‘‘progress’’ that implied a general improvement
of the situation of the inhabitants (Zavaleta 1965). This view of alleged backwardness has been maintained throughout the 20th century, and is still used as the main explanation for the condition of Bolivia, nowadays listed as a so-called Third World country. This means, in other words, that Bolivia is a poor country predominantly in the eyes of institutions such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), or the World Bank that all issue from the wave of the so-called (industrial) development that emerged as a consequence of World War II (Preston 1999). Using the idea of poverty as “the income level below which it is not possible to grant a minimally adequate diet in nutritional terms, nor essential non-nutritional requirements” (UNDP, 1992, p. 275, mt), these institutions have ranked Bolivia as one of the poorest of the region in Latin America.


Globalisation as a new explanatory paradigm has become so rapidly established that it is difficult to understand whether the former terms made sense in the situation which previously prevailed in Bolivia. At the same time, globalisation allows for an understanding of the emphasis put on the so-called ethnical differences, ethnicities and ideas alike that create distinctions deriving in the belief of the objective existence of ethnic groups. This is nothing to be so surprised about if, at the same time, it is possible to see that such a concept – globalisation – is also a phenomenon and an ideology that often get “confused in the application of the term” (Van Binsbergen & Van Dijk, 2004, p. 6). As Bauman has noted, an integral part of the globalizing process is progressive spatial segregation, separation and exclusion (1998, p. 3), thus the phenomenon itself – globalisation – while taking so much of the intellectuals’ analytical time, signifies ongoing changes while, hélas!, they are already in the past – which is one of the reasons why we feel that we are prepared to, for example, discuss it.

The research will try to show how this ambiguous combination of elements has helped in fostering or even veiling strategies that, for the often self-proclaimed social analysts, are surprising if not unexpected.

The Bolivian academic context

The Bolivian academic context of thought and ideas goes back to early colonial times when Pope Gregory XV issued an authorisation to establish a University under the name of Universidad Mayor Real y Pontificia de San Francisco Xavier de Chuquisaca, which became the first in the territory in 1624. The aims of such a privilege are described as authority to grant graduate levels to bachilleres, licenciados, maestros and doctores. Influential as it was in the development of the colonial society and the liberal ideas resulting from the French Revolution that led to upheavals as from 1809 in Chuquisaca (where the historical capital of Bolivia, Sucre, was therefore located in 1825), this university is now part of the large public university system in Bolivia. Although still dependent on state funding for their activities, autonomy and freedom of ideas remain their principle ideals.

La Paz, the official capital city since the early 20th century, has so far been the centre of the intellectual activities and production where most of the Bolivian academic world converges and sets the criteria of acceptability in respect to ideas and paradigms. La Paz houses one of the largest public Universities, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, created in 1835 and offering both anthropological and archaeological education for undergraduate students as from the 1980s. Oruro has opened a new possibility for those interested in anthropological studies at the Universidad Técnica de Oruro (UTO), and Cochabamba has an external programme on the same subject at the Universidad Católica Boliviana San Pablo. In line with an educational reform launched in the 1990s, it is only recently that private universities have offered alternatives to
those who are interested in higher education, debilitating the system of public universities. Archaeology, as a discipline, is not an alternative at any of the latter.

The local science paradigm

What local science paradigm prevails, with its ‘‘set of practices that indicate how the scientific community is to employ the model’’? (Cf. Aman 1992, p. 78).

Behind the local science paradigm we detect that Positivism, influential as it was during the early Republican days, as much as Darwinism and other ideas coming from abroad, might be described as significant in forming many Bolivian intellectuals. Marxism was also part of the development of local ideas, and mostly engaged elite intellectuals in a sterile debate about ‘‘means of production’’, its ‘‘ownership’’ and the consequences for the Bolivian state, before turning into anathema as a consequence of the events that took place in eastern Europe in particular, in the 1990s.

Local problems such as the structure of the society and the historical basis, upon which it was erected, became part as much as consequence of the paradigm while taking for granted an insertion of the nation-state within the ‘‘international’’ context. In practice, this often entailed ignoring local conditions and realities, perhaps in the hope that the population of Bolivia would some day change and accommodate to the principles for the Bolivian citizenship idealised within the liberal paradigm.

Sociologists, first, and then historians, anthropologists, archaeologists and other humanists developed intellectual trends or tendencies forwarding interesting contributions such as an explanation on how a ‘‘national consciousness’’ developed in Bolivia (Zavaleta, 1965). However, local conditions and social affiliation were, as elsewhere, determinant in the way ideas were elaborated. This is why, despite alleged originality in their approaches some writers, such as Albó (1989, 1995, 2000) or Barragán (1987, 1991, 1992, 1996) *inter alia*, were actually imitating foreign traditions in the interpretation of local realities. Even striking views and interesting research, e.g. that of Silvia Rivera (1988, 1991, 1993, 1996a, 1996b), and Alison Spedding (1992, 1996), resulted in only limited challenges to established academic positions given the paucity of discussion and source criticism.

The general impression is of a local Academia still involved in assimilating the ideas of the 18th century Enlightenment. At the same time, academics were affected by dramatic events, such as military dictatorships that limited intellectual progress. Once democracy returned as a political system in the early 1980s, the economic problems of the country lead to the prioritisation of areas other than education and research. Public universities were among the areas adversely affected by lack of funds and resources, and researchers and academics had to find more practical ways of making ends meet. This resulted in the setting aside of projects and ideals about knowledge, and delays in the development of fora where the contribution of ideas could be encouraged and challenged.

In short, there was no adequate environment to develop ideas and there was also little understanding of the implications of ideas coming from abroad which were uncritically applied to the local context. The impact of decades of education based on repetitive teaching and learning imposed on many generations resulted in an inability of generating contributions that responded to local needs. Efforts concentrated on attempts at delineating what should or should not be considered as scientific. Long rules and precepts stipulating the scientific quality for intellectual production were the result of this concern. This lead to situations such as the case of an undergraduate student willing to write an ethnographic thesis on one of the many ‘‘ethnic’’ groups listed in the Bolivian repertoire, which would have helped in illuminating at least in part the knowledge on such groups. Her project met with refusal from her department on the grounds that ‘‘no hypotheses’’ could result from such a descriptive approach.

Nonetheless, the list of ethnic groups is long, ‘‘approximately’’ thirty five – sometimes more, sometimes less (Albó 1989, 1995, 2000; Bouysse-Cassagne 1987b *i.a.*). A map has been drawn on one of the walls of the classrooms at the Department of Anthropology, at the initiative of a teacher – no doubt influenced by anthropological perspectives engaged in ethnographic
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work – where colours have been used to depict the differences together with geographic bounded locations of these Bolivian “ethnics”. The western part of the territory, known as Andean after the Andes, is portrayed containing three ethnic groups (Aymaras, Quechuas, Urus), and the rest, c. thirty, cover the valleys and lowlands of the country.

Whereas ethnographies are not uncontroversial, in the sense that they portray a static view of a specific situation and population, knowledge of the many groups described as ethnic in Bolivia has concentrated on the most densely populated areas, such as the Andes, leaving the rest in the dark because of lack of resources on the one hand and, on the other, because, in some cases foreign researchers took the lead but published results in foreign languages in books and journals, which are often unavailable locally. Local students and researchers do not normally have access to this information.

Research, therefore, is beset with problems in Bolivia. Funds are minimal when attainable, structures are ill equipped or non-existent at all and the general academic environment, as the Bolivian state, are concerned mainly with budgetary problems. Under such circumstances, it comes as no surprise that few discussions are carried out outside the mainstream paradigm of a positivism of the Enlightenment if at all, and every time funds for investigation become available, the researcher is then constrained by the difficulties described plus lack of understanding of his or her duties, let alone encouragement that derives in pessimism and uncertainties as the established intellectual elite goes unchallenged. Add to this that, as Aman (1992, p. 78) puts it, scientific study of research has generally favoured a sort of “paradigm-conservatism”, in which scholars go to great lengths to retain crucial concepts or models, and the soundness of the intellectual panorama is brought into question.

The lack of “indigenous” philosophy

Another controversial subject, derived from the issues addressed above, refers to the question of the existence of any indigenous, i.e. local philosophy, understood as a system of thought that comprises not only “the study of the nature, causes, or principles of reality, knowledge, or values, based on logical reasoning rather than empirical methods” as various definitions of the word claim, but also “the critical analysis of fundamental assumptions or beliefs”, as much as “ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, and epistemology” (Todorov 2003, van den Berg n.d., Wallerstein 2003).

Philosophy, as a fundamental reference for any scientific approach, has been at the forefront in lengthy debates occupying for example the media, while attempting to assess the situation. Media has portrayed local thinkers who, while perhaps apt in discussing philosophical thoughts of foreign origin, have found it difficult to consider and formally articulate local sources of philosophical insights. In addition, and perhaps as a consequence, the persons locally skilled or engaged in philosophical enquiry are portrayed rather as poets, at best, if not ignored completely.

Popular wisdom offers every now and then a refreshing alternative, but it rarely connects further and is not truly acknowledged by local intellectuals who, unwittingly, seem to prove that there is a problem associated with what is seen as “indigenous” and what is considered as the source of knowledge. It is small wonder that a low self esteem is recurrently diagnosed as typical of Bolivians stemming, as it is claimed, from the numerous Indian population.

Why are these problems for the researcher?

The above characterisations, i.e. the different socio-political factors concerning scientific production, are problems (for the researcher) because they lead to a bias that should not go unacknowledged. This means that the characteristics of the economic, social and political systems in Bolivia are generally taken for granted, i.e. they are what they are and analysis, research, and its conclusions are generally arrived at without explicitly considering an assumed system(s), structure, status quo (Preston 1999, p. 95, Bourdieu 1979). In other words, the legacy of a colonial past, the ideas of liberalism and integration that lead to gather together as Bolivians
people who lived in the territory that became Bolivia, the way these ideas and legacy intertwined to build the present status quo, have only rarely been approached from a critical perspective. When this has happened, the reaction might be compared to a commotion, as if trying to understand the present in relation to the past would disturb unwelcome spirits.

Therefore, the bias also underlies explanations and understanding of what is seen as ethnic and/or Andean that are mostly related to analysis and interpretation of the ideological aspects of cultural expressions. Academic production is based on ethnographic work that seems to undervalue material expressions of culture, favouring instead the underlying ideas that lead such ethnic groups to produce those materials. This means that research is mostly about ritual, celebrations, religion etc., and very little is said about the objective conditions of which they are the result.

With a paradigm that emphasises scientific measuring and weighing, leading to generalisations applied to almost every aspect of reality, the emphasis on the different ethnic groups becomes a paradox, since reality is also paradoxically seen as the one-and-only. The discourse about the nation is at odds with the apparent intention to proclaim unity within the diversity, as the reform to the Constitution has proved by stating that Bolivia is a “unitarian Republic” and also “multiethnic and pluricultural” (Article 1, modification approved in 1995). The term ethnic is semantically loaded as it calls for an alleged homogeneity that allows for membership (Bauman 2001, p. 29) and is itself biased towards difference and otherness (Tonkin et al. 1989, p. 16). The concept of Nation (Hayes 1927), on the other hand, emphasizes common characteristics such as language, religion or ethnicity as its basis and as the dominant socio-political condition of our age (Banks 1996, p. 125). In this sense, nation has become synonymous with state, the political unit constituting a federation under one government in the last centuries, when the republican form of administration was chosen.

These paradoxes might also explain why philosophers, who might help to prove the “poverty and even incoherence” of nationalisms (Banks 1996, p. 128), do not have a say in this context. Moreover, if the (multi)ethnic aspect of the Bolivian population became such a question that it had to be mentioned in the reformed constitution, the least one can say is that the Bolivian nation is in a predicament since what kind of “unity” can be expected from those regarded as “different”? What do the “ethnics” stand for when, as a consequence, we see them portrayed – by mass media for example – as claiming rights for a nation of their own? What will the role of the state become and what about the republican system?

The Research

There is another set of problems which, for methodological reasons, are conceptualised apart from those listed above, dealing this time with what is within the context described. I have begun with a rough portrayal of what should not be forgotten when doing research and I would like to continue by portraying what I believe it to be the substance that holds the subject within its context.

Uru inhabitants in Lake Poopó, even if conceived as remnant beings who inhabited “the dark times”, “primeval” beings who chose water courses for surviving as hunter-gatherers (ASUR-IAF-UNICEF n.d.; la Barre 1946; Inda 1988; Inda & Muysken 2001; Métraux 1954, 1967b; Molina 1986b, 1991, 1993; Muysken 2002; Quispe 1955; Stark 1972; Vellard 1967, 1991 i.a.), must all the same have originated somewhere, both as a concept and as an observable fact. Accordingly, a good way to start is to consider the obvious “beginning” which, in academic terms, is the moment when written accounts first describe a context and, in that way, become available for research in general. Archaeology, together with history, currently aim at understanding the situation prior to the Spanish chronicles. Before that, we lack information as the societies the Spaniards found were, it is claimed, oral. Quipus, the knotted cords used for record keeping in the Andes that some would argue were a communication system, are still the subject of research and discussion (See Glossary; Urton & Brezine 2005).
Lake Poopó

What is known about Lake Poopó? It is situated in the Bolivian Highlands (see Fig. 1.a–c and II.1) that open into the large intermontaine plateau known as the Altiplano in the Andes as a result of Pleistocene-recent formation and submergence of continents by broad, relatively slow displacements of the earth’s crust (Newell 1949, p. 1; Collins 1990, p. 150). The two main mountain chains that form this vast intermontaine basin, Cordillera Occidental and Cordillera Oriental, have different origins. Cordillera Occidental first came into existence near the close of the Palaeozoic, or not later than the Late Jurassic, i.e. some two hundred million years ago. Cordillera Oriental, on the other hand, appeared in the Cretaceous, i.e. some one hundred million years ago (Newell 1949, p. 1). The Altiplano is about 2000 km long and 200 km wide with an altitude varying from 3700 to 4600 m (Lavenu 1992, p. 3).

Two large Quaternary palaeo lakes existed in the Bolivian Plateau or Altiplano, namely the Ballivián and the Minchín. Lake Ballivián is thought to be the ancestor of Lake Titikaka, and occupied a much more extensive area than the latter. Lake Minchín, on the other hand, after drying up c. 10,000 years ago, divided into three smaller lakes one of which is the present Lake Poopó. Lake Titikaka is reputed to be the largest and deepest lake in the world at comparable altitudes with 3810 m above sea level, an extension of 8562 km², the part of the lake corresponding to Bolivia being 3790 sq. km (Montes de Oca, 1997, p. 247). It is part of a great system of internal drainage including the basin of Lake Poopó and the vast salt pans of Coipasa and Uyuni to the south that form a basin of c. 200,000 sq. km located between 14°25' and 22°50' south latitude and 71° to 67° east longitude. Titikaka’s waters are fresh with a maximum of 281 m depth and drain through Rio Desaguadero into the highly saline Lake Poopó, 270 km to the southeast. Lake Poopó (2530 km²) lies c. 122 m below the level of Titikaka, i.e. c. 3686 m above sea level (Montes de Oca, 1997, p. 194–5, Wirrmann et al. 1992, p. 40, Newell 1949, p. 14).

Both lakes have been variously described in the historical sources. Lake Titikaka, or Titicaca as presently used in maps, has also been described as a lagoon (Sp. laguna) in the 16th century with the name of Chuqvito or Chucuito. It seems that the Lupaqa population inhabited its shores and built the capital city there, but one can also find references to this lake as Lake Pukina, particularly in linguistic studies (Bouysse-Cassagne 1992, p. 476). Lake Poopó, on the other hand, was also described as a lagoon called Paria, and as lake of the Aullagas or Awllakas in the 16th century. This is a clear reference to the town of Pampa Aullagas, founded close to the shores of modern Lake Poopó in 1575 (see below).

The high altitude on which these lakes are located limits the kinds of plants which can thrive in the area; the vegetation is thin and halophytic flora in particular occurs around Lake Poopó because of its salinity (Ybert 1992, p. 49). There is almost a complete lack of trees, making the region appear semiarid. However, in spite of the altitude, temperatures are never excessively low. Lying near the equator, the range of temperatures during the year is not great and the air is cool during days, but seldom drops below freezing point at night. However, the relative lack of oxygen in the atmosphere and the rapid radiation at high altitudes make most visitors suffer from cold at night, especially during the winter season (Newell 1949, p. 14). Throughout the region, the lower limit of perennial snow lies between about 4900 and 5150 m.a.s.l. (Newell 1949, p. 84). Lake Poopó is in an area of colder and more arid climate than Lake Titikaka and the mean annual temperature is 6 to 8°C with an annual rainfall of between 300 and 400 mm.

The vegetation at Lake Poopó comprises mountain steppe dominated by Graminae (Festuca and Stipa, inter alia) and Compositae (Baccharis and Parastrephia, inter alia), with frequent cactuses in rocky areas and, given the saline soils, the vegetation around the lake itself is composed mainly of Chenopodiaceae. Totora reeds, for example, are rare and the most abundant aquatic plant is Ruppia, which covers ca. 60% of the lake area. The phytoplankton is dominated by the genera Nodularia, Oscillatoria, Dictyosphaerium, Peridinium and Cyclotella and algae seem to be poorly represented with percentages of Pediastrum of less than 0.6% (Alcoba et al. 2002, pp. 25–36, Ybert 1992, pp. 52–8). Waterfowl are abundant in the area,
especially *Phoenicoparrus andinus*, *Phoenicoparrus jamesi* and *Phoenicopterus chilensis* varieties of flamingo (Rocha *et al.* 2002, pp. 43–74). Fish resources, plentiful before the 1950s, have been subjected to a number of changes; for example, the introduction of rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) in 1941 and the silverside (*Basilichthys bonariensis*) in the 1950s. Sources (Vellard 1992, pp. 495–9, Orlove *et al.* 1992, pp. 500–4) claim that all the fish that existed previously had very fine flesh. They mention that most esteemed were the boga (*Orestias pentlandi*), and the huminto (*Orestias cuvieri*), and that many fisheries closed in the 1950s, owing to the replacement of these species by the invading ones.

According to geological studies, Poopó is a young lake dated with $^{14}$C of calcareous remnants to 10,000–12,000 years BP. The lake formed the setting for the development of the supposed fishers, hunters and gatherers of the Bolivian Plateau, who are known as the Uru or ‘people of the water’ as some sources claim they prefer to be called (Wachtel 1978, 1989, 1990; Molina 1993; Insa 1988; Miranda & Moricio 1992). Apart from the river Desaguadero (Sp.: ‘‘where the waters are drained’’), Lake Poopó is connected to Lake Titikaka by a lagoon (Soledad), and a lake (Uru Uru). Lake Poopó also receives water from the south via the Marquez River. The deepest part of Lake Poopó is no more than 2.5 metres with a central area of ca. 1500 km². This shallowness resulted in Lake Uru Uru drying out completely in 1982, after three continuous years of drought (Montes de Oca, 1997, pp. 250–2).

One of the most striking changes in the environmental conditions of the basin was the contamination by colonial mining activities. Gold and silver, abundant in the neighbouring areas of Oruro and Potosí, were exploited leaving a residue of heavy metals (Fe, Cu, Zn, Pb, As *inter alia*) that contaminate the soil and the water table. Acid rain, chemical deposition, and domestic drainage are also environmental problems in the area (Ríos 2002, pp. 167–86). All forms of life in this basin are constantly threatened by these factors.

**Early occupations in the area**

What do we know about the early occupations in the area? According to Núñez *et al.* (2002), calibrated $^{14}$C tests in the area of our concern (20º–25ºS) would indicate that people responded quickly to Holocene climate changes. Early occupations termed initial Palaeoindian were associated with climate change c.13 000 BP. The surveys were carried out at an altitude of between 2400 and 4500 m in the Salar de Atacama and on the Altiplano. Surveys for new archaeological sites in three complementary habitats were completed. Especially interesting were the so-called ‘‘type I’’ sites, as they are said to have included open campsites along fossil Quaternary shorelines of Altiplano palaeolakes above 3600 m (Núñez *et al.* 2002, p. 821).

According to palaeo-ecological investigations, the area changed dramatically from very arid environments at the Last Glacial Maximum to relatively humid conditions during late glacial and early Holocene times. In northern Chile, at the level where the area of research is located, this change began some time around 14,000 BP and culminated between 13,000 and 9500 BP. The shorelines of late glacial palaeolakes were up to 70 m above those of the current salt lakes and provided excellent habitats for what they call ‘‘mobile groups of hunters’’ (ibid. 2002, p. 821). Thirty nine early Archaic open camp-sites were found along the shorelines of twenty of these Altiplano palaeolakes. Charcoal samples from four of them were dated between 9900 and 8800 BP. Núñez *et al.* believe that the presence of these sites confirms the hypothesis that transhumant early hunters lived in the area with complementary resource use between the high-elevation lakes and low-elevation wetland areas of the Salar de Atacama. The high-elevation open palaeo-shoreline sites contain abundant lithic artefacts and bones of camelids (*Vicugna vicugna* and *Lama*) and in some cases, birds, including ñandu (*Pterocnemia pennata*). At twenty five of the thirty nine sites, triangular projectile points were found that are diagnostic for the early period. Thirty of the sites lack microliths, ceramics, and other artefacts indicative of later cultures, suggesting that these sites were never reoccupied. Instead, the sites reflect a particular habitat that was fit for human habitation only during a period of time when conditions were exceptionally favourable and palaeo-lakes existed. The latest dated early Holocene fireplaces on the Altiplano are located near the modern settlement of Salar, indicating that this palaeo-lake
reached modern low levels at that time. The artefacts on the surface of this site were never covered with lake sediments; thus, the lake did not rise substantially above modern levels during the past 9000 years. Accordingly, on the basis of lake sediments and ice cores, palaeo-climates were generally dry during the mid- and late Holocene (ibid. 2002, p. 822).

Recent research, however, is assessing whether or not human settlers were in the American continent already 30,000 years earlier than the accepted theory, which located the arrival of early settlers around 11,000 years ago “by crossing a land bridge between Siberia and Alaska” (Rincon 2005). Archaeology and other disciplines have still much to accomplish before we can understand the events that lead to what we now find in the area.

It is also important to note that these investigations indicate that human settlers interacted with the landscape in ways that, still today, are not so strange or unusual. The unusual, it seems, appears as soon as we are told about the ethnicity of these hunter-gatherers who, as we will find in the sources, are labelled as Uru.

The ancestors of the current population

Who were the ancestors of the current population? Many researchers have attempted a description of the ancestors of the present population. Thérèse Bouysse-Cassagne, from the Institut des Hautes Etudes de l’Amérique Latine, Paris, for example, engaged in a discussion dealing mainly with the linguistics of the research area since 1975. She is well known in Bolivia as a writer of books such as La Identidad Aymara (1987b), and Pacha: En torno al pensamiento Aymara (1987a) on the Aymara vision of the world. Her intention was to prove “the exact co-occurrence between language and ethnic group”, particularly amongst the “oldest groups” of Lake Titikaka (1992). She came to the conclusion that this was a very difficult task, “because the linguistic situation and the names of the groups themselves were the result of various processes of domination occurring in the region from at least the Tiwanaku era” (1992, p. 473), i.e., c. 1500 BC to 1100 AD. Nevertheless, she attempted a classification which, with the help of geologists and archaeologists, tries to illuminate our understanding of who-was-living-where going backwards in time. Still, she admits, the “Andean archaeology in which the chronology has been drawn up from the study of horizons, does not help the historian in answering the vital question: what ethnic groups were there before the Spaniards’ arrival and up to the 16th century?” (1992, p. 474). An ethnogeography is therefore proposed, presenting a succession of ancient civilisations.

The first known inhabitants, according to Bouysse-Cassagne, were the producers of the so-called Viscachani culture because, before that, “most of the Altiplano was flooded” (1992, p. 480). They lived between 8500 and 2500 BC and the associated archaeological sites are “without exception situated on ancient lake terraces and consist of settlements of hunter-gatherers” (ibid. p. 480). The sites spread out along Viscachani, located in the Department of La Paz, through Laguna Hedionda and Laguna Colorada in the southern Altiplano. Another culture thriving between 2500 and 250 BC was Wankarani, a culture of “farmers and pastoralists from the north-east of Lake Poopó, dating from 1200 BC and lasting until the 2nd century AD” (1992, p. 480).

Meanwhile, in the Titikaka area, “two distinct cultures occurred”: Chiripa, to the south of Lago Menor, between 1500 and 600 BC and “from whom the Tiwanaku culture derived”, has been detected “by the appearance of traces of agricultural activity between 500–300 BC”. The other one, the Pukara culture north of Lago Mayor, is dated from 1100–100 BC and considered responsible for the construction of ridged fields between 800 and 600 BC (1992, pp. 480–1). Bouysse-Cassagne writes that Tiwanaku replaced the Pukara people, with a well-developed agricultural sector that becomes evident with the extension of complex agricultural field patterns between 375 and 750 AD. These cultivated lands around the lake were “still in production between 750 and 1100 AD, until being abandoned at some time after the Tiwanaku V epoch” (1992, p. 481) or the “Imperial period”, i.e. c. 724 and 1172 AD according to Ponce Sanjín’s classification widely used in the archaeological discipline and quoted by Bouysse-Cassagne (1992).
Bouysse-Cassagne believes that the **Colla** people represent “on the religious and political scale”, the inheritors of the Tiwanaku tradition. They “took over the intensive cultivation of the land around the shores” of Lake Titikaka, converting them into “the last stronghold of the ancient lacustrine cultures derived from Tiwanaku” and “the ancient masters of the lake”. They seem to have exploited ridged fields “up until the arrival of the Inkas”, sometime after 1400 AD. The **Colla** people are therefore particularly interesting for the present research, both as the so-called “inheritors of the ancient masters of the lake” and as **Pukina** speaking people. Bouysse-Cassagne claims that, used as an adjective, “the term “colla” was applied both to the **Uru** and Pukina groups, but never to the Aymaras” (1992, p. 485, my emphasis). Moreover, the **Moxos** people of the Bolivian Amazonia, “mentioned as living at the edges of the Colla kingdom”, have left “some of the most spectacular traces of ridged fields”. Future archaeological work is therefore demanded by the author, in order to demonstrate “that a link existed between the hydraulic cultures of Amazonia and those of the Colla region and the lake… which if it could be shown to have a cultural unity would not be exclusively Andean, but also Amazonian” (1992, p. 486).

Bouysse-Cassagne also mentions that “the term Colla… designated populations distributed over a vast area, corresponding to a Pukina linguistic substratum, whose origins should be traced back to former cultures of the Late Intermediate Period. But submerged by successive conquests, they only figure in the form of traces in the historical records. This discussion provides insight on the overall Colla problem, but does not resolve the difficult problem of the differences between the Urus and Pukinas… The linguistic map of the 16th century proves that these two groups (a part of the **Urus** in reality) spoke the Pukina language.” (1992, pp. 487–8, my emphasis). Likewise, she claims, the language “of the Callawayas, which is still spoken to this day and which uses a Pukina substratum, is the last linguistic trace remaining of the language of the people of the lake” (1992, p. 486).

The **Lupaqas**, mentioned above, represent “the new and formidable power sprung up between the two extreme ends of the lake formed by Tiwanaku and Hatuncolla (the Colla capital)” (1992, p. 488). Bouysse-Cassagne claims that “the oral traditions of the Pacajes in the 16th century seem to explain the splitting of the chiefdoms around the lake into two factions by their different origins: one related to the **Umasuyu** (lake-dwelling people) and the other to the **Urcosuyu** (pastoralists from the mountains).” (1992, p. 488). These were the “‘Aymara-speaking migrants’ that expanded sometime in the Late Intermediate Period (c. 1100–1450 AD).” In this period, “the great Colla nation fragmented and the shores of the lake became shared among several chiefdoms” to make room for people like the Lupaqas who allied themselves with the **Inkas** (1992, p. 488). Furthermore, the Lupaqas developed three settlement patterns: (a) hilltop towns with tombs at more than 4000 m; (b) towns on flat land with tombs lying between 3812 and 4000 m; and (c) **chullpa** sites, which were tombs in the form of a circular tower, according to Bouysse-Cassagne, and were mainly funerary sites representing structures of a new type for the region, replacing the ceremonial structures of Tiwanaku. These sites, she claims, were abandoned during the Inka invasion around 1450 and “the lake culture, for a while still controlled by the Collas, gradually withered away and fell into fragments” (1992, pp. 490–1).

The **Inka** period, according to Bouysse-Cassagne, “corresponds to a new model of land occupation which, for the historian, proves to be more complex than the previous uses and makes it even more difficult to identify the ethnic groups who were the inheritors of the ancient lake traditions” (1992, p. 491). The change in the settlement pattern seems to be associated to a period of very high lake levels when a “complete infrastructure of roads (which probably used the ancient tracks) was set in place, as well as new religious and administrative centres. In the Lupaca region, the Copacabana Peninsula and the islands of the Sun and the Moon became sites of imperial pilgrimage, that took over from the ancient sanctuaries of the Urus and Pukinas such as that of Titicaca Island… Hatuncolla became capital of the province… and none of the sites dating from this period was situated on hills. All of the population was again on the plains and consequently on the borders of the lake… The most immediate consequence of these changes in land occupation was without doubt the subjection in certain regions at least of people belonging to the Urus and Pukinas, by Aymara populations’ (1992, pp. 491–2, my emphasis).
This general presentation of a panorama previous to the arrival of the Spanish conquistadors is closely intertwined with the explanation on the outcome of the discovery of such human settlers in 1492 that the Spanish chroniclers wrote about. This is also valid for the concept of “America”, and I deal with both in what follows.

The Spaniards portray as from the initial contacts

What did the Spaniards portray as a consequence of the initial contacts? Upon arrival to the new world, it is possible to perceive how the Spaniards, e.g. the soldier Pedro Cieza de León, felt the need to urgently describe what they understood should be in a chronicle:

…And, pulling myself together… I decided to spend some time of my life in writing history. For this, the following were the causes: …that memory of things is consumed by time in such a way that, if it is not because of traces and subtle ways, no true news of what happened will be available in the future.

(Cieza de León, Preface, 2000[1553], mt)

1492 was the year when Spain, formerly the Roman Hispania, proclaimed the recovery of the last piece of territory occupied for more than seven centuries by the Moors, and also launched a daring enterprise by funding Christopher Columbus’ initial travel to what, he argued, would be a new route to the “Western Indies”. It was a time when Europe had already begun to experience the winds of change that the literature describes as a process from a period termed as medieval, to the period known as the Renaissance. The realisation that a *New World* was discovered accelerated changes both in the “old” continent and in the “new” lands.

The early descriptions portray the immense impact on the conquistadors by the view of new things. The first images come from the diaries that Christopher Columbus (1451?–1506) himself wrote, after the events of October 12, 1492 when he reached first Guanahaní, which he called San Salvador, present day Watling in the Bahamas. Shortly after (December 5), he founded Hispaniola or La Española, a large island between Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Antilles. It is well known that the declared aim of the enterprise was not only to reach the Indies through the West, trying to prove that the roundness of the earth would allow reaching the Far East in this way, but also to obtain treasures, mainly gold. For this, the Spanish kingdom united by Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, backed the enterprise claiming their intention of propagating the Christian religion. Already the day following the discovery, October 13, 1492, Columbus wrote in his diary: “I do not want to stop but to strike and reach many islands in search of gold” (*No me quiero detener por calar y andar muchas islas para fallar oro*, Todorov, 1987, p. 18). However, he also believed as many then did, in the existence of Cyclops and mermaids (*Diaries of November, 1492 and January, 1493*, in Todorov 1987, p. 24) who populated the distant waters and, based on these prejudices, called cannibals the “Indians” (ibid. 1987, pp. 38–9). He showed his state of fascination by what he found and, apparently, he was more interested in “the beauty and freshness of those lands wherever he ventured himself” (*Diaries 27.11.1492*, in: Todorov 1987, p. 33), than in human beings and behaviour.

Communication, of course, was part of the problem as previously unheard languages were also included in the new experience and so the Indians were part of that landscape and as such were described, “among birds and trees” (Todorov 1987, p. 41). Columbus’s first impression is expressed in these words: “Then came naked people …” (*Luego vinieron gente desnuda… Diaries 12.10.1492*, in: Todorov 1987, p. 44). The physical nakedness of the Indians, i.e. lack of clothes will soon be connected to a series of flaws: lack of culture, lack of customs, rites, religion: “It seemed to me that these people were poor in every respect… It seemed to me that they had no sect at all… These people are very gentle and very timorous, naked as I said, without weapons and without law.” (Ibid. p. 44, mt). The consequences of this view would soon be clear: they all look “alike”, they have no “language”; they are, in short, part of the nature. This is going to bear on the resulting relationship between “conquerors” and “natives” as the difficulties to accept a different “human substance” will make it impossible to understand the existence of beings that are not just an “imperfect state of the self” (Todorov 1987, p. 50). One of the obvious impacts is exemplified in the change, later on, of his name
from Christopher (Christophorus) to Cristóbal, by reference to Christ and, from Columbus to Colón as his last name, clearly connecting it to the word colonial, a pun so common in our days (Todorov 1987, p. 34). All the same, Columbus had made it clear that he was in search of gold; therefore he was not interested in human beings. However, together with the gold he could find in his first trip, he had also kidnapped natives to show to the Spanish court and later, in 1495, some 1600 Arawaks were captured, 550 of whom were taken to Spain as slaves, seemingly to the horror of the monarchs.

Continuing farther into the “Indies”, the Spaniards moved southwards, discovering places such as Venezuela in 1498, the Amazonas and Brazil region in 1500, Florida and the Isthmus of Panamá in 1513. It is only when Vasco Núñez de Balboa (1475–1517) was exploring and incorporating the Isthmus of Panamá into the Spanish possessions that he first glimpsed the Pacific Ocean, which he called the “South Sea” in 1513. Francisco Pizarro (1478–1541), the famous conqueror of Peru, was Balboa’s chief lieutenant by that time (Lockhart 1972, p. 4). Pizarro had ventured into the Pacific coasts already in 1524 but the actual conquest took place between 1531 and 1532, once he obtained the official authorisation from the Spanish crown to conquer Peru.

The Italian Amerigo Vespucci, known as Américo Vespucio in Spain, while travelling along the coasts of the “Indies” between 1499 and 1502, realised that this was not Asia but a different continent. For the first time, the world, or rather the “habitable earth” (oikoumenê), begun to be perceived as discrete, distinct “earth” and not the “one continuous continent” that had, so far, been perceived. However, only after the geographer and cartographer Martin Hylacomylus Waldseemüller wrote his Cosmographiae Introductio cum quibusdam geometriae ac astronomiae principiis ad eam rem necessariis, insuper quatuor Americi Vespucii navigations in 1507, did Vespucci’s name begin to be used for the new continent designated for the first time as Americi terra vel America, even after the geographer tried in vain to rectify his mistake by writing on his maps that it was Columbus who discovered the New World (see Fig. II.2).

Another chronicler who widens the perspective we get from Columbus, is the above mentioned Pedro Cieza de León (1518?–1554). Known as the “Prince of Chroniclers of the Indies”, he was a soldier who wrote between 1540 and 1550, carefully trying to portray the lands, people, customs and traditions of the “Indies” he had reached already in 1535. His “Chronicle of Peru” (La Crónica del Perú) contains 121 chapters describing “wars and discoveries and settlements of people… of the memorable and great kingdom of Perú, to which I came by land from the province of Cartagena and Popayán [from the North], where I have been for many years’ (2000 [1553], p. 55, mt). Cieza de León describes cannibalism and nakedness as well as sacrifices of “lambs and sheep”, meaning llamas and alpacas, the local ruminants, and of “some children” (2000, p. 78). He mentions the decrease in local demography connected to the arrival of the Spaniards but also that, at the same time, many Spaniards were dying as a consequence of, for example, trying food that was previously unknown to them while attempting to enter a territory “full of lords and caciques of the Indians” and where women were “beautiful and lovely” (2000, p. 88). He describes how gold could be found in almost every river as he mentions, in passing, black slaves that were already taken to the continent. With amazement, he lets us know how “to drink, to dance and to sing” was an ability carried out “at the same time” (2000, p. 133) and, as he approaches Cusco, he will also notice the custom of changing intentionally the shape of heads as much as the variety that could be found, relating this to “the lineage and the provinces where the Indians come from” (2000, p. 184). Furthermore, the noblemen will be called from then on, Orejones, that is “big ears”, due to the fact that they adorned their ear lobes with cone shaped ornaments that, by perforating the lobe, progressively enlarged it. Cieza de León also mentions how the “general language of the ingas” (Inka), i.e. the Qhishwa, was imposed upon the population and that the parents were to be punished in case they would fail to teach it to their children while retaining their own particular languages. In this respect, the Dominican Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás (1499–1571), is said to have been influential in the first years of colonisation and evangelism, as he is attributed the first Quechua or Qhishwa language studies in early colonial times (Cieza de León 2000, p. 249), and authored a Gramática on Quechua language in 1560. Another language
is also noted by Cieza: *Aymara*. He claims that this was spoken mainly by people of the so-called *Kollasuyu* area, the southern part of the *Tawantinsuyo* or “four-part division” of the Inka territory.

The Inka system and organisation made, as could be expected, yet another great impression on people such as Cieza, who wrote: “In these lands people don’t eat each other nor are they as mean as some of the naturals of the provinces that I have already described” (*Por estas tierras no se comen los unos a los otros ni son tan malos como algunos de los naturales de las provincias que en lo de atrás tengo escrito*. 2000, p. 185). Many buildings, particularly those belonging to the upper classes, which Cieza calls “nobility”, are already in ruins by the time he travels along the Andes, but he is able to appreciate the old grandeur that they once had, as he describes where “the golden sheep and other grandness that were sculpted on the walls” (2000, p. 186) would have been placed before the Spaniards destroyed them. He believes that, as they were “built in nice stone and first class construction, they will last for long time and through the ages without wearing away.” (2000, p. 191). Cieza remarks that the “inga” architecture differs from other local buildings which were “square”, whereas the Inka were “long and narrow” (2000, p. 314).

In describing Cuzco, Cieza mentions what he then calls “lineages” from where the “most principal *Orejones*” (2000, p. 225) came from, that is, the territorial division in moieties called *Hanan* – *hanancuzcos* – or upper part, and *Urin* – *orencuzcos* – or lower part, apparently spread all over the Andes. This is still commonly found under the name of *Anansaya* (or *Aransaya*) and *Urinsaya* in Quechua language; otherwise *Alax-saya* and *Mansa-saya* in Aymara language, markers of, as some would claim, status within the local cosmology but also as ways of organising the landscape. The origins of such dual division are not known and, as Gasparini & Margolies put it, “[i]t almost seems as though it had always existed, from the moment that the people cultivating the high-altitude lands realized they could not survive without certain controls and contacts with the lowlands and vice versa. The dual division could have originated from the need to establish contact between the different ecological zones. The two parts meet in a symbolically agreeable place, * tinkuy, which does not exclude rivalries because the division was associated with very clear-cut power structures” (1980, p. 58).

Cieza also refers to particular traits of the Inka social organisation which he compares to those of the ancient Rome, such as temples where virgin women called *Mamaconas*, were raised and kept for different duties such as service in the temple of the Sun or weaving royal clothing (2000, p. 225). *Mitimaes* (Sp.) or *Mitma-kuna* (Q.) are also mentioned and described as those who were transferred by the Inka, together with their families, from one place to another, becoming thus truly colonists who settled as farmers or herders in new conquered territories, and learned the Quechua or Qhishwa language under Inka administration. This seemed to be an effective way of keeping under control both the locals and the colonists as stated in the following quotation: “…and in this way had these lords secured the empire [with people] that would not rebel against them, and the provinces well supplied and fed as most of them were, as I said, in the territories of others. But they [the Inka] had also arranged, in order not to be abhorred by the locals, that the naturals would keep their lords and caciques as well as their heirs…” (2000, p. 187).

From not even knowing that this was a “new world”, as was the case for Columbus who believed the peaks of Cuba to be the Himalayas, by the time Cieza de León visited the area (1540–1550), some catholic priests, particularly the Dominican, had already learned the local languages to preach among the natives, so that they “easily learn the mistake in which they were living, and as a consequence, they adopt our holy faith” (2000, p. 196). No doubt, the steps towards the creation of a relationship between centre and periphery, a civilised world and a barbarian world were at work and America, although a new world, showed up similarities with the old with its mixture of what was already seen as ranging from highly civilised to barbarian elements.

*Bernabé Cobo* (1580–1657), a Jesuit scholar and Andalusian by birth, spent most of his adult life in the New World. As the translator of his work, John Howland Rowe, puts it: “he provides a synthesis of Inka history and culture, based largely on sixteenth-century manuscripts, many of which have been lost since he wrote” (1983, p. xi). His *History of the Inca Empire,*
written c. 1653, is an interesting collection of ‘theories concerning the origin of the Indians’, together with ‘detailed descriptions of the Indians, their environment, and ancient ruins and monuments’ (ibid. 1983, p. xix). It is interesting to note how he portrays such origins and reasons why the ‘Inca kings became such great lords and conquered so many provinces and nations’ (Cobo 1983, p. 186). Cobo mentions that, among others, “these Incas proposed… an imaginary idea that they held and feigned at first; namely, that from the Universal Flood only the first Inca and his brothers and sisters escaped in the cave called Pacarictampu and that from them the world was populated; on the basis of this they had a thousand fables and foolish stories; finally, whatever the case may be, they stated that all people originated from them and their descendants and that for this reason everyone must obey and serve them and this was everyone’s obligation” (1983, p. 187). Being a Jesuit, Cobo derided this and called it an imaginary idea as for him, Adam and Eve and the Bible were the only and true version of the origin of the world. This might look like “fables and foolish stories” to people like Cobo but, interestingly enough, it will help in our understanding on how Uru people came to represent “the first inhabitants of the region”.

Cobo also refers to the making of provisions by the Inca kings, as he calls them, claiming that the entire empire was composed of many and very different nations (1983, p. 189, my emphasis), yet it “was a single republic, governed by the same laws, privileges, and customs, and it was observant of the same religion, rites, and ceremonies; however, before being brought under Inca rule, the several nations had their own common law and a different way of living and governing themselves” (1983, p. 189, my emphasis). This is why the “first thing that these kings did when they won a province was to take out of it six or seven thousand families… and send them to other parts of the quiet and peaceful provinces… and in exchange they put the same number of other people, who were made to leave the places where the first were settled, or from wherever the Incas wished, and among them were many orejones of noble blood” (1983, p. 189). These are the so called mitimaes mentioned by Cieza (above) but, according to Cobo, the people “who were moved by the Inca in this way were relieved from obedience to their former caciques, and they were ordered to submit to the rule of the caciques of the lands where they were placed; and there it was ordered that both types of mitimaes be given places to build homes and lands in which to prepare their chacaras and plant their crops, and they were to remain there as perpetual residents of the towns where they were placed; and they were to follow the practices and way of life of the local people, except that they retained the dress, emblems, and symbols of the people from their nation or province…” (1983, p. 190, my emphasis). It is also interesting to note Cobo’s remarks: “In the process of moving the mitimaes, no thought was given to the distance that there was from their lands to where they were ordered to go, even though it was very great… It is a proven fact that the Indians of different provinces were so mixed and thrown together that there is hardly a valley or town throughout Peru where some ayllo and tribal group of mitimaes would not be found” (1983, p. 192, my emphasis). These are important details to which I will return.

Cobo also explains that these instructions helped in the provision of food not available locally, such as maize, and this is another reason why for “the inhabitants of these provinces, the Inca had picked out lands which lie in the hot valleys of the seacoast on one side and on the other side of the mountains toward the Andes; in these temperate valleys they plant the crops that they lack in their own lands” (1983, p. 192). It is these people “although they lived in the land of others”, who “were under the jurisdiction of their own caciques, and not those of the land where they resided” (1983, pp. 192–3). This, upon arrival of the Spaniards, will lead to misunderstandings and changes in status such as relieving people from the obedience to their former caciques only to put them “under the control of the caciques in whose jurisdiction and land they were living”, being additionally “entrusted to the same encomendero to whom the district in question was parcelled out and not to the encomendero of the cacicazgo of which they were natives” (1983, p. 193 – see Glossary for encomendero).

Cobo confirms, furthermore, that these instructions were also accompanied by the imposition of the new language: “they expected all of the nations of the kingdom to learn the language of Cuzco, which in this way came to be the general language of all Peru…; great care was taken in this and the natives were compelled to learn, for the Incas obliged everyone to
accept their language, laws and religion, along with all the opinions related to these matters that were established in Cuzco…” (1983, p. 191, my emphasis).

By trying to explain how the Incas organized the people whom they subjugated into towns, we are informed that “before they were governed by the Incas, the Peruvian Indians did not have towns… they lived in small groups and dwellings, generally located on hills and slopes, as a defence against the attacks that they made on each other. When the Inca subjugated a province he obliged the inhabitants to leave their former dwellings and come down from the high and rugged places where they lived to other more appropriate places that were designated for them, and there they were to settle and live as a community under the authority of superiors who were put in charge of them” (1983, p. 194). But then, Cobo adds: “It is true that, although we give the name of “towns” to these settlements or groups of huts into which the vassals of the Incas were organised, the name “town” is appropriate only by comparison with the groups of dwellings where they lived before; in fact, ordinarily these places were so small and poorly designed (except for the provincial capitals, which were usually larger and better constructed) that they did not even resemble our most humble villages” (1983, p. 194).

By dividing the territories according to what was made in Cusco, namely Hanan Cuzco and Hurin Cuzco or the upper and the lower district, the Incas denoted, as Cobo states, “inequality between these two groups” (1983, p. 195) in the sense that “with this division of ayllos and tribal groups… his vassals… would not join together in order to promote uprisings… since they were men of opposing factions and opinions” (1983, p. 195). Furthermore, this would “give their subjects occasion for competition and rivalry in the jobs and work that they were ordered to perform… the Incas knew by this means who were the most diligent in serving them on the occasions that came up in peace and war because… the people of one group did not mix with the people of the other one; and in the fiestas and public festivities, each group took great pains to distinguish themselves and perform better than their rivals in the inventions and festive dress that they came up with” (1983, p. 196). Furthermore, this implied that the vassals were not permitted to move from one province to another of their own free will. The men and women of each nation and province had their insignias and emblems by which they could be identified, and they could not go around without this identification or exchange their insignias for those of another nation, or they would be severely punished. They had this insignia on their clothes with different stripes and colours, and the men wore their most distinguishing insignia on their heads; each nation was identified by the headdress; they all had long hair. The Colla Indians wore tight-fitting wool caps, which were cone-shaped because they moulded their heads that way; and their women wore pointed hoods, similar in shape to the hoods of friars. They were so well known by these insignia that on seeing any Indian or when any Indian came before him, the Inca would notice what nation and province the Indian was from. Since all the Indians were beardless and of the same colour, aspect, and features, and since they used the same language and dressed the same way, it would be impossible to distinguish each nation in any other way (1983, pp. 196–7).

The impact on the Spaniards is noticeable in these texts. It can even be posited that it was rather beyond words, those metaphors we use to describe in what we call history and, by the same token, facts. By realising not only that a New World was discovered, but also new people, different and with their own traditions, they were, in a way, preceding all modern anthropological work whereby observation, description and classification has led, from the Spanish chroniclers to people like Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, to write about “tribes” and “primitive societies”, as well as more recently about “ethnics”, “ethnicity” thus deriving terms such as ethnology and ethnography.

The case of the native “Americans” is even more paradigmatic: once designated as “Indians” by the Spaniards, this became a label that, as definitions do, classified them in relation to Europeans. Such labels are still the subject of long and bitter disputes as the term is pejorative and implies colonial relationships. Furthermore, the term Americans is nowadays used mainly for and by the people of the United States (of America); the rest of the continental population is forced to be specific: either they should come from South America or from Central America. The Indians, it seems, are seen as those living in these “other” Americas and, to this, add the social differences created not only in respect of descent but also in terms of what
some anthropologists call “ethnic markers” (Barstow 1979, p. 135, Abercrombie 1998, p. 451/fn 12) such as language, dress, and traditions. I will return to this later.

However, changes in whatever that existed before the Spaniards arrived were inevitable so that, in a matter of few years, in 1553, we are told by Cieza de León the following which, from a more general perspective, will become a recurrent topic in classical anthropology with its claim for the urgent need of collecting information and writing ethnographies on people “about to disappear” (Poole 2005, i.a.):

Afterwards, most of the population disappeared, and the natives left their old land. Running away from Spanish cruelty, many of them left for brave and high mountains… situated above this valley. (Cieza de León, Cap. XV, 2000, p. 110, mt)

The origins of Andes and Bolivia

What is the origin of the concepts Andes and Bolivia? The name Andes comes from the Spanish conquistadors who reached the Andean region only by the end of 1532. The word Andes comes from Antisuyu, which became “Andesuyo” in the Spanish chronicles, and this was part of the eastern region of the Tawantinsuyu or “four-quarter division” in which the Inka organised the territory. The other quarters were: Chinchaysuyu to the north, Kuntisuyu or “Condesuyo” to the west, and Kollasuyu or “Collasuyo” to the south. According to Cobo, these names were taken from “the most important provinces included in each one of them” (1983, p. 185); thus the Anti, the Chincha, the Kunti, and the Qulla or Colla (in its Hispanicised form), were “the great provinces” included in each of the quarters mentioned: “and by these names they meant all the land conquered by the Incas that fell in each of those quarters” (1983, p. 185).

Looking for the attractive richness in gold and precious metals that the Inka would possess, the Spaniards rapidly invaded Cusco in present Peru and gained in this way what is now known as the Bolivian territory. The Spanish colonial territories of the 16th century fought for their liberty in different ways and at different moments and eventually in the early 19th century (1825), Bolivia was able to declare its independence, taking its name after Simón Bolívar, the most famous fighter for colonial liberation in those days.

Bolivia is now a landlocked country, placed at the heart of the South American continent (see Figs. 1.a & 1.b). The various disciplines contributing to an understanding of the past in this area, inform us that the Spaniards found people organised in many naciones as they called them, from the perspective of their differing “languages, customs and rites” (Cobo [1653] 1983, p. 9). Among the main languages they described in their chronicles were Aymara and Quechua and they designated people after the name of their languages, thus calling them Aymara or Quechua nations or naciones. Qhishwa, or more commonly Quechua, was the name they gave to the language the Inka and his people were speaking when the Spaniards arrived. There is a discussion in the academic world today on whether the Inka and his peers were actually Aymara speaking when they expanded their control over territories (Cerrón-Palomino 2003). Whatever the case, it has been argued (Murra 1987) that Qhishwa was rather the name of a geographical area – a valley or a slope – where maize was cultivated, and since this was particularly done under Inka rule, the people found by the Spaniards were named after this, that is Qhishwa or Quechua in the Hispanicised form.

Bolivia, generally speaking, is not only “Andean”, nor is its population only Aymaras, Quechuas or thirty or more “ethnically” classified lowland groups (Albó 1989, 1995, 2000). Bolivia is, as anywhere else, a mixture. The main divide is between what is called rural and urban worlds where the rural is seen as inhabited mostly by “the natives” (Aymaras, Quechuas or the inhabitants of lowlands). They are perceived, as in other places, as traditional societies, as peasants and as some sort of lower class. The urban world is, in turn, seen as populated by the so-called whites in the eyes of both the natives and the urban people themselves. These whites speak Spanish, are rarely fluent in any of the native languages, live in what is regarded as modern world societies that appear as cosmopolitan as many towns and cities all over the globe. They tend to see the natives as an-other kind of people, living in different worlds, having different customs, traditions and, this is obvious, different languages. The natives are, in turn,
portrayed by some of their leaders as “oppressed” in respect of those seen as whites, and some
of these differences might appear as evident to some but, even then, it becomes a matter of
meeting people from one or the other part of the divide and, therefore, of having been told on
how to tell “white” from “Indian”.

Spanish language, being dominant, is compulsory to interact in the urban areas, such as the
main cities. The reverse could be stated for at least some of the rural areas where Aymara and
Quechua are widely spoken in the Andes and, together with migration, it has spread to the
valleys and the lowlands as well. The so-called Tupi-Guarani family of languages are found
mainly in the lowlands, where the rest of the other “thirty ethnic groups” the anthropologists
claim to exist in Bolivia are living. However, Spanish has become not only the
lingua franca
but also an important symbol of status as much as of identity all over Bolivia, particularly for
those who were not born with it as their mother tongue. Incidentally, other communities such as
immigrant Jews, Germans, and Arabs (the latter generally called “Turkish” people), have also
adopted Spanish in addition to their original languages and would only exceptionally learn the
so-called native languages.

Aymara speaking people seem to have inhabited different parts of the territory when the
Inka expansion began, according to the archaeological record, sometime between the 13th and
the 16th centuries. They might have been there, as much as other linguistic communities, for
thousands of years, adapting to the difficult conditions of the plateau and developing subsistence
strategies that led them to be characterised as herdiers and farmers. One of the most outstanding
local developments, Tiwanaku (c. 200 BC –1200 AD), was seemingly the result of such efforts.
Today, Quechuas and Aymaras are seen as a single Andean cultural group expressed in two
different but related languages (Albó et al. 1989, p. 21; 2000). There is still much debate about
from where they come, as well as on their apparent connections with the lowland areas of the
continent and what is known as the Amazons region today.

Another group of people, referred to as Uru or Uros by the Spanish chroniclers, were
described as “different from Aimaraes” (Alvarez 1998) in the early 16th century. Alvarez wrote
about them between 1587 and 1588, claiming that they had “little science or none of it in terms
of curiosity, for they do not remember nor know how to explain where did they come from. It is
claimed by these Uru people that they were the first inhabitants of the land, and that Aimaraes –
in their expansion – reached them in lagoons, valleys with plenty of water… where lots of roots
was there to feed them” (1998 [1588], pp. 390–400, mt). Today, there are people who handle
water resources for their subsistence in the Bolivian Plateau and irrigate lands whenever they
have access to them, dedicating much effort, for many of these lands are rather poor and
gradually becoming desertic. Some of these people have been called “people of the water”, as I
have already mentioned, Kot’suins or Jas-shoni, in what has been termed Uru-Chipaya or
Uruquilla language. They are seen as a group that apparently managed to survive turmoils, such
as Inka and pre-Inka as well as colonial Spanish and, afterwards, the Republican regime.
Aymara speaking people of the Andes still use the derogatory term Chulpapu-chu (‘ancient
remains’), my translation from Aymara language) to portray them as “pre-solar age” rejects, or
those who were not expected to be part of today’s mankind. Their historical and archaeological
identity is one of the subjects of this investigation.
CHAPTER III

THE URUS

‘… y como somos pobres uros yndefenso hasen lo que quieren el daño y agravio’
(… and as we are poor unprotected uros they do as they please, the damage and the offence). In:

The sources

There is a wealth of literature on the people called Uru and this provides two main sources of
information: (a) colonial chronicles, i.e. written accounts from the first years of the Spanish
conquest, and (b) ethnographic and historical works on the Uru identity and other ‘‘people of
the water’’, written mostly within the perspective of the anthropological discipline in the last
century.

I will concentrate on a few of the contributions to help understand the present state of the art
on the so-called ethnic group, the Urus. In addition, I comment on the implications of an
anthropological macro-narrative based on ethnography, involving attempts to create taxonomies
and universals (Banks 1996; Fabian 1991, 1983).

Colonial sources

Who are these Urus? Based on the information compiled here and in the previous chapters, I
answer this question by first attempting a trace back to information found in the early Spanish
Chronicles, also known as Crónicas de Indias.

As explained elsewhere in this text, deliberate attempts were made by the Christian invaders
to destroy all information relating to the pre-Columbian past in the Andes. According to these
sources, the newcomers believed that the best thing to do was to christen the local people and
isolate them from their heathen customs, while exacting tributes from these new members of the
Spanish realm. One of the most organised attempts to accomplish these goals was the one called
extirpación de idolatrías or ‘‘extirpation of idolatries’’ (Albornoz 1967 [1587]; Guaman Poma de
Ayala 1988 [1612–1616]; Duviols 1976, 2003; Taylor 2001; Varon Gabai 1990 i.a.)
involving the thorough removal of what was seen as pagan beliefs but that, from another angle,
may well be seen as their history. This was to be replaced by that of the Catholic Church and the
traditions of the Spanish in particular. Interestingly, this resulted in the local people being given
a chance to adopt the new system in manners that would avoid conflicts with the Spaniards, as
we shall see later. As it happened, the Spaniards provided a privileged source of early written
information on the past of people and lands as they saw and began to conquer them. They
described in detail what they understood were the local beliefs and traditions, and the way
people reacted to the new dispositions. Accordingly, the early references to the local people,
particularly those called Uros, Oros, Urus or vros, have to be used critically.
Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa, for example, is one of the first chroniclers who mention an “Oro ayllu”\(^1\) in his *Historia de los Incas* of 1572 (quoted in Zuidema 1964, p. 100). Another chronicler, Cristóbal de Molina, known as “El Cuzqueño”, mentioned “the other Uros” as a third ayllu of *Chinchaysuyu*, in his *Fábulas y ritos de los Incas* of 1573 (quoted in Zuidema 1964, pp. 101). The way in which the word Uru was used in these accounts about the Incas hints at an understanding of these people as the original population in a particular region (ibid. 1964, p. 100).

Between 1571 and 1574, Juan López de Velasco wrote a *Geografía y descripción universal de las Indias*, a text compiled by this cosmographer-chronicler and published in the Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Madrid for the first time only in 1894. On page 505, he is quoted saying that the Urus are on the shores of this lagoon (Titicaca) [and they are] the largest population of Indians of the Collao, which they call indios Uros, useless and idle people because they would rather prefer the fish and fowl of the lagoon, and the *tobora* which is the root of some reeds that grow on the shores of the lagoon as small palms, good as food, with which pigs are fattened up (quoted in Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, p. 101, mt).

In 1576, Licenciado don Juan Matienzo referred to “vros”, i.e. *Uros* in two different paragraphs in his *Gobierno del Perú*:

The vro Indians are fishermen, they usually live in the great lagoon of Chucuito and in others, they do not sow nor subsist but on what they fish and on fowl that they kill in the lagoon, and of *tobora* which is the root of some reeds that grow on the shores of the lagoon as small palms, good as food, with which pigs are fattened up (quoted in Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, p. 101, mt).

Joseph de Acosta wrote a *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* in 1590, where the following was said in respect of “Uros”:

[lake Titicaca] breeds a great deal of a type of reed called Tótora by the Indians, which is used in a thousand ways, because it is food for pigs, and for horses, and for men themselves; and from this they make houses, and fire, and boat, and whatever else: so much can Uros take from their Tótora. These Uros are so brutal that they do not see themselves as men. It is said that when asked who they were, they answered that they were not men but Uros, as if it were another genre of animals. Entire populations of Uros were found, dwelling in the lagoon on their Tótora rafts, which were linked to each other and tied to some sort of rock, and it happened that they moved a whole population away to another place; in this way, when looking for them at the place where they were one day, no trace could be found neither of them nor of their villages (quoted in Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, pp. 96–7, mt).

In 1597, Balthasar Ramírez wrote what he called *Descripción del reyno del Pirú, del sitio, temple, provincias, obispados y ciudades; de los naturales, de sus lenguas y traje*. This is old Spanish, the translation of which would mean “Description of the kingdom of Peru, of the site, temple, provinces, bishops and cities; of the naturals, of their languages and attire”. He said the following about Urus:

The vro Indians are people who live in the lagoons, as in the lagoon of Chucuito and of Paria and in other places. These [Urus] build their houses on the water over some reed rafts that are called totora in Pirú, and tule in New Spain; these rafts develop roots in the underneath after a while, and they twine together thus becoming grass or turf so that, by pouring some soil over it, they sow some petty things that they eat afterwards. They subsist on fish from the lagoons which is abundant though not so good; and these houses sometimes shelter thirty to forty neighbours, more or less, in line with their arrangements; the wind moves them back and forth. They do not dress properly and, apart from the

---

\(^1\) An *ayllu* is understood as an extended family or lineage believed to have a common ancestor (Cf. Glossary of the Thesis). See next Chapter on the fieldwork experience.
fish, they eat whatever they can possibly steal from the people living in firm land; they are rude and coarse and almost brutish people. They were not used to pay tribute nor serve, and at the time of the general visit of Don Francisco de Toledo [Viceroy of Peru], they were registered in the census and ordered to settle out of the water, so that they pay tribute and serve, and live under doctrine and some sort of harmony (in: Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, p. 96, mt).

By the end of the 16th century (1598), we find R. P. Anello Oliva, a priest repeatedly quoted since to him was attributed one of the most infamous descriptions of Urus in his Historia del Reino y Provincias del Perú, de sus Incas Reyes, descubrimiento y conquista por los Españoles de la Corona de Castilla, con otras singularidades concernientes a la Historia. An English translation of the title would be “History of the Kingdom and Provinces of Peru, of its Inca Kings, discovery and conquest by the Spaniards of the Crown of Castilla, and other peculiarities regarding their History”, where we can read the infamous quotation:

… [Inka Sinchi Roca] ordered… to the useless ones, that is the Uros who are uncouth and useless, that each give a monthly tribute [tasa] of one tube of lice, so that no one should be idle (in: Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, p. 96, mt).

Confirming this version, Diego González de Holguín, in his Vocabulario dela lengua general de todo el Peru llamada lengua Quichua o del Inca of 1608, mentioned that the Incas called these people Uru, which this author translated as worm or maggot, because they “considered that the Uru were fit for paying their tribute [tasa] only in lice” (Zuidema 1964, p. 100, mt). As we can see, Anello Oliva, though infamous, had mentioned the reasons for such a disposition in 1598.

In the early 17th century, we find yet additional accounts by people such as Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas (Historia General de los hechos de los Castellanos en las islas y tierra firme del Mar Océano written between 1601–1615), or Padre Fray Alonso Ramos Gavilán (Historia del célebre santuario de Nuestra Senora de Copacabana y sus Milagros, e invención de la cruz de Carabuco, written in 1621). However, it should be realised that they have started repeating the previous versions with similar ideas but different words.

Nevertheless, it is interesting to note what Fray Antonio de la Calancha wrote in the two different quotations that I transcribe below, since he will also be quoted often in relation to the later written sources:

In Corónica moralizada del orden de San Agustín en el Peru, con sucesos egemplares vistos en esta monarquía of 1639, he said the following:

… there is a town called Toledo, four leagues to the west of Challacollo where Indians are polished, competent, politicians, clean and fairly presentable; most of these Indians are rich people, because they have many lots of cattle; they came from other provinces where the Inga [Inca] had them settled, so that they would be the masters of those Uros, but he was unable (and neither were the religious men) to make good use of soap to whiten an Ethiopian; a little less barbarians today, they still live without policía…; they are fraudulent Indians, ungrateful and deprived of love feelings. Long ago I used to hear the following saying in that Province: From Uro Indian no human should be certain [De Indio Uro, ningun onbre esté seguro- sic]… (in: Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, pp. 97–8, mt).

In Corónica moralizada de la Provincia del Perú del orden de San Agustín nuestro padre, of 1653 Antonio de la Calancha said:

…Those fishermen of the Lagoon [Titicaca], and the islanders of the archipelago, are belligerent, aggressive, haughty, inconstant, vile, maniac, reckless people… most of them dislike intensely the Spaniards, and are not attracted in the least by the law of the Gospel… (in: Créqui & Rivet 1925–7, p. 99, mt).

Considering the many negative adjectives that were used together in these (partially quoted) descriptions, it is actually no wonder that these “fishermen” intensely disliked the Spaniards.

Both Sarmiento’s (1572) and Molina’s (1573) writings were contemporary with Viceroy Francisco de Toledo’s visita or census (see Glossary) of 1572–1575, to which I will frequently refer below. It is claimed that this Viceroy
classified the population of the region into two groups and assessed them separately. One group, almost without exception labelled Uru, was assessed at a rate roughly half that of the other group. Where both groups co-occurred, the group with a higher rate of assessment was labelled Aymara; the two groups contrasted as well in terms of the goods they were expected to contribute… (in: Julien 1987, p. 55, my emphasis).

This assessment has been quoted in almost every text that deals with Urus, thus marking from this early colonial period the generally low status attributed to such population. Therefore, what we see during the first hundred years of the colonisation is the development of a basic division of Indians; they start by dividing them into two groups of which the lower one, i.e. the one less useful for the Spaniards is labelled Uro. (See Fig. III.1)

The Urus as categories

From the above colonial descriptions, an initial trait becomes evident: Uru is used as a category of people for tribute purposes. Before trying to extricate why were they seen as “uncouth and useless” (Anello Oliva, 1598 quoted above), I will investigate what kind of people was included into this category. According to the tasa or tribute (see Glossary) of Viceroy Toledo’s census, they were Aymara speakers but also Puquina (or Pukina) and Uruquilla speakers. The priest for the parish into which the Urus were to belong within Toledan tasa, was required to speak these languages but not specifically one of them (Julien 1987, p. 53). Therefore, a classification as Uru in the tasa does not appear to have been based on language, although Uruquilla was apparently the Uru language (Torero 1992).

Another aspect to which we can also refer is the one connecting Uru people to fishing, hunting and gathering occupations, but also the references to their poverty, their comparatively rudimentary cultural materials, and their marginalization by a majority consisting of farmers and herders (Julien 1987, p. 57). Where were tributaries classified as Uru? According to the Toledan tasa, they were found in the following provinces: Aullagas-Uruquillas, Carangas, the part of Soras and Charcas near Lake Poopó, the two Pacajes provinces, the Lupaca province with Copacabana, the four Colla provinces, and the southern part of Canas and Canchis province. The Spanish city district territories were also important in the setting of the tasa, and Uru tributaries were found in parts of La Plata, La Paz and Cuzco (Julien 1987, p. 69).

As it was noted from the colonial sources, the group labelled Uru was assessed at a rate half that of the other group by Toledo’s census of 1572–5. This concept of a discounted rate for Uru tributaries may have been borrowed with the classification from the Inca system, and this classification may have been based on Inca judgement being possible that the Incas adapted some kind of local classification to the needs of their empire, just as Toledo did (Julien 1987, pp. 86–7). The reasons for the Incas classifying people in these ways are unknown. The “two for one” concept seems to have been used in assigning tributaries to the mining areas, as when sending Uru tributaries to Potosí two Urus were counted as one Aymara. This rule of thumb may have been behind the statement found in Mercado de Peñalosa in 1885 by the corregidor of Pacajes that “two Urus counted as one Aymara” in 1586 (Julien 1987, p. 87, footnote 17). If the number of ethnically identified Uru was smaller than the number of people classified as Uru for tribute purposes by Toledo, the Incas included people in the Uru tribute category who had not been perceived as Uru by local standard. We know that in principle, the naming as such corresponds to Inca practice, adapted to the need within the Spanish administration to describe and define a larger part of the population (ibid. p. 87).

In the late sixteenth-century, Aymara was used to refer to both a language and to a group of people. References (Julien 1987, p. 88) mention a Clements Markham as the person who, in 1871, located the earliest use of the name Aymara for a language in a document dated 1575, appointing a Gonzalo Holguín as general interpreter by Viceroy Toledo. This might be Diego González de Holguín mentioned above, and his Vocabulario… of 1608. The term Aymara was used to refer to a general language in addition to Quichua and Puquina. Prior to that time, the term most commonly used was Colla, a term that continued to be used at least into the early
seventeenth century. If the term was adopted by the Spanish after Toledo learned about the Aymara-Uru classification, it could have been borrowed from the classification and applied to the language. Be this as it may, the cultural majority and the dominant elite were classified as Aymara and the bulk of this group probably spoke the general language of the region where they lived. Consequently, it seems that connecting the language with the census category would have been easy, especially if language distribution was not well known at the time of Toledo’s visit and, on that issue there seems to be little information. Inca adoption of the term Aymara for the census classification was yet another matter, since the classification may have been in use at the time when the Incas organized the area for service to their empire. If not, then the term was probably borrowed from a group within the general class, following Inca naming practice. The only group with the name Aymara known at present is a group living west of Cuzco in the modern province of Apurimac (Perú). Although the language spoken in the area today is Quechua, we have no assurance that the people living in the same area in the sixteenth century spoke Quechua. Since classification as Aymara was based on the ability to provide tribute, some similarity between the people of Aymaraes and the people classified as Aymara in the census may account for Inca use of the name Aymara. The Aymaraes group was heavily assessed in cameloid products in the Toledo tasa, and since assessment in cameloids was characteristic only of those classified as Aymara in the census classification, perhaps the similarity lay in the common practice of camelid husbandry. The Aymaraes area was conquered on the eve of the conquest of the Lake Titicaca region (Julien 1987, pp. 88–9, footnote 18).

Both Inca and Spanish administrations were active in organizing the tribute categories. This led to the unification of a heterogeneous Andean population but the tasa, as has been detected, is simply not a reliable source of information about the process that has led us into the 20th century with yet more mentions of the Urus.

Sources from the 20th Century

Both the general and particular references to Uru population that I have summarised from the available colonial written sources have been widely used for understanding the Uru concept in the early 20th century literature. One of such early sources is a Communication manuscrite by Cecil Gosling, dated December 1st, 1916 in Gothenburg, where he wrote “An account of a visit to Angwaki, a village of the Uros Indians on the river Desaguadero in Bolivia” ( Créqui-Montfort and Rivet 1925–1927, pp. 105–7). The full text is supplied at the end of the thesis as Appendix 1. Gosling points to the sharp contrast that the Uros Indians of Angwaki offer in respect of the Aymaras who inhabit the high Cordillera plateau, and he finds these Uros a cheerful and obliging people, pleased to see foreigners. They appear to Gosling as not very tall, but slim and well built with dark and expressive eyes, without that opaque appearance that he has noticed in the Aymaras. He believes that this alone indicates that they are a different race, possibly one hailing from a warmer climate. Gosling tries to present an honest account of the characteristics of the village, mentioned in the current literature also as Ancoaqui, near the Desaguadero River, and of the different ethnographic material that he believes worth of description. He describes as a remarkable feature the willingness of Uros to go into very cold water up to their waists, without apparent discomfort, in search of a wounded bird. This attracted his attention as contrary to the habits of the Aymara Indians. Gosling also sees evidence of artistic taste on the part of the Uros when it comes to constructing their balsas.

This idealised and quasi private presentation of Uros is at odds with all what we have learned so far about them, such as that they are useless and idle, idolatrous and sorcerers, not men but Uros, rude and coarse people and almost brutish, fraudulent Indians, ungrateful and deprived of feelings for love, belligerent, haughty, inconstant, vile, maniac, reckless etc. In the years that elapsed after these texts were written, scholars begun to specialize in what became the disciplines of history and anthropology. They became increasingly interested in the Urus and wrote descriptions that, similar to Gosling’s contribution reinforced the vision of Urus as different, presenting further idealisations of their past (see Appendixes 2, 3, 4 and 6) that would
allow for an understanding of the present situation of these people. From such accounts in Bolivia, I have chosen two 20th century examples of researchers, Arthur Posnansky and Nathan Wachtel. Both were influenced by 19th century evolutionist perspectives and contemporary theoretical approaches. Furthermore, both are representatives of what might be called schools of thought in the academic milieu in Bolivia.

**Arthur Posnansky**

Arthur Posnansky (1873–1946), began dealing with the Uru subject in Bolivia already in 1903, as he claims in his writings. Born in Vienna, Austria, he studied naval engineering. He became a Bolivian citizen in 1909 and he is still credited for his pioneer work in Bolivian archaeology connected with the Tiwanaku ruins, in particular (1957 [1945]). He is one of those who deliberately approached the Uru subject from a 19th century anthropological perspective, unlike others who, like some of the colonial chroniclers or the travellers of the 17th to the 19th century, were more interested in collecting data for reports, statistical records or collections. Posnansky is the son of his time when he refers to Urus as a *race*, understanding this as a concept where there is an interweaving of biology, culture, and language that are part of the same thread (Cf. Tonkin et al. 1989, pp. 14–5). Nowadays, the word race has commonly been replaced by terms such as *ethnic group, culture, group of origin, and people of origin*.

Posnansky published his work on Urus in various ways, but one that seems to be representative of his perspective is *Antropología y Sociología de las Razas Interandinas y de las Regiones Adyacentes* (Anthropology and Sociology of the Races of the Inter-Andean and Adjacent Regions), published in 1938. In this book, he also refers to other groups, which he calls the remains of very old races of present Altiplano and adjacent regions, such as the *Pukina* and the *Chipaya*, and he mentions that he also wanted to approach their languages and “remote ways of living” (p. 5, *Exordia Rerum*).

Uru people are seen as Andean, similar to those who speak Aymara and Quechua; thus, Posnansky starts by eliciting the first and most important difference, in his view, between the latter and the Urus. In this way, the lakes, the rivers, and the islands of the Andean Altiplano, he claims, would have been the habitat of Uru people from ancient times, whereas the *Pukinas* would have had a habitat consisting of mountains and lands. This explained, in his view, why Urus were fishermen and hunters, whereas Pukinas were farmers and herdsmen, although both spoke the Aymara language (1938, p. 10). The Pukinas, furthermore, would have been connected with those who spoke Aymara and Quechua, particularly the *Kolla* and the people from *Qullasuyu*, one of the spatial divisions of the Inka territory, known as Tawantinsuyu (Q.: four corners division).

The second difference, according to Posnansky, was attributed to the “*sui generis* cranial shape and perfectly measurable typical configuration of face and body” (1938, p. 57, mt) that he compared to *Kolla* people. He did, indeed, measure people, particularly face and body, and his publications are abundant in photographs. For example, while visiting Isla de Panza in Lake Poopó, he managed to obtain skulls by luring people into excavating the bodies of their ancestors from the local cemetery (see Appendix 2). After measuring and comparing the indexes obtained, he claimed that these skulls turned out to be “identical to those of the pure race” (1938, p. 113, mt) of both the dead and the living in Panza. He promised that he would write about this in his books, where he claimed he had already made it public all over the world that these people were the oldest in the continent and the relics of an ancient and noble race that occupied the whole region (1938, p. 113, mt).

Posnansky is also of interest when he tries to summarise what the emic perspective in Anthropology calls the internal vision of the people he meets and classifies as *Uru*. It is clear that he is not very interested in this view, as he mentions it under the heading “Folkloric traditions related to their origins, still preserved by the Urus” (1938, p. 84, mt), and as a corroboration of his views, in the chapter dedicated to deal with sociological, ethnographical and ethno-genetic data. He does not mention where or from whom he obtained the information, presenting what seems to be a literal transcription of what he was told. I reproduce it in the
following quotation where all the footnotes have been incorporated in the text in italics and within square brackets.

“Folklore Nº 1: We, the Kjotsuñi, are the most ancient people in this land. We were here before the Sun would set for a long period of time [Posnansky’s footnote to this: Maybe a reminiscence of an old glacial winter].

Folklore Nº 2: Over there, where you can see the Suñi [Suñi, aymara word for ‘Puna’], all was covered by water and there was plenty of fish and many rivers coming in and out in times of our Aechichis [sic] [Achachi: ancestors, probably a word from Aymara language or vice versa (Achachi: grandfather in Aymara language)]. Our nation was great and happy then.

Folklore Nº 3: We were in this area already before the Sun would set for a long period. Afterwards, the Kolla people came and deprived us of our lands; they used our bodies as Kjuchos for building the basement of their temples [‘Kjicho’ refers today to a blood and species ritual sacrifice in honour of Pachamama and ‘Condormamani’ (goddess of the earth and perhaps her son), carried out by the Indians for the sake of good luck in the construction of a building. ‘Condormamani’ is also portrayed at the ‘Sun Gate’ of Tiwanacu and in ceramic symbols from that place, as the one who carries the ‘Sun rays’. Chibcha people performed another kind of ‘Kucho’ (sic). They carried out human sacrifices when building the fencles of their hamlets. The poles were erected over the corpses of children (Max Schmidt, ‘Voelkerkunde’). A child’s blood was usually offered to feed the Sun (Ibid.).]

Folklore Nº 4: We had to go out in search of food when the lake dried up, and thus we met the Aymara people.

Folklore Nº 5: Tiwanacu was erected before Tschamak-Patscha [‘Tschamak-Patscha’ means ‘time’ or ‘era of darkness’, in Aymara language].

Folklore Nº 6: We have constructed our houses over the settlements of our ancestors [Here he refers to the location of Iru-Itu]. The coloured broken shards and ‘topos’ (female dress pin) found on the soil, particularly when ploughing, belong to them. {1938, pp. 84–5, mt}

For Posnansky, the word Uru is an expression obtained from colonial chroniclers such as Anello Oliva (1598) and Antonio de la Calancha (1639) quoted above, and Posnansky claims that the self-designation would be Kjotsuni, never Urus or Puquinas (1938, p. 59). The term would mean “people of the lake”, the term used by Iru-Itu Urus from Desaguadero. Another term for self-designation would be Utschumi, connected with the people called Ochozumas or Uchozumas or Uchuzumas in the Spanish Chronicles. They would also have a term for people of firm land, Tojsa, and the round houses of the Chipayas would be called Putukus, built with adobe of turf (sod) shaped as typical beaver caves (1938, p. 68). Other names for houses among Urus of Iru-Itu would be Chujlla or Khuya. As we can see, the Urus are different in the eyes of Posnansky, but there are also differences between these Urus: the Iru-Itu, the Ochozumas or Uchuzumas and the Chipayas. However, similar to Gosling, Posnansky sees no problem in drawing a distinction that allows for a classification of people. Apparently, the differences are obvious.

Nathan Wachtel

Nathan Wachtel is a contrast to Posnansky. He belongs to a generation of French researchers who, under the influence of the notable French journal Annales, created by Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch in 1929, aimed at generating the conditions for a systematic and open comparison of work in the different social sciences, having history as a central axis. They combined anthropology with history, and their efforts are seen as a landmark within the Annales School (Cf. Revel 1995, p. 18) and as a contribution to the method called regressive history. The historian and anthropologist Wachtel was born in Metz (Moselle) in 1935 (when Posnansky was already writing about Uru people). From 1976 he has been the Director of Studies at the Ecole

2 Chibcha would have been people of the highlands on the Eastern Mountains (Cordillera) of Colombia from pre-Columbian times. Characteristic of these people is the relationship that has been established between their abundant resources, particularly gold, and the legend of “El Dorado”.

3 Here he refers to the location of Iru-Itu.
des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, and as of 1992, he is Professor of History and Anthropology of Meso- and South-American Societies at the Collège de France.

Nathan Wachtel carried out wide research on the history of Andean societies, and together with a small group of historians of the Annales School, he presented what was perceived as radical new definitions of their research subjects by combining both anthropological and historical approaches. His first book, *La vision des vaincus* (The vision of the defeated, Paris 1971), generated controversy among Americanist scholars. A special number of *Annales* ESC 33 with the title *Anthropologie historique des sociétés andines* (Historical Anthropology of Andean Societies) which Wachtel edited together with John Murra, another prestigious “Andeanist” from Cornell University was published in 1978.

Wachtel authored several essays and books on the Uru people, particularly on the Chipaya Uru from Carangas (1989, 1990, 1994), a region in between Lake Titicaca, river Desaguadero and Lake Coipasa, west of Lake Poopó. As one of the most recent ethnographers of the Uru people, Nathan Wachtel introduces them as a problem. Having dedicated more than two decades of his life to a thorough study of what he saw as a particular Andean society, the Uru – though obvious for Posnansky – were also an enigma to Wachtel, both in historical and ethnological terms. In one of his exhaustive essays on the subject, *Hommes d’Eau: Le problème Uru – XVIème et XVIIème siècle* (Men of the water: the Uru problem in 16th and 17th centuries 1978), Wachtel discusses that which he sees as a problem, using questions formulated from the perspective of the economic and social history. He posed questions such as: what do the sources based on Spanish administration files allow us to understand? What can these sources teach us about the nature and function of Uru – understood in terms of water specialisation – during the 16th and 17th centuries? Do they qualify for a category similar to *yana*, i.e. Indians detached from their community of origin and serving either the Inca or the traditional chiefs? Do they all fit the description of the men of the lake as fishers, hunters and gatherers exclusively? Does the whole correspond to a real homogeneous group? Are we not facing some sort of ethnographic myth instead? (Wachtel 1978, p. 1130, mt).

Wachtel begins by presenting the demographic data and he warns us that the Uru are almost extinct, but that during the 16th century, they occupied an exceptionally large area, i.e. some 800 km long covering the course of the aquatic axis flowing through the high plateau, including River Azangaro, Lake Titicaca, River Desaguadero, Lake Poopó, River Lacajahuira and Lake Coipasa (see Fig. III.2). In that context, the Uru counted as the fourth part of the indigenous population. However, today, there would barely be some 2000 Uru people distributed among 4 or 5 isolated groups. The most important group is the Chipaya with c. 1200 people living around Lake Coipasa. Other groups would be the Moratos of Lake Poopó with c. 500 people, the *Iru-Itu* of river Desaguadero with c. 130 people as well as other groups located on the Peruvian shore of Lake Titicaca, in front of Puno (Wachtel 1978, pp. 1127, 1145).

During the General Visit of Viceroy Francisco de Toledo in 1573–1575, however, the presence of Indians called Uru was detected in quite distant regions from the above-mentioned aquatic axis. On the one hand, they were found in the south, between the ice-capped mountains of Lipes, and, on the other, over the arid coasts of the Pacific from Arica up to Cobija levels (Wachtel 1978, p. 1131). This information, being part of the problem introduced by Wachtel, and as the result of a different type of source, suggests the existence of Uru people that did not belong to the aquatic axis, and therefore create difficult problems when it comes to documents and identification. The different source mentioned by Wachtel (ibid. 1978, p. 1146 footnote 12), is a letter written by Juan Lozano Machuca, from Potosí, to the Viceroy of Peru in 1581, which has been published in Madrid as a historical source in 1965, by Marcos Jiménez de la Espada in his *Relaciones Geográficas de Indias (Perú)*, of 1881–97.

Wachtel can only interpret the last source as a possibility and prefers to focus on the eight administrative units or *corregimientos* (see Glossary) visited by Toledo, as he feels comfortable with this source, being an official document, and also because these units covered the total Uru population of the Altiplano during colonial times (ibid. 1978, p. 1131). The names of the administrative units were Azangaro, Cavana, Pucarcolla, Chucuito, Omasuyu, Pacajes, Carangas, and Pari. Wachtel presents charts and pie diagrams of the demographic data collected by Francisco Toledo in the 16th century, showing a total of 69,664 people who paid
tribute. Of these, 16,950 were Urus, i.e. c. 80,000 people if we assume that families averaged five members, representing a 24.3% of the indigenous population. However, this population had an unequal distribution, densities being particularly high north of Lake Poopó: 67% Urus at the repartimiento of Challacollo, and the same for north and east of Lake Titikaka: 100% at Coata, 57% at Saman, 48% at Carabuco (1978, p. 1131).

A tradition transmitted to us through the chroniclers, and adopted by travellers and ethnologists, is what Wachtel claims as the reason for the various descriptions of Urus presented above (uncouth, barbarians, clumsy, lacking manners, dirty, badly attired, hard to discipline, primitive and different from other Andean people, as well as conspicuous because of their physical traits such as dolichocephalia and dark skin). Wachtel believes that this is an unfair repetition of a view that presents Urus as savages and inferior by nature. This is qualified as racist by Wachtel (1978, p. 1127) and as a cliché that conceals an inferior status in respect of the Aymara people (ibid.).

However, he accepts the widespread notion that the Uru people are the relics of an ancient population that preceded the Aymara people, who subsequently rejected the Uru to the most inhospitable regions. The question remains when and under what conditions. This opens to Wachtel the possibility of illuminating the subject by means of what he will later call “regressive history” (1990), since he will focus on the Toledan visit of 1574 in particular. The report of this visit described other Urus “exclusively Uru-hunters, -fishers, -gatherers otherwise called savages and reflecting the traditional stereotype”, who were found close to Desaguadero, in Zepita (1978, pp. 1134, 1149, mt). They are mentioned as Urus Ochosumas, or Uruquillas de Ochosuma, particularly miserable, rustic people and of even lower capacity (ibid.).

Wachtel combines this information with contemporary self-identification of some Uru groups and, similar to Posnansky, reproduces the information that people from Lake Titikaka call themselves Kot'suñs, meaning men of the lake, and that Chipayas see themselves as Jasshoni, or men of the water as opposed to dry men. Wachtel claims that these definitions are complementary rather than contradictory, for, he claims, this is “one of those complex cases where ethnic belonging, economic specialisation functional to a lake milieu, and social stratification, are all found at the same time” (1978, p. 1130, mt). The recent contribution of historians (cf. Murra 1982, 1987 i.a.) allowed for theorising that Andeans adopted a sort of archipelago settlement pattern, with territory scattered not only in the Andes but also in the valleys and the coast, as a way of coping with the reduced farming possibilities in specific areas. Finding Uru in a variety of environments led Wachtel to believe that they also settled in the archipelago-like pattern and, for this, he recurred to historical documents. These included a particularly interesting document at the Historical Archives of Cochabamba (Bolivia), allowing for a recreation of procedures registered in 1556 (Wachtel 1982). In this document it is mentioned how Inka Wayna Qapaq had included Uru population in his resettlement policies. Consequently, Uru people were found among mitimaes, i.e. settlers sent by the Inka to populate valleys previously occupied by, in this case, Cotas and Chuis groups who in turn, were expelled to Pocona, since their lands were much coveted for planting maize crops. Years after the events, Uru are found in these valleys by the Spaniards, and counted in the census as Uru of Paria, “happy because they managed to preserve their precious maize lands” (Wachtel 1978, pp. 1136–7, mt). Later on, they are granted an Encomienda (or grant of Indian labour and tribute to a Spanish conquistador, see Glossary) from their encomendero (see Glossary) Lorenzo de Aldana, a conquistador who, unlike others, founded a Pious Work in Paria that was still active up to the end of the 18th century, as a true banking institution. This encomendero also decided to restore his immense wealth to the Indians in his testament. The lands of this Encomienda were situated in Charamoco, a valley in Cochabamba, and the property titles were issued in favour of Uru from Challacollo. The same documentation proves the ways utilised by “the descent of a wealthy Uru family [to convert themselves] into Aymara caciques”: by marriage and after a lapse of three generations (1978, pp. 1136–7, mt). Wachtel claims that this was an unusual process, particularly when related to Uru population.

For Wachtel this cannot but qualify for acculturation of the Uru and prompts the suggestion that quantitative studies should be conducted for measuring “the degrees at which Uru became Aymaras in terms of culture” (1978, p. 1138, mt). Wachtel complains that so
many other Urus such as Villi-Villis, Moratos, Ochozumas, Iru-Itus, lack ethnographic studies and that the documentation on them being insufficient, creates a gap in our understanding of the situation. Information on these other Urus would help in overcoming problems of chronology that, according to Wachtel, stem from the scant information on the area. For example, the people whom he calls “the ferocious Villi-Villis” were traced through their religious registration at the chapel of Coro, west of Lake Poopó. A clear presence of this group of Urus was registered and evidenced in 1718 for the last time. However, after a priest claimed that he succeeded in “extracting them from the lake”, they would have gone through what Wachtel calls a process of acculturation. They were granted title deeds by Visitador Fray Thomas de la Torre, specifically to prevent their “returning to the totoras” (the lake) and thus to paganism. This, according to Wachtel, explains why Coro inhabitants identify themselves as Aymaras nowadays and resent being suspected to be of Uru descent (1978, pp. 1140–3, 1153: footnote 123).

As for the Moratos of Lake Poopó, Wachtel quotes Jehan Vellard, who claimed in his Dieux et Parias des Andes that “Moratos themselves avoid contact with other people: we have seen them from far away, without having the possibility of getting closer” (1954, p. 205, in Wachtel 1978, p. 1143). In 1976, however, Wachtel claims that he had the chance to hold a long conversation with their leader. This man told him how, during his childhood “over the floating island, in the middle of the totoras”, a time came when they had to endure floods, droughts and, after that, they were forced into the shores, some time between 1930 and 1940. They had already lost their ancient language except for some kinship terms and others related to lake fauna and, after two or three generations, they spoke only the Aymara language. Furthermore, owing to an absurd and tragic situation, fishing cooperatives created by the Aymaras were granted permits. This put the Moratos in a desperate situation where, deprived of land, they were on the brink of being dispossessed of the right to access the lake itself (1978, pp. 1143–4). Cross-referencing has helped to identify the Moratos leader that Wachtel quotes as Daniel Moricio mentioned in Wachtel (1990) and in Miranda and Moricio (1992, collected and compiled by Barragán – see below).

Having started with an analysis of historical sources, mainly those of the 16th century, Wachtel continued with his fieldwork carried out among the Chipaya in 1973, 1974 and 1976, among the Uru-Moratos of Lake Poopó and Iru-Itus of river Desaguadero in 1976, as well as a new visit to Chipayas “ten years later” (cf. Wachtel, 1994). In this way, the author presented a critical vision that tried to match the anthropological rescue and the reflection on the validity and finality of these efforts, not without a bitter feeling after all the years he dedicated to the research.

What these sources illustrate

The colonial sources, while hinting at the differences that set the initial stage for an understanding of how the population in the Andes will be described, have in no way explained why the differences were both created and recreated by the Spaniards followed by the historians and the anthropologists who elaborate their discourse with representations of these people. From indications of a primordial nature of the Oro ayllu (in Zuidema 1964, p. 100), to the fishermen without policia as in Juan Matienzo in 1576 and to descriptions of a rude and coarse, almost brutish, people as in Balthasar Ramírez in 1597 (in Créqui-Montfort & Rivet 1925–7, pp. 101, 96–7), we have moved to regard the Urus as a category. In order to analyse the Urus as a category, the perspective chosen was an anthropological one that discusses ethnic boundaries and ethnic composition (cf. Barth 1969; Julien 1987). This raised the question of what actually led to understand such composition of the population as what was called a nation or the naturals in the beginning, then parcialidades and or /ayllos/, to end up calling them ethnics (Cf. Banks 1996).

Today, the Urus found in the literature, be it Muratos, Chipayas, Irohitos, Uruquillas or Ochosumas, have all been lumped into the concept of an ethnic group. In other words, saying Uru leads to ethnic, ethnicity, ethnos and so on. What does this mean? The term originally
comes from the Greek *ethnos*, surviving as a rather common word among the intellectuals in modern French, *ethnie*, with the associated adjective *ethnique* (Tonkin *et al.* 1989). Looking for the etymology of this term, we find that in the earliest records, e.g. Homer, it was not a word used for familiar groups of people sharing a culture, an origin, or a language. Instead, it described large, undifferentiated groups of either animals or warriors. It could be glossed as throng or swarm, both of which terms have ambiguously animal and human possibilities. Pindar employs the term to describe groups of like people, but again people whose location or conduct put them in some way outside the sphere of Greek social normality. Aristotle uses it for foreign or barbarous nations, as opposed to Hellenes. Romans, writing in Greek during the Empire, use the term to describe a province, or the provinces in general, i.e. regions that were not Roman (Tonkin *et al.* 1989, pp. 11–2).

It is apparent that the term co-existed with *genos*, more commonly used by Greeks of the Greeks themselves and, in later uses, in New Testament Greek, *ethnos* comes to be used to mean non-Christian and non-Jewish. Therefore, the derived adjective *ethnikos*, at this stage is nearly synonymous with barbarous, with all its moral, social, and linguistic content, i.e. people who spoke unintelligible languages, wanted for civilization, beyond the bounds of meaning, order and decency (Tonkin *et al.* 1989, pp. 12–3). The adjective exists in modern English as ethnic, such as in ethnic group, ethnic clothing, with a suffix added to give *ethnicity* but neither *ethnos* nor *ethnic* exist in English. The term *ethnos* took its meaning in a vocabulary of related terms, most of which have come down to us in some form or another – *genos* (Gr.), *gens* and *genus* (L.); *populus* (L.); *tribus* (L.); *natio* (L.); *polis* (Gr.); *barbaros* (Gr.) and *barbarus* (L.). It is important to notice that “the legacy of these words in the modern Romance languages, and in English, is a rich and complex moral vocabulary, laid out along dimensions of inclusion and exclusion, dignity and disdain, familiarity and strangeness” (Tonkin *et al.* 1989, p. 13).

The immediate successor to terms related to *ethnos* was, in an important sense, *gentile*, which, as *gentilis*, was how the Greek term was rendered in the Vulgate version of the Bible. Church Latin dominated literacy in Europe throughout the Middle Ages, and terms related to *ethnos* had no place in this. After the Reformation and the English vernacular rendering of the Bible, the term appeared as gentile and not ethnic. In the Byzantine and medieval period, the term *ethnos* continued to be used for the gentiles, as a grouping of religious otherness. The Greeks may have been referring to themselves as the *ethnos* from the fifteenth century onwards, and when Greece became a kind of experimental laboratory for modern nationalism in the early nineteenth century, the Greek *ethnos*, as a semantic and political opposition to the then crumbling Ottoman Empire, came “to be seen as quintessentially self-realizing, self-defining entity; as such, the idea would have been generalized throughout classically educated intellectual Europe” (Tonkin *et al.* 1989, pp. 13–4).

The term ethnic, together with its derived forms, has been used in English in its Greek New Testament sense, as an unusual intellectual synonym for gentile, denoting pagan or non-Christian, and it retained this sense well into the nineteenth century. From the mid-nineteenth century, however, scholarship has made *ethnos* into a word meaning something like group of people of shared characteristics, and a variety of compound and derived terms have been formed, which are now in common academic use – ethnology, ethnography, ethnocentric, ethnic, ethnicity and others. The term *ethnos* itself was not needed, since all these terms relate to the discourse built around the idea of race, for which *ethnos* would have been no more than a redundant synonym. Ethnology was the study of races (Tonkin *et al.* 1989, p. 14).

Although there has not been a similar process in Bolivia that would explain the use of such a generalised idea, the Spaniards as well as the subsequent general influence of the nineteenth century ideas resulting in modern nationalism and the creation of republics led to a similar adoption of the term ethnic group. This did not carry the connotations that it had for the Greeks or the Greek New Testament, although with all the weight of a complex moral vocabulary, with dimensions of inclusion and exclusion. Consequently, the subsequent scholarly contributions, such as the often quoted Barth (1969), with his explanations on what makes or does not make an ethnic group clearly indicate why we find the Urus categorised as an ethnic group.

Identity is understood as part of our reference to other human beings (Cf. Jones 1997, Banks 1996, Barth 1969 *i.a*.), and as such, it is a complex construction with roots both in our psyche.
and in our social entourage. Identity also gives us what we call a feeling of belonging, while at the same time it detaches us from those who are not part of the group. The way in which we, in turn, construct an explanation for the detached ones, that is the others, is where Anthropology, with the help of for example History and Archaeology, has been an important influence and, as some claim, still has a raison d'être.

The Urus of today

I could not see my account of references to the Urus as complete if it did not include what they themselves have to say about the subject. In addition, another perspective should be what those who do not see themselves as Urus write about the group when the opportunity arises, particularly in the early 21st century. Before I do that I will add that, in line with the research framework, I will not describe the Urus found in the Peruvian region of Lake Titikaka. They are briefly mentioned above as “Urus of Chucuito” who, allegedly, claim the name of Kapis for themselves instead of Urus, and live in the floating islands that they build close to Puno (Perú). The colonial sources mentioned above (Matienzo 1576, de Acosta 1590, Ramírez 1597 inter alia) mentioned these islands. Furthermore, Chucuito, as we have also seen, was the other name given to Lake Titikaka by the Spaniards, as it was the main settlement of the group known as Lupaqas in the area.

The Urus on the Urus

In 1988, a Biblioteca de autores étnicos (E.: Collection of ethnic authors) published a peculiar text by Lorenzo Inda C. with the title Historia de los Urus. Comunidad Irohito, Yanapata (History of the Urus, Community of Irohito Yanapata). I see the text as peculiar for various reasons. It is, literally, a manuscript i.e. a handwritten document with drawings that has been reproduced with no attempt to correct any of the aspects regarding presentation. Therefore, the calligraphy, the Spanish orthography and the grammar are found wanting. The reader is, in other words, challenged to read the text as it is, with no indications on how to deal with it and while struggling through the handwritten pages, as well as many uncertain words, the origin of “Urus” (with inverted commas in the original), the language, the history, the clothes, the houses, the totora rafts… are all published unedited by the compiler (Javier Medina, HISBOL). What do we learn from this peculiar text? We read that the ancestors, as the grandparents are otherwise called (Jesusa Salinas and her granddaughter Julia), have already been told that they were Urus and so they have transmitted this information to their descendants. We are told that the Aymaras, with whom they have so many feuds in respect of territory, did not exist in the Altiplano previous to the discovery of America. Their religion is connected to Pachamama, Apus, Achachilas – all of them Aymara denominations for sacred spirits, according to some anthropologists (Cf. Albó 2000, 1995; Barstow 1979; Bouysse-Cassagne 1987a; Albarracín 1996 i.a.). They also state that a school was built “on a Thursday 2nd of April 1952”. The mentioning of a school building – normally a small one-room house – is connected to important aspects of rural life, among which the most salient are the possibility of becoming literate in Spanish language if your mother tongue is Aymara, for example, and of securing a post funded by the government for a resident teacher. I would be happy to translate other details from this account were it not to appear as a collection of reminiscences on what we had just read in the texts mentioned above.

Therefore, I will continue with other Urus who are presented as speaking about themselves, although with the help of someone else. In 1992, Rossana Barragán compiled what she called testimonies about Uru-Muratos lives (Memorias de un Olvido. Testimonios de vida Uru-Muratos). Two Uru-Muratos, namely Daniel Moricio (see Wachtel reference above) and Lucas Miranda, told stories about their lives and I will summarize relevant information compiled by the archaeologist and historian Barragán, as well as highlight the manner in which Urus are
viewed. The book is divided into three sections: an introduction to the interviews, a recorded interview with Daniel Moricio that apparently was edited, and an attempt to record and edit the interview with Lucas Miranda. I will organise the chapters where the two Uru-Muratos refer to a variety of subjects that, when contrasted with what they claim as their identity, enable the reader to perceive how ideal and prosaic meet, and this does not conform to the views of Moricio and Miranda.

Daniel Moricio Choque’s memoirs are transcribed almost literally for the reader to make the best of what Barragán calls raw material (ibid. 1992, pp. 77–170). It takes much effort to try to understand the transcription of a particular way of expressing memories in a Spanish dialect, as commonly expressed by Aymara language speakers. One could easily wrongly interpret what has been transcribed for the reader, not only because of the language problem, but also because of the way the authors handled this raw material as well as the additional difficulties connected to context – where, how, when, why were these “memories” obtained. However, considering this, it still is worthwhile to try to make sense of some of the details, for Moricio is also presented as a “true Uru-Murato” by people other than Barragán.

What does Daniel Moricio say about the origin of the group? Using the suggestive title Acerca de una historia de los Urus (Oro), hoy Muratos en Bolivia (About a history of the Urus (Oro), present-day Muratos in Bolivia) he describes the myths of origin of the Uru. Moricio suggests that the name Uru comes from the belief that this tribal ethnic group (Barragan 1992, p. 23, sic) had gold – or oro, in Spanish – treasures in their possession, hidden in a mountain behind the city of Oruro (ibid. 1992, p. 26). He is quoted claiming that “the Urus… had golden pots, big ones, small ones; plates, vessels, [everything made of] pure gold”, and that the Spaniards came looking for Urus because of this. Oro and Uru are often used as synonyms and, thus, as a confusing way of describing an “ethnic tribe” [sic] that had to hide from the “Spaniards or Aymaras” (ibid. 1992, p. 29, mt).

Regarding the topic of descent, Moricio claims that his father was Uru, but that his mother was “purely from Aymara family, purely from isla de Panza” (ibid. 1992, p. 77, mt). At the same time, he says that his mother’s father was Aymara but that his mother’s mother was Uru. This suggests that the word purely should be read carefully, if we believe it to represent birth line, ethnicity or even primordialism. However, and to confirm what he claims, he gives an account of the tradition of Urus (Moricos) as suppliers of wives to the Aymaras (Choques), and the “Choques bringing women to Moricos” (ibid. 1992, p. 80, mt), their family names providing the evidence. In short, it implies that women moved with their husbands thus his Uru mother’s mother gave birth to his mother within an “Aymara family” and that Choque patronyms are Aymara.

His account helps in our understanding of an approximate distribution of Uru-Muratos in the territory around Lake Poopó. This has apparently occurred after the lake dried up in 1937, when nine groups resulted as a consequence of the incident (ibid. 1992, p. 82): Group Chapipata, sector Choro; Group Puñaka; Group Río Juchusuma; Group Río Vilañique; Group Río Tacagua; Group Lichichuto; Group Llapallapani; Group Calzar Vinto; Group Chullasi. By following the transcript, it is possible to perceive a periodic drying-up of the lake which seemed to have occurred more or less every ten years.

It is also interesting to note that Uru-Muratos were excluded from the obligation of serving in the war with Paraguay that took place in the 1930s (ibid. 1992, p. 86). This was apparently achieved on similar grounds as those that absolved them from paying tribute during colonial times. Moricio states that many Aymaras-Quechuas were eager to obtain the same treatment, and that they offered the Uru leader (Toribio Miranda, father of Lucas Miranda) “to pay four llamas and one cow” to be included in the same certificate as the Urus for, he alleges, the patrols would not be able to tell Muratos from Aymaras or from Quechuas. This caused trouble and feuds that led to the abolition of the special certificate for Uru people and in the conscription for the war of eighteen or twenty Urus (ibid. 1992, p. 87). Taxes were avoided again in the 1960s by claiming that they belonged to the Uru-Muratos group (ibid. 1992, p. 128).

Moricio mentions the abilities of Uru people of weaving, as an additional strategy for obtaining food, and he names the loom, hillawa, in the transcription offered by the authors. In the Aymara language, the word illawa means the threads that are woven in the loom. This detail
is worthy of note as Wachtel, mentioned above, also listed among the “problem of Urus” that their ability to produce textiles had been mentioned by the chronicler Polo de Ondegardo in 1571, as being at odds with the stereotype of men of the water, who were expected to be hunter-gatherers or fishermen (Wachtel 1978, p. 1132). However, when the fish called pejerrey (Basilichthys bonariensis, Cf. Dejoux & Iltis 1992, pp. 427, 500) appeared to invade the waters of the lake some time in the 1950s, Moricio claims that they did not know how to fish it. Therefore, they had to learn and use different tools, including fishing nets and boats that, according to Moricio, had been “unusual” until that time. The phiri (a kind of pole) and the raft or boat made out of totora, had previously been the traditional tools for fishing (Barragán 1992, p. 120).

The group fought to have the legal rights to fish that the Aymara had already obtained. They tried to form a Cooperative called Urus Ltda. A “Doctor Murillo” (see below) assisted them and Moricio is quoted as saying, “Mister Doctor has presented [a claim] that we are an ethnic group without animals and landless Uru-Muratos, in order to avoid being compared with other fishers” (ibid.1992, pp. 128–34, mt). In this context, Moricio mentions how corrupt intermediaries wanted to become involved in the fishing cooperative, which finally received the name of Tintamaria, Urus del lago Poopó Ltda., Cooperativa de Pesca del grupo étnico Uru-Murato. Intermediaries were soon interested in commercialising the fish caught by the Urus and they tried to bribe the members of the cooperative as well as Moricio himself. He is quoted telling how he was offered money to begin with, and then clothes (ternos, i.e. men’s suits), fried chicken and beer, all this to prevent Uru women from selling the fish themselves (ibid.1992, pp. 134–6). Incidentally, the fact that “Aymaras-Quechuas” were the first ones in organising themselves into fishing cooperatives, invalidates the question of Urus as “owners of the lake”.

Other means used as strategies for subsistence are also mentioned by Moricio, such as becoming members of Confederación Sindical Unica de Trabajadores Campesinos de Bolivia (CSUTCB), i.e. the major peasants union of the country that became quite important in the 1980s. Being identified as farmers allowed for access to food donations such as rice, wheat flour, vegetable oil, bulgur [fulgor, sic], that came from CARITAS – a United States aid NGO. As a consequence, Moricio was accused of “trying to sell them” (the Urus) to the United States, and one of the members was shot to death after a row (1992, pp. 138–9). We are also told that a black market of goods was another option opened up to many Uru-Muratos (1992, p. 141) in those years.

In 1987, Daniel Moricio was part of a group that flew to Mexico with the objective of being trained as a fisher, and of speaking in the name of Uru-Muratos. He relates how he stayed there between May 25 and June 23, thanks to the support of the Director of the Centre for Fishing Development. The other participants seem to have been included as fishermen, but not as representing Uru people. From his words we learn that he had introduced himself as representing an ethnic group (ibid.1992, pp. 141–5).

On another occasion, which he dates to the 22nd of August 1987, Uru people were proclaimed as “men of the lake, well before Christ, well before Inkas”, by the Vice-Prefect of Oruro together with other authorities from the Instituto Interamericano Indigenista and the Centro de Desarrollo Pesquero of Oruro. After this, the fishing season was declared as closed and Uru people had to leave, apparently without any support (ibid.1992, p. 147). In addition, cholera disease spread in the 1990s and damaged all fishing projects of Uru-Muratos as, from then on, pejerrey fish was suspected of carrying the disease and nobody wanted to buy it.

Another anecdote mentioned in Barragán’s transcription is connected with the Bahai religion that came to the area with food donations to “help the poor”. Because this kind of support was accepted, Moricio tells that the Aymaras accused them of being communists (1992, pp. 110–5). Obviously, being Uru was bad but being communist was, it seems, worse. Dwelling briefly on this quotation allows for perceiving a tradition of conservative perspectives that have made an impact on people that, as in the first chapters, I refer to as Bolivians.

As regards the identity of Urus, a confusing account is presented on how the groups that formed (see above) after the lake dried changed over time and how some even refused to be called Urus. However, in the case of those who moved to Aymara territories, they still claimed their identity as Uru-Muratos (ibid. 1992, p. 82). The claim that Moricio’s “grandparents, truly
Uru people”, i.e. his ancestors, were the owners of Isla de Panza, but that the island was taken by Aymaras during times of conflict, sometime in the late 19th or early 20th centuries (ibid. 1992, p. 84) is also confusing.

Moricio confirms that the Urus built round houses in the early 1930s, “similar to their Chipaya brothers”, but mentions that Aymaras also had round houses (ibid. 1992, p. 90). Moricio repeats Miranda’s version (see below) that the name of their language was chholo, and that this was spoken before the 1920s (ibid. 1992, p. 96). Moricio also provides another list of all Uru groups that merge with the places where they live, as follows (ibid. 1992, p. 98):

- Puno, Perú
- Lake Titikaka
- Urus Iru Itu
- Urus-Uruquilla-Toledo
- Urus-Muratos of Lake Poopó
- Urus-Choros Pampa Aullagas
- Urus-Soctita Pampa Aullagas
- Urus Chipaya Coipasa

Names and the correct way of spelling them, according to Moricio, were learnt from almanacs. He claims to have studied the almanac for six weeks, because he did not know how to spell names and the example he gives is that he was used to write Benceslao, instead of the right way, which should be Wenceslao. Incidentally, this might explain the names chosen for newborn babies, and the recurrence of particular names such as Lucas, Zacarías and Pascual and prove how unusual it is today to find a name that is not rooted in European traditions.

In another important passage regarding identity, Moricio mentions Lucas Miranda as being wrong when he referred to Muratos as Isla (island). The reason for this, Moricio claims, is that he had “just learned, assessed by Dr. Murillo, that we are an ethnic group, Uru Muratos… I have asked Dr. Murillo [and he replied]: ‘you are a group and even your laws [attest to that] you are a tribe, Uru-Muratos ethnic group’.”(1992, pp. 116–8 my emphasis, mt). Joseermo Murillo Bacarreza – referred to as Dr. Murillo in all these quotations – is introduced in the text as one of the people who assisted Uru-Muratos both in their organization and in the claims they regularly make to the Bolivian government. A lawyer from Oruro city, Dr. Murillo allegedly held a “Private Record” or files where Ayllu de la Laguna was registered as the 19th century name for Uru-Muratos. Apparently, Toribio Miranda, father of Lucas (below) and member of a group known as the Movement of Caciques and Apoderados, formed at the end of the 19th century, had to do with the reasons why the name of the group, i.e. Uru-Murato, was chosen. José de la Vega Alvarado, visitador (or colonial inspector, see Glossary) credited by Cédula Real of May 27, 1631, was in charge of hearing the Uru people claims (cf. Introduction by Barragán 1992, p. 17). It is speculated that Miguel García Morató, who acted as de la Vega’s amanuensis when these claims for rights were issued in the 17th century, was associated with the combined name of Uru-Muratos in a way that today is difficult to understand. The titles José de la Vega instructed to be produced in favour of the Urus were probably known as the ones that García Morató wrote. The name of Murato for this group of Urus seems therefore to have been preserved with a modified spelling and transmitted through the generations.

This is also why the word Isla (above), was wrong. As Moricio mentions, Aymaras and Quechus call usla the Uru people. This, seemingly, comes from the same word (isla), and is a derogatory term connected to the place where they apparently live (Barragán 1992, p. 118).

However, the prefect of Oruro had paid them a visit and “notified they were Uru-Muratos, owners of the lake” and that they “had been there from times immemorial, perhaps from Chullpa times”. This was formalised through an investigation carried out by Dr. Joseermo Murillo Vacarreza in 1965. It seems that the prefect of Oruro also tried to remind the “Aymaras-Quechus” that they were farmers and herders; consequently, they should not remove fish from the lake. This led to people from Oruro claiming that they were Úrus as well and that they had fishing rights in the lake. This partly explains why they had to constantly move from one point
to another, i.e. from Lake Uru-Uru to Lake Poopó, etc. However, no matter where they moved, “Aymaras-Quechuas” would always claim that Urus did not belong there (ibid., mt).

I see it of an additional interest to mention the details that Moricio gives on the people that visited Uru-Muratos at various opportunities. He says that Professor Luis Zeballos, together with one señorita had written about them offering help but that “he never came back” (ibid.1992, pp. 150-1, mt). He also speaks of “Señor Don Daniel Hugo”, who worked for the Cultural Museum in the city of La Paz. Moricio referred to Hugo Daniel Ruiz, Director of the Museum of Ethnography and Folklore (MUSEF), during the government of García Mesa (sic), who was one of the last military dictators ruling the country in the early 1980s. Señor Don Daniel Hugo seems to have helped in the creation of two schools for Uru-Murato children, in Vilañique and Llapallapani (ibid. 1992, p. 151). A Doctor from France is also mentioned, referring no doubt to Nathan Wachtel. Not only did Wachtel seem to have helped with money for the cooperatives (Bs 300), but he also motivated them to meet all Uru-Murato ethnic groups from Lake Poopó, and then to visit their “brothers from Iru-Itu” (ibid. 1992, p. 151, mt).

On p.152, Moricio mentions the visit of a man, David, from the United States. We do not know if this corresponds to David Tuschneider, one of the editors of the book. He seems to have been asking many questions but Moricio preferred to let him borrow “the papers. He has made photocopies” (N.B.). We are not told what kind of papers, but the man from the United States also brought toys for the children and tried to teach them how to read and write. Ramiro Molina Rivero, the anthropologist in charge of editing the book (Miranda & Moricio, 1992), is mentioned as a visitor from La Paz. He is described as somebody to be afraid of, since he was not “familiar enough”. Molina is said to have been kind to Moricio, asking after a while for papers connected to the Royal titles that Uru-Muratos received in the past. Moricio claims that these were in the hands of, again, Doctor Murillo, who seems to have died shortly after, having designated Molina as his successor. We are left without knowing whether the titles, important from a historical perspective, were finally recovered from Murillo. However, Molina seems to have helped in obtaining another fishing license for the group, as well as in other areas such as obtaining food donations for the community (ibid. 1992, pp. 153–64).

After that, between October 11th and 12th, 1991 they had their meeting with their Chipaya brothers, but Moricio claims that they did not enjoy the encounter. It was held as a meeting of peasants from 16 provinces of the department of Oruro and it seems that the encounter was not so pleasant because, according to Moricio, they are all people who “suffer because of the lack of lands and everything” (ibid. 1992, pp. 163–4, mt).

As a closing statement, Moricio says that owing to all the troubles they have been through, in the end, the Uru-Muratos will disappear. However, the last page contains this declaration: “The descent of Uru ethnic groups will exist forever […] I will die but the law in favour of Urus that I have fought for will never die” (ibid. 1992, pp. 169–70, mt). This is followed by a statement seemingly translating these words into the Aymara language.

Lucas Miranda is portrayed in Barragán’s compilation (1992, pp. 39–45), but the text provides little information. It is similar to that provided by Moricio regarding the references to the Oro = Uru relationship, which here is mentioned as the mountain of Oruro, where gold was transformed into bronze after “the Spaniards, the Aymaras” invaded the area. Miranda claimed that many bronze pieces were found on the surface or close to where Urus lived, or in Oruro, or in caves. They did not have houses but caves close to Pazña and close to Huancané, all around the lake. Apart from that, we are told that Barragán regrets that she was unable to provide as much information from this interview as she did from that with Moricio. She claims that the reason is that they (Barragán and Molina) could only contact him “too late in his life” and, while trying to substantiate the information recorded in tapes, they were informed that he had passed away in Llapallapani in 1991. Therefore, although Lucas Miranda is included in this book as an Uru Murato and he identifies himself as such, there is little to learn from his own story. For this reason, a reference to who he was and what he accomplished is found in other texts about Urus that I will present below.

What kind of recollections do we have from these people (Inda 1988, Miranda and Moricio 1992)? They are not striking as a strong case of identity vindicating the Uru case. Although the introduction of Barragán’s text (1992) written by the anthropologist Ramiro Molina Rivero
claims that Barragán wrote a biography of old and recent Uru history through the oral testimony of Lucas Miranda and Daniel Moricio, some details connected to the way in which these persons are presented are worth a short comment.

The introductory paragraphs written by Molina (1992, pp. 7–10, mt) are interspersed with expressions such as “Uru-Aymara relationship in the region of Lake Poopó”, “the Urus and the Bolivian society (represented by the miner and the urban citizen)” and “the ethnic identity moulded in the myths of origin”. It is tempting to say that there should be no mention of a relationship between Urus and Aymaras since we have been told that they are enemies. However, the specific reason for mentioning the two as related is to emphasise identity. Nevertheless, when the Uru is portrayed as the mine worker in Bolivian society, it raises questions. Is this because Oruro – a political division of the Bolivian territory that was named after the Uru – was created to accommodate the mining companies and a capital city? In the late 19th century, when the Potosí silver mine was no longer profitable, the metal that sustained the Bolivian economy was tin and important reserves in the area surrounding Lake Poopó were mined until the 1980s. As the low international prices for this metal made the mining activities no longer viable, the Bolivian government closed the central mining company (COMIBOL) and the mine workers were forced to migrate. If these miners were Urus, they no longer live in the lake area and, obviously, every ex-miner from Oruro could qualify for an Uru identity. This echoes the myth-of-origin mentioned by Molina (Barragán 1992, pp. 7–10) about the moulding of identity and exposes a gap between myth and identity.

Molina further writes that the publication is the result of a team effort (ASUR-FIA) intended to strengthen and reassert the “ethnic identity of a highly marginalised group” that is “rapidly becoming culturally extinct” (mt). This effort, according to Molina, recovers the narrative of two generational leaders of Uru-Muratos, expressing the feelings of one people, their ways of being, thinking and acting. Testimony is used to generalise a condition of marginalizados, uncritically linked to an ethnic identity. On p.19 a map prepared by Molina is presented and the main Uru settlements are pointed out, no doubt based on Moricio’s account referred to above. After this, we are offered a repetition of some of the clichés on Urus, the origin of which we have just traced back.

In the Introduction to the text (1992, pp. 11–8), Barragán is clear about the way in which the compilation of the testimonies was carried out. She writes that the historical background on the situation of the Urus was obtained from N. Wachtel’s work, but that she also consulted sources of the 19th century and very shallowly explored the situation of two ayllus of Pampa Aullagas that Ramiro “intuited” to be Urus, an intuition still alive when he transmitted it to me in 2002 (see Ch. IV). About the way in which Daniel Moricio became a source or, to use Barragán’s words, a “testimony”, we read that it happened when he went to La Paz while trying to look for solutions to problems of Uru-Muratos connected with the fishing cooperative and permits and that he was lodged at their house. In this context, Barragán and Molina realised that Don Daniel had a “privileged memory” which, together with his “age, experience and role as a leader” would make of the oral transmission a strong, valid and long lasting one. They began with the recording of the testimony in 1987, with the aim of “recovering the Uru-Muratos history for the archives only” but they ended up compiling a version of his life.

With Lucas Miranda the situation turned out to be different; his role as leader and representative of the Uru-Murato group had by then been inherited by Daniel Moricio. It was only in 1991 when they recorded some conversations with Miranda that they realised the communication problem. When they tried to check the accuracy of the transcription of the recorded tapes with Miranda, they were told that he had died. As a consequence, in order to avoid loss of the testimony they decided to publish what they had.

The visions of Urus as the ‘‘other’’

Ramón Conde Mamani (1992, pp. 109–22) wrote an article on Lucas Miranda Mamani, mentioned above, who is presented as Maestro Indio Uru-Murato (i.e. Indian Uru-Murato Teacher). A dedication to the first Indian teachers of Qullasuyu introduces the text, and Miranda
is described as the first *Amawi’ta* and *yatiri uru murato* (see Glossary for these words), “teacher who trained and educated hundreds of Aymara, Qhichwa and Úru Murato children” (mt) between 1936 and 1970. An introduction mentions discriminatory practices and the “Indios being oppressed and excluded by the mestizo-creole society” in Bolivia. A consideration follows on what the “Indios” have been fighting for which, maybe not surprisingly, is education, although they are presented as poor Indians, abused, mistreated and deprived of their rights as citizens (Conde 1992, pp. 110–3, mt).

According to the author, this *sociedad criollo-mestiza* succeeded in “disarticulating the Indian movement” (Conde 1992, p. 115, mt). Regarding the Úru-Muratos, the author claims the existence of such as a nation that he describes as a “ubiquitous surviving ethnic branch of the ancient Urus” (mt). Conde quotes a document that he claims was preserved by Lucas Miranda where the Spanish chroniclers describe the Muratos as “people with lands for herding, grazing, cultivating and for building their houses” (1992, p. 117, mt). *Colla* groups in expansion such as the *Carangas*, would have been behind the deprivation of such lands that forced them “to live a primary life” (ibid., mt).

At the same time, Conde writes that Lucas Miranda claimed that Úru-Murato nation was deprived of their lands as a consequence of the agrarian reform of 1953 and that, before that, Aymaras and Úruses lived in peace, clearly contradicting what has just been asserted. He supports this statement mentioning that Lucas’ father, Toribio Miranda Flores, one of the leaders of the movement he recalls as *Alcaldes Mayores Particulares* (Particular Mayors), represented Aymaras, Qhichwas and Úruses in some time between the 1930s and 1940s in many departments of the country (1992, pp. 118–19, mt).

While paying attention to the way these elements are connected by Conde, the description allows for an understanding of some aspects of the construction of the Úru identity and it becomes obvious that:

a) Úruses are not necessarily people of the water, but were probably reduced to such after conflicts with other Aymara groups (e.g. *Carangas* or *Colla* groups).

b) Úru strategies for survival might have pushed them into fishing, picking plants that grow in aquatic environments, hunting birds as well as wild rabbits and whatever they could find in an area well known for its fauna and possibilities (Molina, 1993, 1991).

c) An “essence” becomes apparent in respect of a peculiar identity that stems from watercourses and environmental conditions, portrayed as a reason for the “option” they took, as it were, for subsisting on water resources.

Nevertheless, before going further, two short references to texts that were recently published on Úru people will help me in closing this part. The way I see them, they should stand as examples of the typical presentations of Úru population in texts intended to deal with the subject from a general perspective. The quotations show that the words contained in these texts are still in common usage in the 21st century.

The title of the first text, *Uso de fauna y flora silvestre por los Úru Muratos y otros pobladores locales* (Ríos & Rocha, 2002), hints at the view of the authors on the subject:

> When the Spaniards arrived, the Bolivian Altiplano was inhabited by three main groups, the Aymaras, the Quechuas and the Úru-Chipayas. The dominant Aymara and Quechua groups were herdsmen and farmers and had a fair political organisation. The Úru-Chipayas were hunters and fishers, known as “men of the water” (“Kot’suns” or Jas-shoi” [sic] in their languages). This ethnic group worked mainly as fishers or labourers for the Aymaras in exchange of food. They complemented their diet by capturing rodents, hunting cameloids and aquatic birds, they also used the feathers of flamingos for rituals and ceremonial gowns (Lamaire 1909, Posnanski [sic] 1937, Ibarra Grasso 1985, quoted in Campos 1987).

> Because they were traditionally denied access to lands and cattle, and were pushed to marginal areas of the Altiplano, Úru-Chipayas lived by the shores of lakes or salts. Remnant population is still found around Lake Titicaca and along river Desaguadero (Úrus), Lake Poopó (Muratos), and the Salt of Coipasa (Chipayas) (Campos 1987).

> According to Murillo Vacareza (VAIPO 1998), the Úruses were already where they are found [today] before the arrival of the Incas. However, they were not counted in colonial census because Aymaras outnumbered them. The Úruses have found a place in “refuge zones” covering [areas that stretched] from Oruro up to Salinas de Garci Mendoza, occupying the basins of rivers
Caracollo, Sora Sora, Poopó, Pazña, Tacagua (Challapata), Huari, Condo and Salinas. They have been [sic] sailors and builders of totora rafts. The Muratos are the descent of the Urus. In this way, Muratos of present days subsist dependent on the lakes and rivers for food and economy, preserving a strong link with water and settled in three communities: Llapallapani, Vilañeque and Puñaka Tinta María. Though isolated settlements are found along the lake, in most cases comprising one family [only], this is but a strategy for preservation of territorial space that, in the past, in one way or another, they were able to occupy and that, in the end, it consisted of only the three representative communities [mentioned] (VAIPO 1998). At present, Llapallapani belongs to the Municipality of Huari, Vilañeque to Poopó’s and Puñaka Tinta María to the Municipality of Pazña. (Ríos & Rocha 2002, p. 95, mt)

The authors explain how they used the method of going directly to the three representative communities mentioned, asked direct questions in face-to-face interviews – more often than not with the help of interpreters – and thereby thought that they could present the resulting data as a description of typical Urus activities related to the local fauna and flora. They assumed that those interviewed were Urus, but they do not mention the reasons for seeing them as such other than the quotations I supply above. They do not seem to have bothered about making questions on the identity attributed to the people interviewed and I wonder if any ideas the statement that follows might have inspired in the authors, after they checked the final drafts: ‘‘In Lakes Poopó and Uru Uru there are 18 fishing cooperatives, two of which belong to Uru Muratos from the communities of Puñaca and Llapallapani […] There are no adequate systems of unloading, storing, transporting and preserving the fish, losses are therefore immense (up to 70%)’’ (Ríos & Rocha 2002, p. 97). Did they not see the incongruity?

The second text complements the first. Intended to be a “historical account of the Murato people” as the author claims, it was written as an article titled Diagnóstico de las actividades socioculturales del pueblo Uru Murato en el lago Poopó y las consecuencias de las relaciones interétnicas con los Aymaras (Lavayén 2002) which I have also translated from Spanish – revising moreover both grammar and syntax:

To talk about Muratos is to talk about one of the older races in our continent for which an antiquity of 1500 to 2000 before Christ has been estimated. Different human groups dispersed all over the lake basin were members [of this race], in an area of 150 leagues between 15º and 23º southern latitude (Delgadillo 1998).

Though the ethnic origin of the Uru group is still unclear, different hypotheses have been presented in this respect and [I intend to] describe the most important ones [i.e.] the Atlantis and the Migration hypotheses…

[The Atlantis] theory states that after many expeditions, the Urus arrived to America from the old continent of Atlantis. This theory postulates the oldest population of the continent, according to Posnansky, and so the construction of the metropolis of Tiwanaku should be attributed to them…

At the same time, the Migration hypothesis elaborated by José Camacho in his “Urus, Changos y Atacamas” postulates that the Arawak nation must have encouraged the dispersion of colonies from the Guyanas and tributaries of the Amazonas that reached Paraguay and the ridges of the Andes, extending further into the western parts of Ucayali and Purus, in Peru, and the Bolivian plains of Moxos reaching afterwards the Altiplano and particularly the Titicaca basin where the Urus originated. At the same time, Alberto Guerra Gutiérrez, in line with the research carried out by Paul Rivet on the population of America, states that the migration that originated the Uru nation came from the south towards the north, and it was people like the Camancho, Changos, Huanchaco, who populated all the interandean area originating other ethnic groups such as the Cunzas, Chipayas, Tahuas, Yuras, Capilus and Muratos.’ (Lavayen 2002, pp. 111–28, mt)

I have cut several other parts of the two texts, as I wanted to emphasize how researchers particularly in the second text seem unable to avoid speculation especially when writing so-called scientific articles on Urus. The rest is unfortunately of even less use as sources are used uncritically without crediting the authors. Unfortunately, this has become commonplace for those who write a few lines about Urus when addressing a variety of other topics.
A voluminous ethnography on Urus?

This chapter would be incomplete if I did not refer to the ethnographers’ accounts and the way they perceive the world, a world of Urus in particular. I present in appendixes short ethnographies by Cecil Gosling (Appendix 1) and Arthur Posnansky (Appendix 2), but the Urus best described in extended ethnographic monographs are the Chipayas. Nathan Wachtel wrote the most recent and poignant ones and I have chosen this author for a brief analysis of the ethnographical approaches on Urus. The following books have been central for the account that follows: (a) *Le retour des ancêtres. Les indiens Urus de Bolivie XXe.–XVIe. siècle. Essai d’histoire regressif*, published originally in French in 1990, and (b) *Gods and Vampires. Return to Chipaya*, publication translated into English from the original French by University of Chicago in 1994. The limitations of this kind of account are discussed in the concluding section of the chapter.

The Chipayas

On the horizon, to the west, loom the massive silhouette of the Tata Sabaya volcano and the snowy peaks of the Andes, while around us the vegetation grows thinner and thinner: the bushy tufts vanish once the van passes Escara. Now, with the sun directly overhead, I can see the bare, white pampa glisten, its flatness broken only by the mossy mounds scattered among the salt patches... In the late 1970s, Chipaya could still be distinguished from the other villages of the high plateaus by its round, straw-covered huts... They were grouped in each moiety in seemingly chaotic clusters, and it was difficult to make out the four “streets” that... extended from the main square to the four corners... (Wachtel 1994, p.1)

With these words, Nathan Wachtel (1994) introduces the Chipaya territory and landscape. His studies led him to investigate these people he also calls hunters-gatherers, and while doing so he found the Chipaya people that he claims are the only Urus that today exist as an autonomous social group, and have been granted a territory of their own (canton) in the Departmento of Atahualpa in Oruro, Bolivia, after 1940 (1990, p. 14).

As mentioned above, Aymara speaking people use the derogatory term Chullpa-puchu, to describe Chipaya people as rejects of a pre-solar age, excluded from mankind today. Chullpa-puchu, or rests of chullpas, were beings that, according to an Andean myth of origin, inhabited the earth before the sun would come to shine over it (a reference to the last glaciation, according to Posnansky, 1938). They would have made their living from hunting and gathering under the blurred light of the moon and the stars, seeking refuge in caves, dressed in foliage or animal furs. When fortune-tellers predicted the imminent birth of the sun, they would have been unable to indicate whether this would happen at the north, or the south or the west part of the area where they lived. These chullpas, the legend has it, decided to build huts with doors open to the east in order to protect them, the result being that when the sun came out almost all of them were burned to death in the celestial fire. The only survivors would have been those who found refuge in a lake (Ajllata), close to River Lauca, to the north of the salt pan and Lake called Coipasa where Chipayas presently live. It is from these rejects that the Chipayas originated as the last witnesses of this world’s primeval humanity (see also ASUR-IAF-UNICEF n.d, de la Quintana 1999).

The Chipayas, according to their ethnographers, regard themselves as jas-shoni, that is, people of the water, in opposition to the dry men as they, in turn, call the Aymara inhabitants of the region. Wachtel claims they are the last representatives of the Indians called Urus, mostly fishers, hunters and gatherers that, in the 16th century, amounted to a fourth of the population in the Andean plateau and that today are reduced to four or five isolated groups of no more than two thousand people in total (1990, p. 13).

The inhabitants of the Chipaya territory would be distinguishable from their neighbours by traits such as language, dress, ways of subsistence, matrimony prescriptions and, most of all, “the strong consciousness of their identity” (Wachtel, 1990, p. 17, mt). Other Urus, such as the
Moratos of lake Poopó, “mixed with their Aymara neighbours” and, deprived of land, professed admiration for their distant wealthy brothers from Lake Coipasa (the Chipayas), to the point of regarding them as more civilised people (ibid.).

Chipaya territory is described by Wachtel as almost 30 km long from east to west, and 20 km wide from north to south. North of Lake Coipasa and 40 km from the border with Chile, it constitutes an enclave within a wide Aymara zone (see Figs. III.3 & III.4).

The affluence of the Chipayas would be relative as the territory that shelters them is mostly a desert in rather gloomy plains shattered by the wind and standing 3900 m.a.s.l., where the outcrops of salt plates provide an unreal moon-like effect (Wachtel 1994). The only fresh water supplies come from River Lauca, formerly linked to vast lakes, allegedly those where Chipaya ancestors, that is other Urus, subsisted by fishing, hunting and gathering aquatic plants. However, despite the apparently repulsive environment of the area, it was the origin of a long standing conflict and fiercely disputed until recent date between Chipayas and their Aymara neighbours from Huachacalla, who had reduced them to a servant-like condition during colonial times (1990, p. 17).

Two similarly sized units, divided by a north–south line close to the middle of the village, conform to a dual space in Chipaya. These two units or ayllus, are Tuanta (east) and Tajata (west) in what Wachtel calls Puquina language (1990, p. 28), and the names in Aymara language for these ayllu divisions are Manasaya (the lower part), and Aransaya (the upper part). These two ayllu divisions contain two other sub-divisions in Chipaya: Tuanta has five extended families grouped around a sector called Ushata (usha meaning the north), and two other extended families grouped around another sector called Waruta (waru meaning the south). As for Tajata, two extended families group around a sector called Tajachajta, while some five families or more group together in a sector called Tuanchajta (1990, pp. 29–30).

There is also a double residence pattern that these families express in keeping houses at the village where every nuclear family has one or more houses and another at the estancias or hamlets, dispersed around the village. Main residential preferences oscillate according to the seasons, but coming and going from village to hamlet in the same day are equally frequent. The line dividing the territory of Chipayas from north to south is said to coincide with a former deviation of River Lauca that, passing through the village, flowed into Lake Coipasa. The channel is covered today in order to avoid flooding of houses during the rainy season; the river that formed as a consequence was called Taipi (meaning centre in Aymara language). In 1961, a canton was created under the name of Ayparawi, after long-standing conflicts with Aymaras from the neighbouring Huachacalla, thus recognising Chipaya’s rights on the dunes of the territory. Ayparawi became a third ayllu and seemingly originated in a process of demographic increase. As Aymaras from Carangas cultivated on the slopes of mountains using the extended plains of the plateau as pastureland, Chipayas found in Ayparawi an ecological complementary environment before introducing irrigated agriculture, because they could get there what did not yield in their own territory. As Chipayas explained to Wachtel, the dunes were to them what the mountains were to Aymaras: all the families had access to land behind the dunes at the beginning of the 20th century until the canton (Ayparawi) was created in 1961 (1990, pp. 33–75).

In a chronological order, Chipaya history is summarised in the following periods (Wachtel 1990, pp. 345–48): The earliest news about these people come from colonial sources of the mid 17th century that mention a small group of Urus (less than three hundred), settled in a wide lake area where some sectors were already being handled by means of a network of dams and channels, similar to the ones observed in the 1970s by Wachtel, he claims. Aymara neighbours of Huachacalla, holding them as servants, forced them to tend their herds of pigs and llamas near the lakes, ignoring local authorities’ dispositions that Urus should “move out of the water and adapt to Christianity” as per Toledo dispositions of the 16th century. Chipaya people subsisted mainly from fishing, hunting and gathering by then, and the social organisation consisted already of a division into two ayllus.

In the 18th century, they changed their names and started using patronymics such as Lázaro, Guarachi, Quispe, Mamani and Condori. The social organisation is now based not only on a dualist scheme but quadripartite, with two majors, two jilaqatas, and four priostes (priests) for
each religious celebration such as Santa Ana and Guadalupe. The droughts of 1804–1805 were qualified as catastrophic as they led to an important decrease in population, i.e. less than two hundred inhabitants, the lowest level ever. The demographic imbalance among the two moieties between 1790 and 1830, threatened the dualist organisation which seemed to tend now to a tripartite scheme. The relationship with Aymaras was modified during this period and Chipayas emancipated in several stages:

First, they freed themselves from the personal services to Aymaras, the debts system, and the hard labour in the mines that disappeared towards the beginning of the 18th century. The earliest colonial source mentioning a “Chipaya territory” is from 1726 (Wachtel 1990, p. 340). In the 1740s, the colonial authorities acknowledged the existence of the Chipaya territory, coincident more or less with the lake area and a fringe of about one league that was later added to the territory. As from the 1760s, they gained a foothold on the dunes of Ayparawi: they started subsistence agriculture and agreements were reached with Aymaras on a sort of reciprocal basis, consisting of access to lands for the Chipayas, in exchange for tending herds for the Aymaras in the lakes. Towards the late 1820s, the authorities, now Republican, officially acknowledged their rights on Ayparawi.

From 1830 to approximately 1920, a stable period followed and the Chipayas achieved emancipation and recognition of their rights over Ayparawi, allowing for “full display of the Andean model of archipelago”, i.e. in line with Murra’s (1987) conception of the interspersed occupation pattern in the Andes. This was achieved, according to Wachtel, particularly with respect of households on Lake Coipasa, now divided into regular sectors, and peripheral settlements in the dunes, with the family lineages closely intertwined. Chipayas were then engaged in all kinds of activities: fishing, hunting, gathering, herding and occasional agriculture. Demographic growth was registered in 1830, and in 1870 they already represented more than 30% of the population.

The decade between 1920–1930 marks a rupture: this is called the agricultural revolution by Wachtel (1990) and leads to “modern Chipayas”. The introduction of agriculture was related to demographic pressure and to the progressive climate change, which caused the lake to shrink, decreasing the aquatic flora. In the beginning, Chipayas cultivated lands within enclosures that they called canchones, similar to the Aymara system. They irrigated lands in regular strips called tsvi, distributed to every head of a household. From then on, farming and raising herds were integrated into the system, and fishing, hunting and collecting were only peripheral activities. The extension of irrigation networks for handling tsvis strengthened community links at each moiety level and the quarters fused two by two. The population increased twice between 1930 and 1970; together with latent conflicts with Huachacalla, this led to the creation of the separated canton in Ayparawi (1961), and the traditional dualist organisation now seemed to favour a tripartite organisation.

The history of the Chipayas proves a succession of different economic systems, all linked to what Wachtel sees as a fundamental element of continuity, that is water, and the apparently tardy agricultural revolution presupposed their immemorial experience in lakes, dams and channels (1990, pp. 347–48). The system of balancing agriculture and raising animals was from recent date. If hunting and fishing were traditional activities attributed to Uru population, raising pigs should be attributed, according to Wachtel, to colonial influence and the same should be said for agriculture. Wachtel’s informants, particularly the eldest, remembered that techniques for inundating fields and allocating tsvi were still much of a novelty in their childhood. Chipayas did not practise agriculture before the 20th century and only sowed quinua at the margins, where Ayparawi dunes were located (1990, p. 104).

In October 1989, seven years after the events described and sixteen years after his first visit to the place, Nathan Wachtel visited Chipaya again. The impressions he gathered from this last visit are also described in a moving book, Gods and Vampires. Return to Chipaya (1994), where he claims that accelerated rotation of the lands caused deterioration, with one bad harvest after another. The lake in which pigs were raised dried out; the animals were struck by an epizootic disease, and the “city of pigs” was now deserted (1994, pp. 20–1). However, in 1991, Chipaya was in turmoil again. The two ayllus, Aransaya and Manasaya, were opposing each other because of a colonization project in the tropical valleys of Bolivia known as Alto Beni (1994, p.
Exclusion, migration, land distribution according to a population effectively residing in Chipaya, changes in the system of beliefs from Catholicism intertwined with local divinities, to Protestant sects such as Baptist and Adventist; all had a part in the new scenario (1994, p. 138).

As a consequence of the events, an unhappy Wachtel emerges in grief: “Is it wrong”, he claims, “for the ethnologist to yield to nostalgia at seeing his area of study fall apart over the years?” He contemplates a large photograph that presides over his office where one can see the waters of Lake Coipasa, “its crusts of salt twinkling with bluish reflections” and where a Chipaya hunter “in suspended motion, forms a tiny dark spot, lost in the grey and white immensity and overshadowed by the distant ridge of snowy mountaintops, unchanging in their beauty” (1994, pp. 139–40). I would say that sadly, it is that tiny dark spot that Wachtel translates as a Chipaya hunter, that seems to be left from the bulky ethnography where he describes an “ethnic group”.

It is unsettling to realise that he seemed so unable to see what was right before his eyes – as the very photograph that presided over his office. A tendency to “freeze” events, as in the photograph, is what ethnographies lead to and in this manner, the picture Wachtel contemplates becomes the perfect metaphor for his way of understanding “his area of study”. How many times must the ethnographer come back to the area of research to make sure that the object of study is still preserved there, as when he or she left? The question sounds preposterous. Rather, why should the ethnographer see the area of study as fixed in an ethnographic present? Yielding to nostalgia is part of the problem and, in the case of a historian-ethnologist, it is paradoxical since nostalgia, that bittersweet longing for a past and for an absent historical reality, is anti-historical (Andersson 2005, p. 168). It does not help in our understanding of the dynamics of which the ethnographer seems to be oblivious.

In the following chapter, I attempt a description of what I found in the Lake Poopó area. As my intention is to be multidisciplinarian, the description is peculiar. It was not meant to be labelled as ethnography but neither as history nor archaeology. I call it an experience.
CHAPTER IV

THE FIELDWORK EXPERIENCE

The initial approach

When I first went to Lake Poopó, I wanted to understand the reality behind the contradictory information projected in the oral and written accounts about the Uru people. I wanted to understand what kind of other the Urus were. In short, I wanted to meet the other.

The first journeys therefore aimed to first locate and then investigate the areas where these people are said to have been living, “in their traditional ways”, for “thousands” of years (cf. Créqui-Montfort et Rivet 1925–27; la Barre 1946; Métraux 1954, 1967a, 1967b; Posnansky 1938; Wachtel 1973, 1978, 1989, 1990, 1994 inter alia). The starting point was the information claiming that the course of the aquatic axis that flows through the high plateau (Wachtel 1978, p. 1127) is the area they occupied when first described by the Spaniards in the 16th century. An exploration around Lake Poopó helped me to become familiar with the landscape, the inhabitants and the way population and landscape interacted or, better, were interconnected.

What I saw was a great deal of the so-called rural landscape or countryside, some of the main towns and villages, people usually considered Aymara because of their language, the mountains, and then the lake. The rural landscape and particularly the Bolivian highlands opening into the impressive plateau I have described elsewhere, close to four thousand metres above sea level, usually make a significant impression no matter what is your background or education; this partly explains the general belief in the peculiar way of understanding landscape as sacred in the Andes (Albó et al. 1989, Beyersdorf 1998, Choque 2001, Platt 1987, Varón Gabai 1990, Varón Gabai et al. 1997). The main towns and or villages I visited were Condo, Challapata, Llapallapani, Huari-Condo, Estancia Chullunkayani, Huari, Challapata Viejo (old Challapata), Tacagua damn, Old Poopó, Sora-Sora, Jiquilla, Andamarca, Toledo, Challacollo, Paria, Quillacas, Pampa Auillas and Sevaruyo, all of them part of the Departamento of Oruro situated south of La Paz. The mountains surround both the east and west sides of Lake Poopó, and the most impressive ones are those east of the lake where terracing is evident. Some of the terraces are still used today. I have described the lake and the inhabitants in Chapter II and here I focus on understanding the so-called Uru connections with water and origins.

My curiosity about the concept of Uru was partly satisfied after reading the available literature (see Chapter III). The ethnographic and historical sources helped me to understand how and when Uru people had previously been described. I could also understand what had led to the widely held belief in “different cultural traits” of the “people of the water”, and the “ethnic contents” of Urus (cf. Créqui-Montfort et Rivet 1925–1927; la Barre 1946; Métraux 1954, 1967; Posnansky 1938; Trigger 1995; Wachtel 1973, 1978, 1989, 1990 inter alia), as well as how other people inhabiting the area were also described and sometimes related to the Uru.

From what we have seen, Urus also lived on firm land. Given this, it seemed to me that occupation or settlement patterns, when treated as archaeological and anthropological sources, would help me understand this apparent contradiction. In accordance with established traditions, if they were Uru, they surely lived in round houses. I was told that if there was a particular cultural trait that had constantly been related to Uru people, it was the architecture of their houses. More importantly, my colleague archaeologists both in Bolivia and in Sweden claimed
that if Uru people were hunter-gatherers and lived by the shores of rivers and lakes, or in *totora* rafts, it would be extremely difficult to connect any other sort of material remains of their culture with what has been described as Uru in the current literature.

So, where did they live? What was the oldest trace of their settlements? Which were the more recent traces of settlements? Archaeology was intended to be the main resource discipline in helping me to answer these questions. How was the pattern perceived? How was it related to their worldview? Anthropology was expected to assist me in understanding these other questions. How do present day occupation patterns relate to the past? Anthropology and Archaeology are both relevant for this topic.

One of the initial contradictions was between material culture described as Uru, in this case permanent round houses and expected residential patterns associated with semi nomadic hunter-gatherer subsistence strategy life that might be expected not to have permanent residences (Binford 2001). Moreover, even if the Uru had, as it has been described, aquatic residences, i.e. the large rafts described by Posnansky, they would not be preserved owing to the material used for its construction. Why were round houses only attributed to Uru people? Was it because the Ursus were viewed as beings who were as old as the hills in the highlands?

Soon I encountered the round houses together with people labelled as Uru. It was only in 2001 and 2002 when I could come to Llapallapani, otherwise known as the town of Urus (as proclaimed on the welcoming banner at the entrance of the place), that I could stand in front of a picturesque recently built round house, directly connected to Uru people. In fact, when I asked, I was told that it was built some years ago by a governmental institution (*Fondo de Inversión Social* – FIS). It gave me the impression that they intended to lead foreigners to think, “look, they do have such round houses!” Actually, people there (some schoolchildren) told me that nobody lived in the house, but that it was a space intended for artisan activities or training. The houses where they lived were rectangular, as everyone else’s. In addition, they addressed me in Spanish.

The literature had even provided maps of the places where to look for Urus as shown in the previous chapter (Wachtel 1990; Molina 1986b, 1993). Llapallapani was of course on one of those maps, located at the east of the shores of Lake Poopó, and here is when I made my next discovery and found a new contradiction. The aquatic association was *not* exclusive to Uru people. In other words, people of the water, such as those at Llapallapani, were surrounded everywhere by people who lived in the neighbourhood, or by the mountains making any direct attribution difficult just because of the place where they were situated. In addition, other Uru places were rather far from water – such as Toledo or Challacollo – or located in areas where conditions influenced their development, as in the case of the Chipayas, the most widely described Uru people (see previous chapter).

Therefore, apart from Llapallapani and the historical and anthropological references to the places portrayed on the maps, I found mainly Aymara-speaking people. This was no doubt qualifying for an ethnic marker, according to anthropological traditions. I also found a lake (Poopó) drying up to the extremes when the rainy season was over, but no apparent nor obvious sign of Ursus other than inconspicuous farmers and some fishermen dedicated to their subsistence duties. When the literature portrays “fascinating people” (Posnansky 1938) such as the Ursus, one might expect some visible characteristics. After all, the classical ethnography provides a vast number of pictures depicting for instance their clothes, houses and hairstyles.

**Quillacas**

I began my fieldwork in Quillacas, c. ten minutes by car from Pampa Aullagas and three hours from Oruro, the capital of Oruro *departamento*. I paid several visits to the place and its surroundings in 2000 and 2001, accompanied on occasion by some of my students. This helped me in the understanding of an interesting town established in colonial times, with a long religious tradition and an historical account connecting its leaders to alliances made during the expansion of the Inka political system (Espinoza Soriano 1981, 2003).
Written sources indicate that a multi-ethnic confederation had developed south of Lake Poopó prior to the Spanish arrival in the 16th century. Groups known as Killaka, Asanaqi, Aullaga, Urukilla, Siwaruyu and Arakapi formed this confederation. The name Quillacas (an Hispanic version of the work Killaka) was suggested for this particular confederation (Saignes 1986, p. 15), probably owing to the fact that today there is a town named after such a group. However, it is also interesting to consider another reason namely the remarkable personality of the leader, Guarache, the hereditary lord of the Killaka, who did not hesitate to form alliances with Spanish conquistadors as soon as they invaded the area. Accordingly, Guarache’s group became ethnically and historically important in written sources (Espinoza Soriano 2003, 1981; Barragán & Molina 1987; Aguirre 1981 i.a.). The extent of the confederation apparently reached the present Bolivian regions of Cochabamba (east of La Paz), Chayanta (north Potosí), Chuquisaca (Pioxera and Poopo areas) and the Pacific coast. They also shared land around Puná and San Lucas in Pahacollo, near the Chiriguano border in the southern lowlands of Bolivia (Saignes 1986, p. 15). Significant for the research is that the Aullaga and Urukilla groups were transformed into “reductions”, planned by the Spanish colonial regime and known today as Pampa Aullagas (see below).

Quillacas is now a town with c. 2700 inhabitants according to census data from 1992, 1996 and 1997 and people coming from all throughout Bolivia and from Argentina, have granted it a place in the religious traditions within the Catholic Church. This is due to the belief that, as the local authorities tried to explain to me (Emilio Mallku and Eleuterio Huayllas Mallku), in the 1600s and, as they stated, long before colonial times, an Argentinean man trading with horses, possibly destined to work in the mines, stayed in Quillacas to rest overnight. When he woke up, the horses were gone and he searched for them everywhere without success. He was desperate and that is when, I was told, a man dressed in a white gown appeared and told the Argentinean that he should look for the horses at a specific location. He did that and succeeded in finding all the horses. Therefore, every year, on September 14, the celebration of the “miracle” takes place, as it is believed that it was Jesus Christ who appeared to the horse trader. A church has been erected in Christ’s honour and the name of Santuario del Señor de Quillacas (Sanctuary of the Lord of Quillacas), comes from that episode as well as the obvious Argentinean flags displayed in the interior of the church, next to the Bolivian ones. The mixture of historical data is easily noticeable in this story. On the one hand, the reference to the year 1600 as long before colonial times is clearly wrong as, in fact, it is the opposite. On the other hand, the reference to a horse-trader is telling us about colonial mining activities in Potosí (south of Oruro). Horses were introduced by the Spaniards, as were Catholic Church activities in the area. In addition, the man connected to the miracle is an Argentinean, and Argentina as such came into existence only in the 19th century. At that time, Quillacas was already established as a colonial town as the consequence of Viceroy Toledo’s ordinances, set up already in the 16th century (1570s). Finally, the church itself was built sometime during the Spanish colonial times, probably on top of a sacred place or wak’a, as was customary at the time as soon as a town was founded. A wak’a (Q.) refers to something sacred, sometimes a hill, a river, or a stone. Colonial churches were normally built over such sacred places, as in Cusco where the Dominican church and monastery were built over the famous Qurikancha, or golden enclosure, the Temple of the Sun as the Spaniards named it, one of the highest-ranking religious structures (Gasparini & Margolies 1980, p. 343).

Quillacas seems to be frequently involved in boundary problems with the neighbouring Pampa Auñagases, the latter belonging in fact to another province, Ladislao Cabrera, whereas Quillacas is part of province Eduardo Avaroa. The disputes concern access to Mount Sato that divides both towns and provinces. Four ayllu comprise the entire Quillacas territory – Collana Primera, Collana Segunda, Mallkakumasquaqa and Soraqa – apart from the town itself, each ayllu counting five to eight communities totalling c. 30. Located at 3700 m.a.s.l., the name Quillacas was translated by the same local authorities as killa (Q. Moon) and q’asa (Q. broken, incomplete). This referred to the moon irrupting into the area through the gorge formed by the mountains that enclose the town, San Julian Mallku and Santa Barbara. Irrigation problems are constant, thus the conflicts with Pampa Auñagases, but the lake (Poopó) was not mentioned as a resource.
During our first fieldwork, we tried to investigate close to the lake in the belief that the closer we came to the lake, the sooner we would find Urus. As soon as we circumvented mount Santa Barbara and passed the community of Kayni Machaqa, we noted changes in the landscape such as sandy soil contrasting with the previous cultivated fields with onions, carrots, peas and potatoes. Some round structures were evident, next to rectangular ones and, on closer inspection, we could establish that the round structures were animal corrals and the rectangular ones dwellings. In the middle of this C-shaped house group was a small rectangular chapel decorated with crosses, a fence with doves, and a bell. Nobody was there and all doors were closed, and the corrals were empty. We could observe in the distance people herding sheep and llamas. They were trying to avoid us the best they could.

As we progressed further, the landscape changed into more sandy soils, inundated areas called bofedales (bogs or marshy grounds), where llamas were grazing on pasture. We saw three other round structures with the typical cone-shaped top or oblong dome, described as rural house by Mesa & Gisbert (1966, pp. 492–3, in: Gasparini & Margolies 1980, p. 142), and a third one already collapsed, larger in diameter, in addition to six large corrals connected to three small corrals and a well. These dwellings were c. 2 to 2.5 m high, with a diameter of c. 3 m, and a low doorway. The walls were made of sod blocks cut directly from the ground. Conspicuous were the blood spots over the walls and outdoor floors, as signs of ch’alla (Ay.), the Andean ritual of splashing and sprinkling liquids all over to ask for beneficial weather or good luck. The blood must have derived from sheep or llama. These rural houses that rise to form a false vault (ibid. Gasparini & Margolies 1980, p. 343), are called Putuku. More corrals and an ever distant lake were the experience of the rest of our journey.

Back in town, upon hearing of our intention to understand the extension of Lake Poopó’s tides, one of the local residents mentioned that five years before (i.e. c. 1995) the lake reached the town contours but that owing to the droughts, the flow was reduced. He also mentioned that those who live by the lake would never approach the town; they were seen as quiet people usually avoiding others. Nobody referred to them as Urus.

Where else in the Lake Poopó region could a study of Uru people be viable? I needed advice and I decided to consult a Bolivian anthropologist known for his writings on Uru people (Molina 1986a, 1986b, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1993) and for having shared knowledge with other famous ethnographers such as Nathan Wachtel. I paid a visit to Ramiro Molina Rivero in La Paz and after listening to my arguments, he suggested I should rather forget locations such as Quillacas, where “only Aymara people” could be found, he claimed. Instead, I should go directly to Pampa Aullagas, also south of Lake Poopó, where he suspected two ayllus would qualify as Uru but which could not be definitively classified as such during his own research (see the previous Chapter on Urus). This is why I chose Pampa Aullagas as the place for studying Urus.

Pampa Aullagas

South of Lake Poopó, the town of Pampa Aullagas was established because of Viceroy Toledo’s ordinances of the 16th century. Much of his General Visit ordinances remain valid as a model in the Bolivian Andes, particularly in most of the remote rural areas. As soon as Christopher Columbus started colonizing territories, the Repartimiento, i.e. allocation, was the initial system established forcing Indians to work for the benefit of the Spaniards who, additionally, had the responsibility of preaching the gospel to their allotted Indians. In 1505, Repartimientos were transformed into Encomiendas, i.e. concessions or holdings through which the colonial officer was now called Encomendero. Encomienda was a Spanish juridical institution transferred to the new world to rule the relationship between Spaniards and the Indians. Francisco Pizarro (1478–1541) and his brothers (Hernando and Gonzalo), together with Diego de Almagro (1475–1538) and an expedition of more than 160 men, the famous conquerors of what was called from then on Peru, entered Inka territory only in 1532 (Cajamarca, November 15, 1532, Cf. Lockhart 1972, pp. 10, 13).
Francisco de Toledo, Count of Oropesa (1516–1582), was Viceroy of Peru between 1569 and 1581. His *Visita General* of 1572–5 took the form of a systematic census that, as a consequence, set the basis for the new society that was to be established and officers in charge of carrying out his ordinances were called *Visitadores* (visitors). He centralised the colonial activities confirming the establishment of *Encomiendas* or areas commended to conquistadors, as well as the compulsory work of Indians at the mines (*mita*) under the colonial regime. In addition, the king ordered to transfer the tribute or personal service to be paid to the Crown by Indians, to a Spanish subject, i.e. the *Encomendero*. The Indians living on the land were thus forced either to serve their *Encomendero* or to pay him taxes. The *Encomendero* in turn, was expected to look after the interests of the Indians in his territory and to convert them to Christianity.

Written sources mention one such visitor called Pedro Zárate who, in 1575, took Toledo’s instructions with him to Killaka and Asanaqi territory “to scout out healthy sites for a radically reduced number of settlements, lay out their plaza and streets, and see that the towns were built and the Indians removed to them from their old and remote haunts” (Abercrombie 1998, p. 237). The visitor treated the Repartimiento of Aullagas and Uruquillas, now a Crown encomienda owing to an Awllaka suit against Hernán Vela, to reduction in a manner that was also applied in other Killaka diarchies or moiety divisions. From 19 *pueblos*, villages or towns, within a district of 20 leagues, Zárate reduced a total population of 4851 persons to three new towns. The old *Inca Tambo* of Awllaka became *Villa Real de Aullaga* (modern Pampa Aullagas), with 824 tributaries (cf. Abercrombie 1998, pp. 237–8). Pampa Aullagas is today the second section of Ladislao Cabrera province, situated c. 198 km southwest of Oruro city, and bordering the southern part of Lake Poopó to the west. The climate is cold and the area is topographically flat, whence the name *Pampa*, i.e. plain, corresponding to the puna region of the Bolivian Plateau and prone to severe frosts. The main rivers are the *Lakajawira* and *Márquez* and there are ca. 1400 inhabitants in the Municipality of Pampa Aullagas.

Generally speaking, Bolivia, classified as a so-called Third World country is considered to be a poor country according to the UNDP nutritional criteria. According to these criteria, 98% of the people in Pampa Aullagas, live in poverty. In other words, they are very poor. Basic services are virtually non-existent and electricity has only been available 2000. Drinking water is a constant problem, not only because of difficulty of access but also because of contamination from e.g. mining. The main local language is Aymara, Spanish being second. Quechua is also spoken in the area. Main economic activities are llama and sheep herding, cultivation of potatoes, quinua (*Chenopodium quinoa*, an Andean cereal), onions, carrots and other vegetables. Temporary migration is common between cultivation periods (Atlas Estadístico de Municipios de Bolivia 2000, p. 339).

Pampa Aullagas is divided into what is described as a traditional Andean system of moieties (*anansaya*, *urinsaya*) within which six *ayllu* are part of the territory. The name of these and the number of their communities are as follows: *Sakatiri*, with 11 communities; *Jiwapacha*, with 11 communities; *Taxa*, with 5 communities; *Quillana*, with 4 communities; *Suxita*, with 11 communities; *Choro*, with 4 communities. Andean *ayllu* are described as social and economic organisations involving geographic location, genealogy and kinship as well as to refer to diarchy moieties, diarchies and federations (cf. Abercrombie 1998, p. 463, footnote 23). The etymology of the word *ayllu* is interesting because it relates to fertility as well as to human semen, in other words the origins of social life. Today, the term also denotes the most widely known community, often translated as *kumunirara* into Aymara language by native speakers (from Sp. *comunidad*). According to Wachtel (1978, p. 1126), the so-called indigenous communities or *comunidades* are a colonial creation resulting from the policy of large scale *Reducciones* or

---

1 Quillacas/Killakas, Asanaques/Asanaqi, Aullagas/Awllaka: note the differences in orthography due to the problem of reporting names and other historical references that were not intended for written purposes, in the way we understand orthographic conventions. Castilla, the conquering Spanish kingdom of Queen Isabel called ‘the Catholic’, gave its name to the Spanish language generally spoken all over the American continent (Castellano). Most Aymara and Quechua terms are frequently quoted in their Castilianized forms as reported on in chronicles.
Reducción implemented by viceroy Toledo from 1570. These indigenous people were concentrated in Spanish-type towns for economic and religious purposes, integrating certain European traits such as the cult of Catholic saints, confraternities and opening up markets. So far, this has usually been described as conforming to an allegedly Andean logic, such as several ayllu groups integrating a dual system, communal reciprocity, kinship links and others (Albó et al. 1989, Bertonio 1984 [1612], Layme et al. 1992, Murra 1987).

The centre of the town, called Pampa Aullagas, fits the Toledan ideal described by Abercrombie (1998). In this sense, and following Castilian notions of the kind of living that was considered as civil and Christian, royal orders required that Indians be resettled in Spanish-style towns. A hint to what the king had in mind is royal cédula (or legal disposition – see Glossary) of 1549 called for “[g]atherings of Indians in well-formed towns; year-long posts of mayors and aldermen”. While some indigenous settlements had been “improved” by the addition of a church and a pillory, movement of all Indians from scattered hamlets into larger population centres was an enormous undertaking that had not been systematically carried through and Toledo’s visita general or census, as explained above and in Chapter III, changed that situation. The Toledan ideal was to settle about five hundred tributaries in each new town and the effect, as Abercrombie puts it (1998, p. 237), was dramatic. In each, a regular grid plan of streets focused upon a spacious public plaza on which was built a church with its parish house, a town council hall, a jail as well as a tambo (Q. tampu: rest station, see Glossary), which was now a house for visiting Spaniards. Along parallel lines and right angles, the Indians who were forcibly settled there built their own new homes, also, if surviving examples tell the truth, according to rectilinear principles. These were not merely new settlements; they came with a new set of institutions and clearly bounded territories. Arbitrarily, we are told, visitors decreed which old settlements within the district of a repartimiento or, later, an encomienda (see above) would move to what new towns, and the lands pertaining to the people who moved into a new town now fell under the town’s jurisdiction. Nearly all the institutions that Toledo instructed his visitors to establish, had precedents in Castilian villas (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 237–8).

Each new reducción (see above) town was also called a doctrina, and from the tributes of its new population a priest’s salary was to be paid. The priests, called doctrineros, or indoctrinators, were charged with keeping careful watch over their Indian charges, providing frequent instructional sessions in addition to regular weekly and daily mass. Above all, they were to make sure that Indians left their idolatrous ways behind in the origin settlements that they had abandoned. Toledo’s initial project plan, drawn up on November 7, 1573, urged visitors to take care when caciques, or local chiefs (see below), begged them to leave more old settlements standing than were absolutely necessary. For reducciones (see above) were principally intended to force the Indians to leave the places and sites connected with their idolatries and the burial places of their dead and, for this reason, and “under every shade of piety”, the caciques “have deceived and continue to deceive the visitors so they are not moved from their old pueblos” (in Abercrombie 1998, pp. 237–41).

The move, we can see now, was necessary as a technique of amnesia and to distance Indians from their past; therefore, active erasure of memory that was encoded in living space and commemorative space of burial places was carried out through demolition. In addition, former homes were to be levelled, along with monuments such as burial towers, or chullpas, in which ancestral bones were kept. These were to be thrown together into a common pit and buried. The new towns would have their own cemeteries, located within the church and in its immediate environs, but only Christians could be buried there (see Fig. IV.1). Once the old ancestors were gone, new, Christian ones would be left to commemorate in the rituals in favour of the dead, a specialty of 16th century Catholicism (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 237–41).

It comes as no surprise then, to observe this kind of reality upon arrival at Pampa Aullagas: the town is conspicuously the result of the reducciones policy implemented by Viceroy Toledo. Ayllu and community systems are directly linked to this style of organising the landscape or occupation pattern, where the organisation around the plaza, the grid plan of the streets, the church with its parish house, a town council hall, the cemeteries located within the church and in its immediate environs are all there, even the parallel lines and right angles along which the Indians were forcibly settled. It is as though the tambo had been replaced by the new facilities
the Municipality has for the visiting researchers such as us. The following approximate figure illustrating the similarities in Pampa Aullagas with the model described, clarifies what we found there: (see Figs. IV.2 & IV.3).

The Historical past of (Pampa) Aullagas

According to written sources, Aullaga or Awllaka were people who settled close to Lake Poopó, and this is one of the names found in early sources for the lake, i.e. lago de los aullagas. Restructuring or re-foundation into Hispanic cities or Hispanic towns, as mentioned above, began in early colonial times and Cusco, for example, was re-founded in 1534 shortly after the occupation of present Peru. Paria, located north of Lake Poopó, is another name found in the written sources for the lake and this referred to an important settlement of Urus, founded in 1536 by Diego de Almagro, who was en route to conquer Chile through the Collao or Kollasuyu (Martín Rubio, 1998; Lockhart, 1968, 1972; Wachtel, 1978).

Hernando Aldana, introduced as a relatively lowly Extremaduran whose linguistic talents made him the first Spaniard to have learned the Quechua language (Abercrombie 1998, p. 137), received an Encomienda in Cusco in 1534 as a reward for his participation in the capture of Atawallpa (or Atahualpa), the Inka leader executed by the conquerors Pizarro and Almagro. After these conquerors came into conflict over the possession of territories, the Siwaruyu-Arakapi diarchy was separated from the control of Guaraque (see above), described as the Únu Mallku of the Killaka federation, meaning that he had been the lord of ten thousand vassals (Julien 1982). Consequently, together with the Encomienda that Aldana received in Cusco, he was also allotted Killaka Indians and among them the leader of this group, Guaraque.

Another Pizarro associate, General Pedro de Hinojosa, was given the Indians of Awllaka-Uruquilla sometime in the 1540s, until his sudden death by sword thrust during another short-lived rebellion in 1553. When the Awllaka-Uruquilla Encomienda became vacant it was granted to Hernán Vela, a morisco, i.e. a descendant of Muslims converted to Christianity who was fleeing his lowly status in Castile. Hernán Vela, mentioned above in connection to visitor Pedro Zárate, took the Encomienda of Awllaka-Uruquilla Indians after 1553 and was, previously, a follower and retainer of Viceroy Blasco Núñez de Vela. Viceroy Núñez de Vela had come to end the Encomienda system in 1543 and had for that reason been murdered (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 143; 149–51).

Visitor Pedro de Zárate claimed in 1575 that the Repartimiento of Aullagas and Uruquillas (Awllaka-Uruquilla) had 4851 persons, 3103 of whom belonged to the Aullaga-Uruquilla nation and 1748 Urus, each subject to the leadership of five caciques. The report by Visitor Zárate states that Aullaga-Uruquilla people were initially distributed into 19 towns, within an area of 20 leagues. Due to the Visit – and probably due to the visitor’s decision – they were reduced to three urban settlements: Villa Real de San Miguel de los Aullagas with 824 tributaries, Salinas de Tunopa with 300 and Santiago de Guari with 200. They were expected to pay 6,994 pesos of tested and marked silver on a yearly basis tribute, meaning that Aullagas and Uruquillas should pay 5,109 pesos and Urus 1,885. Half of the tribute was to be paid in June, close to San Juan celebration, and the other half in Christmas period (Martín Rubio 1998, p. XLVIII, mt).

It is interesting to note that after revising the written sources, Abercrombie prompts us to notice that today, people of Pampa Aullagas exhibit a historical amnesia about the Killaka federation, but that colonial caciques were at pains in their probanzas and memorials to recall to Spaniards the nature of the pre-Columbian social arrangements (1998, p. 154; see also Memorial de Charcas 1598). I will return to this later. The term cacique (T.), mentioned above, was the denomination the Spaniards used generically in place of local words for chief. A Probanza (Sp.) was a service report in form of curriculum vita backed up by sworn witness testimony, presented to Spanish Crown in an effort to gain privilege or position (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 517–19). Written sources mention also the original ayllus that were made part of Aullagas as a consequence of the Toledan ordinances; these were: Hilasacatiri, Collana, Sulcasacatiri, Taca, Iguapacha and Ullagas. To these, we are told, four Uro ayllus “poorer
than themselves” belonged also to the latter, that is *Sogtita, Sato, Uramayo* and *Choro* (Martin Rubio 1998, p. LII, mt). Though the Spanish spellings in colonial sources are different from scholarly literature, it is easy to see the connection of ayllus “Hilasacatiri” and “Sulcasacatiri” with modern, single ayllu of *Sakatiri*; “Collana” with present *Qullana* or *Kollana*; “Taca” with *Taxa*; “Iguapacha” with *Jiwapacha* and “Ullagas” is perhaps what we know today as the town of Pampa Aullagas forming a different ayllu by that time. As to the “poor Uro ayllus” mentioned, we can safely postulate that “Sogtita” became modern *Suxtita*. “Sato” and “Uramayo”, on the other hand, seem to have vanished and “Choro” is still *Choro* and already mentioned as *Uru*.

Another important and rather recent source of information on this area, is the 1998 edition of Bartolomé Alvarez’s Memorial (1998 [1588]). Alvarez was a Spanish priest who wrote about the Indians of Peru in a document sent to King Felipe II in 1588. The document and the author were unknown until 1991 when a librarian from Madrid (Guillermo Blázquez), handed a copy to a historian (María del Carmen Martin Rubio) who realized its value as a document. The copy was from the late 19th century and the original seems no longer available. Bartolomé Alvarez wrote the document in 1587 and 1588 while residing as a *doctrinero* or preacher in what was called the indigenous town of Aullagas, also *Ullaga* or *the Ullagas* in his words, today known as Pampa Aullagas, south of Lake Poopó. His intention was to persuade King Felipe II of the need to have the Inquisition intervening in the follow-up and punishment of non-Christian practices among indigenous people of the Andes (Alvarez 1998, p. XI).

Because of the date (1588), this is one of the early sources about *Uru* population in the area of Pampa Aullagas. Through the eyes of a Spanish *doctrinero* or preacher, i.e. Bartolomé Alvarez, it is argued that these *Indians* were so filthy and mean and vile, of low understanding and black hearts that they were not good enough to be servants of God, since they would only worship their uacas and rites (1998, p. 73, mt). The term *uaca* (or *wak’a*), refers to local so-called deities, usually male, in the form of a hill, a river, a stone, or any other object, worshipped because, it is claimed, of their anthropomorphic or particularly impressive shapes (Cf. Layme 1992, p. 259).

The chapter Alvarez devoted to Uru population of Aullagas shows that as early as the 16th century, there was an identification of differences between those called *Aimaraes* by the author, and the people called *Uru*. I have translated his words as I believe they are also worth quoting extensively:

```
… particularly a part of the naturals, people that the others call Uros, different from Aimaraes… all of them… have few science or none of it in terms of curiosity, for they do not remember nor know how to explain where they came from. These Uru people claim to be the first inhabitants of the land, and that Aimaraes – in their expansion – reached them in lagoons, valleys with plenty of water and rivers, where there were plenty of roots to feed them…

These people are more uncouth and crude, lower and clumsy and lacking good manners in comparison with Aimaraes: they are so inept that they can hardly make calculations. They are dirtier, worse clad, poorer than Aimaraes; lazier, less communicative, more elusive, less industrious, great lazybones; tougher, more on the loose, the worst in Christianity matters, hard to discipline… They abhor any preaching and indoctrination, and persevere in their idolatries and rites, they are meaner than those Aimaraes: because among the Aimaraes not all of them are learned on how to worship their sepulchres and uacas, and among Uros they all are worshippers of their silly religion, so whenever Aimaraes need help in their sacrifice rituals – or any superstition destined to guess by means of rabbits [cuy] … or others – they call an Uro person to help them in doing so.

And even when an Aimara person can do that, if an Uro happens to be around they will not do it without the help of the Uro. I have seen it and particularly in this town, [i.e.] Ullaga…
```

720. Of this generation of Uros is the lagoon they call Paria [old name of lake Poopó], people so lost and rough and unruly that no knowledge on their number exist, although it has been said that they are six thousand. The lagoon where they hide is sixty leagues round, more or less. So when Uros do not want to get out, no one is willing to go and look for them except other Uros, who of course would not do it if they do not want to. Rafts are necessary on such wide waters and if someone would dare to go after them would be at pains in finding them, because far beyond they are prepared to build caves where they can hide so that others would not be able to find them: they introduce sods to fasten the land, building a Venetian-like basement and a hole [as in...
palafittes, structures without doors firmly based over the water] where there is room for few people... and by surrounding it with totoral they hide amid the waters without it leaking into the interior. (Chapter XX ‘De los Uros’, the figures introduce each paragraph in the original text [1587–1588] 1998, pp. 390–400, nt)

This early description, while illustrating prejudices found in almost every written source on the subject, add to the idea of an “ethnic” difference already present in (Pampa) Aullagas in early colonial times. It is also interesting because it seems to confirm a context where the differences we stress today were already established before the arrival of the Spaniards, grounded on prejudices similar to those arguing about who should be deemed civilised or not.

**Uru Population in Pampa Aullagas?**

Upon arrival in 2002, we contacted the local authorities in order to explain the purpose of our visit as well as to ask for permission to stay. In the conversations held with the people in charge of the local Alcaldía (Mayoralty of the Municipality), we were told about the authorities’ structure. This, again, reflected the above-mentioned Toledan ordinances for the hierarchies both at the Mayor’s office and for the traditional authorities (jilaqatas), intertwined in the peculiar “fiesta-cargo” system described in the literature, as we shall see below.

The recently implemented law of Participación Popular (1994) grants direct economic support for the local Municipality, in charge of the Alcalde (Mayor) and eight Concejales (councillors). These are elected every five years from a list prepared by the political parties, in a structure akin to urban centres consisting of the Honorable Alcalde, Oficial Mayor Administrativo, Intendente Municipal, Concejales and, additionally, two Mayordomos. At the same time, there is a parallel structure representing local authority, that is, the Corregimiento. The name is suggestive, as it is the same as was established by the Toledan ordinances of the 16th century. A Corregidor was an officer appointed by the king to represent royal authority in the province during the 16th century; his jurisdiction was a Corregimiento, that is the Province of the corregidor’s jurisdiction during colonial times. From 1565, Licenciado Lope García de Castro divided the Altiplano in corregimientos (Cajías, 1975 quoted in Martín Rubio, 1998, p. XLV). Today, both represent canton authorities and offices (cf. Abercrombie, 1998, p. 517). The members of the Corregimiento at Pampa Aullagas are called jilaqatas (see Glossary), after the traditional term for local authority in the Andes and they are elected every year (another Toledan disposition), in this case in November, through open Cabildo to represent their ayllu. There is also a cacique territorial and a juez de minima cantidad or cuantia (judge or procurator fiscal) as part of the hierarchy, i.e. nine members, the same as for the Alcaldía. The highest representative among these jilaqatas is the Corregidor and this, as we have seen, was a post previously assigned to a Spanish authority according to Toledan ordinances. At the time for the fieldwork, they had offices on the same street next to the Alcaldía’s, where the six jilaqatas of the six ayllus met regularly to discuss local problems related to their respective ayllus (see Fig. IV.2 and IV.3). However, we were told that only four of the six ayllus rotate as head of the Corregimiento, Corregidor, on an annual basis. When asked for the reasons to exclude two out of six, they argued that the other two had too few inhabitants to be in charge for a year.

The two ayllus excluded were Choro and Sojitita or Suxtita. Their jilaqatas never rotate for the post of Corregidor in Pampa Aullagas, although they are present when ayllu matters are discussed (see Fig. IV.4). Interesting for this research was that these two ayllus were considered Uru in written sources (cf. Molina Rivero et al. 1986). The jilaqatas (Choro, in this case) did not mention it. They just mentioned the small number of inhabitants in these ayllus and that the common language was Aymara, as most would also speak Quechua and Spanish. I was tempted to understand this also as a recurrence of old beliefs about Urus, i.e. those who did not count, those who were seen as extremely barbarian people, the savage and inferior by nature, the Chullpa-Puchus or rejects of old times that should be avoided.

By not asking directly about the Uru population, as this would assume alleged ethnic differences, costumes etc., I tried to explore how people identified themselves, what ascriptions
they would use and/or mention. Nobody claimed ‘‘I am Uru’’, nor did anyone identify others as Urus, at least not directly. *Uru Murato* population from Llapallapani, the place between Huari and Condo previously visited east of Lake Poopó (see above), was mentioned when commenting upon fishing activities and we were told that these people usually visit the shores of Pampa Aullagas on occasion. They did not seem to be concerned about this, as they saw *Uru Murato* as people who just did their job. However, the description of how, when and for what would they, in turn, fish, hunt or collect aquatic fauna was interesting as this indicated activities attributed to Urus without formally acknowledging it. However, I was careful in these appreciations, as more observation was still needed. Nevertheless, they admitted the existence of some *Uru Murato* people in the ayllu of Suxtita. They were described as guests (Sp. *alojados*), a curious category that we also considered worthwhile to investigate, since Wachtel mentions in his work among the *Chipaya* that Moratos had no lands. Wachtel states that they lived on the shores of the lake as *inquilinos*, i.e. tenants of Aymara owners and, as such, kept small plots close to their huts, harvested some potatoes and also knitted some handicrafts for sale, but the essential part of their resources came from hunting and fishing (1990, p. 230, mt). Therefore, when people in Pampa Aullagas referred to *alojados* or guests in respect of Uru people, they referred to what Wachtel calls *inquilinos* which, in Spanish language, has equal meaning.

A recent law (INRA, 1995) refers to the use of territory and the rights that should be accorded to indigenous communities. The interesting part is that it has prompted the emergence of ethnic identities in view of the fact that by gathering efforts through local organisation, they might be able to obtain exclusive rights to territories that they proved to occupy since ancient times. In fact, the *Uru Muratos*, as a separate or different Uru group located around Lake Poopó, are demanding, according to INRA’s records, the quantity of c. 152,000 hectares (INRA-SAN-TCOs, 2003). All of a sudden, it is as if *Uru* identities would become recurrent, as the benefits of ascribing to such an identity are potentially enormous. It should be said, however, that claims related to these territories are temporarily held up by the government, as the implications are obviously also enormous.

**Uru occupation patterns in Pampa Aullagas?**

As I perceived that the *Uru* problem, as Wachtel dubbed it, was far from being solved, I also realised that not only people who live in aquatic areas should be perceived as *Uru* or, for that matter, that not all farming and herding should be considered as exclusively *Aymara*. Therefore I tried to very carefully study the occupation patterns of Uru characteristics (i.e. as described in the literature) during the initial fieldwork in Pampa Aullagas (2002).

It should be remembered that sources mention the Uru houses that were round and elliptical in old times, but that today rectangular houses are built (Posnansky 1938, p. 67 ff.). In this respect, Gisbert & Mesa (1989) explain that Chipayas have two types of dwellings, one urban and one rural. The urban house has a circular plan with a diameter of c. 4 m; the walls are not vertical but lightly sloping to the interior in a false vault construction and the fireplace is within the house. The occupants sleep on the floor. The rural house is similar to the urban except for the thatched roof of the latter as the walls slope to form a cone-shaped vault. They are also made of sod blocks directly cut from the ground and all houses have a single door oriented to the east (1989, p. 55, mt). On the other hand, Wachtel (1994) recalls that in the 1970s, Chipaya could still be distinguished from the other towns of the high plateau by its round, straw-covered huts, similar to those in the early 17th century drawings by the chronicler Guaman Poma de Ayala. They were grouped in each moiety in seemingly chaotic clusters. Reminiscing about the vanished landscape, Wachtel notices that almost all houses were now built according to a rectangular plan. The few round huts that remained among all the new homes seemed to be falling into decay (1994, p. 2). Bartolomé Alvarez’s Memorial mentions such also circular plans in Aullagas, particularly for the important or community houses, some fifty years after the conquest (1998 [1588], p. LII, mt).
These ethnographic data led me to consider the round structures or circular plans as the sign of characteristic Uru dwellings, also called putukus, but aware of the fact that Toledan reducciones had already altered any original landscape and occupation pattern. However, archaeology would assist me here.

Fieldwork as an aid to understand descriptions

I carried out fieldwork in Pampa Aullagas between 2002 and 2003 with the intention of obtaining insights while going through the experience. Considering what I had learned by then about the population in what is called Andean Bolivia, i.e. mainly the traditions and characteristics of Urus, I was prepared to be surprised by the real thing. I anticipated the difference that the fieldwork would make when I had the chance to face what the people living in the area were prepared to show and tell about their situation and their history, as they saw it.

This was the place, these were the people (see Figs. IV.5–IV.10) who would help me in showing, even if inadvertently, what it is like to be labelled and classified by, as I was led to hear from them, “anthropologists who come to do research and then disappear without leaving any benefit for the people”. I wanted to be careful to not repeat what others had said, nor what others would have expected me to do, that is, what I saw as the traditional extractive research where the anthropologist-archaeologist practises “hit-and-run” research guided by questions which he or she believes to embody the ultimate truth in the discipline. After all, this was my chance to come up with a critique to this situation but also with something that helped in the approach to a subject presented as a problem. I had been given the chance to be creative but, nonetheless, my possibilities were restricted by tradition in the academic mainstream and by the local conditions. I decided to take the chance anyway.

I would like to provide some reflections on the fieldwork that guided me through the experience. Imagine that you want to find out what really gives your next-door neighbours their identity. You have been taught that, as an anthropologist in this case but also as an archaeologist, the normal way to find out how things are in respect of your anthropological and or archaeological object of study is mainly to be there, to go there, to carry out participant observation, to conduct interviews etc. You begin by crossing the street and knocking on the door and, as soon as you see it open, you step across the threshold and proceed to unload your stuff, install yourself – maybe on a nice couch or, perhaps, that bedroom over there that looks cosy? Who knows; the point is that you see it as indispensable to spend at least a couple of days and nights over there –particularly if you aim at being participant. Anyway, at the same time that your problems connected to your prolonged stay there are solved, you proceed to inform your neighbours about your plans and you just let them know that you want to study them, that you want to know about their history (or histories as there may be more than one to tell!), and that you aim at understanding how their normal daily life works. For that, you argue, your credential as an anthropologist and or archaeologist should suffice for your being accepted amidst that people at their home, where nobody has requested your presence, nor expected you to be so interested about particularly because they, in turn, know nothing about you.

This rude caricature is what anthropologists and archaeologists are expected to do when they do the so-called fieldwork. They are intruders who go into places where nobody expects them to arrive, to find out about private, personal things. In addition, they pretend to write about these things using their anthropological/archaeological authority so that the rest of the world can learn about it. How can it be acceptable that whatever results they get through this procedure should be attributed to their ability not just to obtain the information, but also to interpret what they see and find? Mainstream academics as well as science more or less tell us to do this, but the other side of the story is that we also more or less invent additional ways to comply with this request, while trying to deal with the anxiety created by the research situation (Devereux, 1999). We therefore invent the quite real agreement received from our institutions and transmitted for unquestioned acceptance to the other, i.e. our object of study who happens to be people, in this
case, who produce and are connected to what we call culture, the one we believe we have been trained to both understand and define and, of course, explain in what we then write about it.

It is this method – and its caricature if you wish, that I find problematic. It is this method that I wanted to deal with in a way that, in my view, would not only be unproblematic but also fruitless, unrewarding. Science, and the knowledge we accumulate with its help, should also be a way to find solutions to its intrinsic problems, i.e. the human hand in a science that we, as humans, have created (and still recreate), a significant detail we usually forget about. Since I was offered the opportunity, having identified some limits in my science, i.e. the stance of the single-discipline approach, I focused on trying to find solutions to the problems of those limitations. At the same time, I tried to recover one of the old ideals of the Enlightenment; that of the possibility of enhancing our understanding by not only reducing the reality to parts, but by remembering that these parts should be put together, since they are pieces of a larger panorama. It is within this rationale that my approach that draws from different perspectives should be understood.

What has been found and where

I started to explore the area of the supposed Uru territory in Pampa Aullagas, that is, the shores of Lake Poopó as well as the shorelines of the rivers connected to it (Lakajawira and Márquez). Observations were carried out first near River Lakajawira and the Pai rumani ruins marked on the maps I consulted (IGM, TCOs, 2002). Initial pictures were taken of the archaeological structures that showed round, square or rectangular ruins. It was only after a second visit to the place that we could establish that the site called Pai ruman i was not the one containing such ruins; it was Calzar Vintu, the place marked on Wachtel maps as Uru Murato territory (1990). I will come back to these later.

Visits to one of the allegedly Uru ayllus of Pampa Aullagas (Suxtita), allowed for a revision of the eleven communities of the ayllu. Six of these eleven communities in Suxtita are located NE of Pampa Aullagas and south of Lake Poopó, two are located N-wise, and one is located NW-wise, while two are communal lands for cultivation of potatoes and fodder. They are all placed within or part of the dunes. None of the houses registered in these communities was round or elliptical. All inhabitants interviewed showed or pretended distance in respect of Uru Muratos, and claimed an Aymara identity for the records, that is, they all tried to relate directly to the Aymara town of Pampa Aullagas, where they also have communal houses, or to the city of Oruro, capital of the Departamento.

All claimed to be herders raising llamas, sheep, donkeys as well as chicken and dogs. Farming is a second source of food supply, and mainly relates to cultivation of a few kinds of potatoes (the most resistant varieties under the extreme local climate conditions and saline waters), some quinua plots as well as fodder for the animals (Sp. cebada: barley). Two communities acknowledged trading in salt carried by llamas to the Potosí and Cochabamba valleys, in order to obtain maize and wheat. Only one of them, Tola Collu, seemed still engaged in the trade though in 2002 they did not have llamas enough to be able to trade. Some communities had tried greenhouses for growing vegetables (tomatoes, lettuce, spinach, turnip and radish), but they soon discovered that greenhouses are not viable since the sunrays in the Andes are too strong for this type of farming. Migration seemed to be a common feature for all the communities. No community acknowledged the recourse to water resources, except for one (Challa) who admitted trying to collect eggs without being noticed by Uru Muratos, who were portrayed as the masters of the lake. Moreover, the only Uru-Murato that showed up as such was actually not a member of any of the allegedly Uru ayllus: he was living in one of the largest Aymara ayllus of Pampa Aullagas (Sakatiri), and his abilities in hunting flamingos (pariwana) as a source of traditional Uru livelihood were particularly pointed out to me and my students (see Figs. IV.21–IV.24).
**Choro**

For the initial fieldwork, I focused on the two allegedly Uru ayllus of Choro and Suxtita. Choro was the first ayllu visited and observed in 2002, with the help of the jilaqata (Alfonso Choque), who was temporarily also in charge of the Municipality. It soon became clear that although close to Lake Poopó, with lands surrounding the east-southern part of the town of Pampa Aullagas and part of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, also known as Santos Mallku, no direct connections to Uru identity were evident. Mr. Choque, a name some would believe to be Uru (cf. Lavayen 2002, p. 115; also below in Ayllu Sakatiri – Comunidad Calzar Vintu; but see Daniel Moricio Choque in Chapter 3), tried to show his connections with the local Aymara population as well as with the valley territories of Sucre and Cochabamba, to where he had moved when we visited Pampa Aullagas in 2003.

We visited the four communities that make up the ayllu of Choro: Q’irpata, Thula, Linsupata and Paqullani. Alfonso Choque was born in Paqullani, while his sister and brother-in-law lived in Q’irpata, at an estancia called Kaluyo. We counted 112 sheep that were tended by the sister (Paulina) when we arrived. Some sheepskins were hanging to dry in the patio where three domestic houses, all of them rectangular and with a single room, enclosed it, forming a C-shape. We also visited Alfonso Choque’s own house where he lived while in Pampa Aullagas, acting as the jilaqata of his ayllu. The house that had belonged to his father was uninhabited when Choque was away in the valleys, i.e. Chuquisaca or Cochabamba. The house was placed at the foot of Mount Santos Willka, amid the sand and close to the road connecting to Quillacas. A single room house, it was also rectangular. Structures of old houses, mostly in ruins, were observed in the surroundings and it seemed that, apart from Alfonso Choque, nobody lived there. That is why, Choque argued, he also had left Pampa Aullagas and only came back because of the cargo or civic and religious responsibilities (see Chapter V) he fulfilled that year, i.e. as jilaqata. When we came back in 2003, we did not see him, but before that, Mr. Choque had also taken us to the places he considered worthwhile visiting, such as the strange wirjinas, i.e. the sources of bubbling water, both by River Lakajawira and on the southern slope of the mountain that we climbed, after visiting his house.

**San Miguel de Uruquilla**

Alfonso Choque, jilaqata of the ayllu Choro, also guided us to San Miguel de Uruquilla in 2002, a place people in Pampa Aullagas claim to be the original founding site of the town. It is seen as an old city that includes the rests of a church and a square, c. 20 km from Pampa Aullagas. We went there to see it together with other proud guides who also joined us, eager to explain the details of what we were about to see.

The place, consisting of different sized structures is located close to River Marquez, on the eastern side, with Mount Phawa on the west. Many chullpas with square plans and stone bricks were also close to the ruins (see Fig. IV.12), which showed traces of Inka structures such as a large kallanka (see Glossary), the roof of which was gone but with the walls and doorway still standing. Other rectangular structures were all built in stone, including one that was particularly attractive at the time. This was a circular structure with a diameter of c. 4 m, surrounded by others that were not circular (see Fig. IV.11). Enclosed by a secondary wall, it had eight niches in the contouring wall placed at a man’s height. The literature refers to these structures with the generic name sunturwasi, a Quechua word meaning circular structure, the function of which is largely unknown (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980). It looks like a circular tower and this particular one had no roof.

I was fascinated by the way in which people related to the structures: they described the area as the original town or, in their words, the founding place where the Archangel Michael had begun a persecution of the devil. The devil tried to escape by hiding in the watercourses of the river (this would be why the river – Lakajawira –comes in and out, disappearing in some stretches and then appearing again, but always there, beneath the earth where the bubbling water emerged, as we were shown). The chase, they say, succeeded in the town of Pampa Aullagas where the devil was captured, and subsequently the church was built just below Mount Santos.
Willka, or Pedro Santos Mallku, facing River Lakajawira. When entering the church, it is possible to see a painting made recently by a local student, depicting this founding event and, at the same time, explaining why the town of Pampa Aullagas is not located in the founding place of San Miguel de Uruquilla.

The visitor Pedro Zárate, who took Toledo’s instructions to Killaka and Asanaqi territory in 1575, reduced a total population of 4,851 persons to three new towns from 19 pueblos within a district of 20 leagues (Martín Rubio 1998). Thus, the old Inca Tambo of Awllaka, possibly the ruins in San Miguel de Uruquilla, became Villa Real de Aullaga (present day Pampa Aullagas). On the opposite shore of Lake Poopó, Zárate founded Santiago de Guari (present day Huari). Far to the south, on the edge of the great salt pan of Uyuni, he settled tribute payers and their families in a town he called Salinas de Tunopa (modern Salinas de García Mendoza) after an old travelling hero, whose name is linked to a mountain in the neighbourhood (see Annex 4, The Legend of Tunupa). Each of these three new towns may already have existed as a settlement, but they were renamed and transformed. The Guarache headquarters of Hatun Quillacas was refounded as Oropesa de Quillacas (Cook 1975, p. 5, quoted in Abercrombie 1998, pp. 237–8).

A closer analysis of the sources also indicates the following: The report by visitor Zárate (above) stated that the Aullaga-Uruquilla people were reduced to the three urban settlements mentioned above, one of which, Villa Real de San Miguel de los Aullagas (Martín Rubio 1998, p. XLVIII), is our focus. With this information, we could understand the remark made in San Miguel de Uruquilla that the village was the original founding place of Pampa Aullagas, which subsequently moved to its present position at the foot of Mount Santos Willka, or Pedro Santos Mallku. We can almost see San Miguel, or the angel Michael, moving from the old Inca Tambo of Awllaka that became Villa Real de San Miguel de los Aullagas, to what is now modern Pampa Aullagas and, at the same time, we can understand to what memory of past events “San Miguel” and “Aullagas” are related.

Meanwhile, our guides also commented that a special visit was recently paid to them. As a result, they had been told that they were, in all probability, the descendants of the Atlantes as, according to the visitors’ conclusions, the mythic Atlantis was originally placed in the area. San Miguel de Uruquilla was possibly one of the main cities of the lost civilisation. They were referring, as we understood from their descriptions, to the expedition organised by Discovery Channel and James (Jim) M. Allen, a British geographer and cartographer who claims to have discovered that the Bolivian Altiplano “is similar to the characteristics described by Plato” for the Atlantis (La Razón, 2004; La Epoca, 2004). I will only add that I find it hard to forget the question that followed this event, for the guides asked, “Señorita: ¿cree usted que seamos los hijos de los Atlantes?” (Do you believe that we could actually be the descendants of the Atlantes?). I mentioned above that, in the words of Abercrombie (1998, p. 154), the present-day inhabitants of this area exhibit a historical amnesia about their past, whereas the colonial caciques were at pains in their probanzas and memorials to recall to Spaniards the nature of the pre-Columbian social arrangements (see also Memorial de Charcas 1598). What we find in San Miguel de Uruquilla is not only amnesia; they seem to know little or nothing of such pre-Columbian past that suggests the existence of influential groups such as the Killaka-Asanaqi and Awllaka-Uruquilla, let alone the different Urus. The people of Pampa Aullagas are unaware of the importance that Aullagas’ deposits in silver and other precious metals, such as those in Salinas de Tunopa, had for the miners’ activities in the area, and which made the region influential compared to other communities well into the 18th century. They do not think of themselves as connected to Urus in any respect. Instead, they consider the theories of Jim Allen to be serious.

**Pairumani**

It was clear that what we took to be Pairumani was instead Calzar Vintu, described below. A more in-depth approach made us realise that Pairumani (GPS marks 0705243 / 7877234 – 3,757 m.a.s.l.) was, instead, located on the northern slope of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, facing River...
Lakajawira and Lake Poopó to the north, Mount Sato and Quillacas to the east, and the town of Pampa Aullagas to the west. From here, it is possible to obtain a general view of the surroundings, including the characteristic large stones (some were c. 1 m high) all over the area as well as some flowering cacti.

Although deserted, it showed some interesting details. Members of Suxtita and other ayllus considered this as the place of the ancients, who settled there in the time of chullpas. However, people from Nueva Florida (ayllu Suxtita), would rather talk of a more recent past, mentioning that Pairumani was part of Challapuju (another community of ayllu Suxtita). It had been inhabited by members of their community until they decided to migrate to Santa Cruz (in the lowlands, one of the nine Departamentos of Bolivia); this would not affect the ayllu constituency as it still figures as an existing settlement.

The settlement in question is formed by three groups of stone dwellings and a chapel that seems to be a more recent construction. The latter has a rectangular plan surrounded by adobe bricks, a lintel made out of a single block of black stone and there are remains of a thatched roof that would have been built on cactus wood but now lies on the floor of the single room. There is also an interior altar in the shape of an inverted pyramid facing three empty compartments. The external tower built with bricks is not higher than 1.90 m, both structures being surrounded by a double wall of black and white stones forming an interior patio. The first residential group consists of one house, two stoves and one oven. The walls and basement are built from white and black stones. A second residential group consists of two houses and a patio delimited by a wall close to which was a black grinding stone. The final residential group had four houses located around a patio surrounded by a wall; a grinding stone on the floor was also visible and a second stone placed on a c. 1.30 m high stone pedestal.

In all but one construction, the doors and roofs are gone and the use of slate for the roof beams is visible. In two of the largest residential group (the third), it was possible to observe two stone platforms c. 40 cm high above the floor, one of them with two small steps marked by twigs. The structure with a preserved thatched roof had a metallic door and seems to have been the last to be abandoned, as it still had a piece of blue cloth tied to a wooden stick that acted as a lock. There was a further area still being used by someone we were unable to meet in person, corresponding to a corral with a two-part division, one part containing sheep dung and the other llama dung; access through a tola door was possible in only one of the compartments (see Figs. IV.13–IV.19).

Close to the constructions and on the slope leading to the top of the mount, some terraces for cultivation were built. There was also a path bordered by stones leading to the constructions on one end, and on the other connecting to pathways that cross the mount on the western part, leading down to the town. There were large amounts of modern pottery shards as well as some stone artefacts including grinding stones and takiras (see Figs. IV.16–IV.17), some of which ended up as locks for houses. To the northwest, a quinua field of the people from Nueva Florida was tended and covered with wild straw.

**Calzar Vintu**

On a map published with Wachtel’s text on Chipaya Urus (1990, p. 234) (see Fig. IV.20), nine estancias of the Moratos are pointed out, showing that, in [Pampa] Aullagas, Calzar Vintu is one such estancia or cluster of houses that form hamlets and are distributed among arable portions of the territory (Wachtel 1994, p. 146). Wachtel stated that there were eight heads of family in Calzar Vintu at the time, and that these would be extended families defined by their patronymic – Choque, in this case – with four heads of family with this name residing in Calzar Vintu at that time (1990, p. 233). Nothing is said about the patronymic of the other four.

We headed to Calzar Vintu (GPS marks: 0707323/7878058 – 3730 m.a.s.l.). The circular plan was of particular interest for us, the context within which it was placed as well as whether the area was inhabited. In 2002, it was possible to make a first contact with Julian Choque who spontaneously declared his identity as Uru Murato, stressing the fact that he was not Aymara. He and his wife were the only inhabitants in the area at that time. Julian Choque said that he was
Puñaka (or Puñiga, one of the nine estancias of Moratos, according to Wachtel 1990, p. 233), and that his sons migrated to Cochabamba and Tarija, unwilling to stay there, as they saw no future in the lands of his father. He mentioned members of his family who had passed away, such as his uncle, Norberto Alero, his brother, Apolinario Choque and his grandfather, Angelino Cayo. They were buried in the neighbourhood, he claimed, but was unable to state exactly where. The surviving members of this family, apart from his sons, all lived in Llapallapani.

I would like to mention that every time we brought up the name Calzar Vintu, the reply was something like “oh, yes… Balsar Vintu!”. The name of the village in the written sources is given as Calzar Vintu; however, the locals do not spell it this way. The word balsar would make slightly more sense to us, since, the village is located close to a lake, a balsa (Sp.), i.e. a raft, would sound more appropriate in the context. However, no source mentions the origins of the word calzar which in Spanish would have the approximate English meaning of shoes that somebody wears; additionally, it is a verb that shows the action of wearing a pair of shoes. Spelling the word “Calsar” is meaningless, as many names today and, Vintu, on the other hand, refers us to a Spanish word – viento or wind – in Aymara = vintu or wintu. So much for speculations.

To begin with, Julián Choque explained that Calzar Vintu (or Balsarwintu) was now part of ayllu Sakatiri, one of the largest Aymara ayllus (consisting of eleven communities) in Pampa Aullagas. Recent ordinances about borders between the different ayllus (INRA, July, 2002) left his lands in the territory of ayllu Sakatiri. He claimed he had rights to c. 2000 ha of land, according to what he called the ancient settlement of Calzar Vintu, but now he had only c. 300 square metres, where his two one-room houses and cultivation plots were located. In addition, he was allowed access to the lake (podía usar el lago). However, he did not feel as though he belonged in ayllu Sakatiri, as Suxita was more familiar to him and he felt that he shared a common history with the people of Suxita. People from Sakatiri, he claimed, were hostile and had told him, “you are [another one]; you are not from here” (in Spanish: otro eres, no de aquí). He believed that the decision to ascribe him and his lands to ayllu Sakatiri was not right as he felt that being an Uru Murato, he was entitled to claim territory of his own. However, this was not viable, as no other people claimed to be Uru. The possibility of obtaining territory in other Uru areas such as Llapallapani, where his relatives resided, or Puñaka, where his wife comes from was not an option either, as he feels attached to the place where he was born or, in other words, where he was raised as a child.

Julian Choque’s house was a few hundred metres away from the structures in which we were interested. It was a typical rectangular house, actually two one-room-houses in an L-shaped disposition, where he washed and prepared llama wool to be utilised in making different traps for pariwanas (see Figs. IV.21–IV.24). He commented that the structures we had been observing (including the circular one), were the property of a Sakatiri community that had lands in Mount Sato (landmark shared with Quillacas), and that the house near the circular structure was owned by Máximo Cayo, an Aymara member of Sakatiri. However, the lands were jointly used as corrals or janta’s (see Glossary) for the camelids or sheep that grazed on the shores of the lake by the members of the ayllu Sakatiri. Some thirty years ago, he added, Uru-Muratos had permanent residences in the area and had commercial contacts with the Uru Muratos of Llapallapani, buying and selling fish and agricultural produce. This ended when floods forced them to move some fifteen years ago and left Julian Choque as the only resident in the area. He decided to stay even at the risk of having to move farther into the sand dunes if the water levels of the lake would change. His present occupation was to hunt pariwanas (local flamingos). He did this in the same way as his relatives in Llapallapani, he claimed, with the help of traps called chalalawas. The latter are prepared with the threads (waskas or huascas) of llama wool, each c. 1 cm thick and a few metres long. These threads are used for tying sometimes up to 170 cm long twigs of eucalyptus collected in the valleys. A net is formed where the birds are trapped by catching their legs and necks in slip knots tied to the extremes of the huascas or threads. Julian Choque planned to build a putuku to shelter him when he was far from his house or when preparing chalalawas. He claimed to have prepared many chalalawas longer than a jiwa, that is, some 12 sticks of eucalyptus planted every 1 m, and tied by means of the huascas, preventing
that the loops formed by the slipknots enter the water, so that birds are caught in abundance. He claimed that long ago, it was possible to catch up to fifteen pariwanas in a single day, but this was no longer the case. The pariwanas are sold in Challapata and Huari for Bs 25 and sometimes Bs 50 (ca US$ 3 and US$ 6 respectively); feathers are also sold for Bs 1 that is something like Bs 2 per bird. He presumes that feathers are used for dancing costumes, whereas he recommended that the blood should be drunk to cure stomach aches or diseases caused by Karikari (see Glossary).

He also mentioned other activities such as the sale of hens and the collection of pariwana eggs, facilitated by the fact that these animals usually make collective nests, although the areas where one can find them are difficult to access since it is marshy and well hidden. Cultivation had been difficult for him lately; his Aymara neighbours let their animals graze in the areas he would like destined for cultivation, the lands being equally suited to grazing. However, he had started cultivating quinua (Chenopodium quinoa) that year (2002), in the sand dunes close to his house; the first sprouts were being protected with some old saucepans and tin cans that had been perforated to facilitate the plants growing and to avoid intruding animals. He believed that the lake was “tired and cold”, and the reason why the quantity of fish and birds had constantly decreased. Nevertheless, he still sailed his 2.80 m long boat or warco, from Sp. “barco”, made out of old corrugated tin plates that he received from a friend and godparent, with his kero or pole used as a support to thrust the boat and sail (tawi), and his oars called tawiña (see Figs. IV.25–IV.29). When he was younger (he now claimed to be 60) it would have taken him c. four hours to sail to Llapallapani and two and a half days to the central area of Lake Poopó. Today, his warco allowed only short trips along the shores where fish have considerably diminished; otherwise, when the rainy season comes it is easier to catch pejerrey (Basilichthys bonariensis), a species that invaded the waters of Lake Poopó and Lake Titikaka in the 1950s (Cf. Dejoux & Iltis 1992, pp. 427, 500). He also hunted aquatic birds such as ducks and geese that were easy to catch by the shores or totorales (local reeds similar to bamboo – Schoenoplectus californicus) and, of course, pariwanas.

This collection of ethnographic details was encouraging. We returned in 2003 to pay a special visit to Julián Choque to see how things were going for him, the only and lonely Uru Murato in Calzar Vintu, to compare our understanding of his way of life to the larger research context. I will return to this second experience after the details of our visits to Suxtita.
CHAPTER V
FIELDWORK IN SUXTITA

Introduction

Ayllu Suxtita, as mentioned in the previous chapter, is one of six ayllu settlements that we found around the town of Pampa Aullagas during our first visit in 2002. It borders Ayllu Sakatiri to the east, to the north with Orinoca and South Carangas and Lake Poopó to the northeast. Sand dunes are characteristic of the area, as well as tola or t’ula (see Glossary) shrubs, wild straw and ch’iji and llapita, two local varieties of Andean grass. Wetlands are also common around the lake shores considered part of the ayllu. Its main access road connects the town of Pampa Aullagas with Orinoca; from May and August 2003, additional rural roads are available connecting the different communities with the main road owing to the support of the PLANE – National Plan for Employment programme. Although the area is rather arid, the proximity to the lake favours access to a rich fauna of fowl such as ñandu (local version of the ostrich) or partridge, as well as animals such as hare, rabbit, fox and vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*). Some of these are seen as pests, e.g. the rabbit, because it destroys quinua cultivation, and the fox that hunts sheep and even llamas. Tola and wild straw have a variety of uses, e.g. as firewood or as a component of thatched roofs. Resources from the lake such as *mulluchi*, algae, are not really appreciated as people connect them with times of scarcity that forced them to use as food owing to the droughts that affect potato cultivation. Fishing activities do not seem to be of interest either; neither fish nor *pariwana* meat were mentioned as worthwhile, at least for trading purposes.

As noted in Chapter IV, Suxtita – also Sogtita or Sojitita – appeared as the only place left to investigate the Uru problem in Pampa Aullagas. We also noted the way in which written sources and some verbal references mentioned Uru people (see Martín Rubio 1998, p. XLVIII; Abercrombie 1998, pp. 237–8; Alfonso Choque, *jilaqata* of Choro; Julián Choque of Calzar Vintu).

The ayllu of Ullagas, no longer mentioned by the present population, is said to have also included four *Uro* ayllus, namely Sogtita, Sato, Uramayo and Choro. The possibility of an ayllu including further ayllus is not unusual; this structure, described as an extended family or lineage believed to have a common ancestor, remains as what we have described as moieties. Generally speaking, each moiety, *Anansaya* and *Urinsaya*, are part of a larger unity called *Ayllu Mayor*, i.e. Greater Ayllu, the moieties thus becoming *Ayllu Menor* or Lesser Ayllu, each divided in turn into smaller ayllus. They all receive the name of ayllu, the difference, particularly in present time, lies in the importance of the divisions that they cover or are part of.

Members of ayllu Suxtita, e.g. Román Calle and Cristina Cayo, confirmed that the size of their territory was larger than the present one. Without reference to any precise date but as a memory from past times for men and women in their 30s and 40s, they mentioned that Sato areas and Calzar Vintu were part of ayllu Suxtita. Mount Sato would have been an area destined to cultivation in its entirety as no part of it ascribed to Quillacas would have existed at the time. The distribution would have followed the same logic as for Mount Pedro Santos Willka (see below), specifying communal areas as the one that Asurcollu, one of Suxtita’s communities, had on the northern hillsides. Calzar Vintu, on the other hand, was a grazing area where *jant’as*, or temporary shelters, were built and, owing to its proximity to watercourses such as River Lakajawira and Lake Poopó, it was covered by *kulcha* (grass). The general comment about the
Uru Murato settlement in Calzar Vintu was that ‘they were allowed to stay as it was sad to see them wandering around’, i.e. without no land of their own in the community. However, Maximo Cayo from ayllu Sakatiri, whom we shall meet again soon, was of the opinion that Urus settled temporarily in the area only to abandon it later, according to their needs that, in his opinion, were the hunting and fishing activities.

The loss of Sato and Calzar Vintu areas is apparently connected to one of the ‘authorities’ (a fiesta-cargo post – see below) who failed to meet his obligation as junta muyu, that is regular visits to communities of the ayllu in order to ensure that activities developed. Following this, the jilaqata of Sakatiri is said to have promoted the recovery of the lands of Sato and Calzar Vintu in favour of the ayllu. They succeeded and this became official once recent revisions of borders among tierras comunitarias de origen or TCOs (original community lands) or ayllus in the Andes were completed, establishing new official borders between Suxtita and Sakatiri. It is interesting to note that references to this were made in terms of territorio salpicado, i.e. ‘scattered territory’, by people in Suxtita, as Sakatiri areas, e.g. Chullpa, lie in the middle of Suxtita territory. Was this a reflection of the archipelago mentioned before (cf. Murra 1982, 1987 i.a.)? We were beginning to follow the way in which people perceived the landscape, how they related to it and how landscape and people were interconnected.

No reference was made to whether or how the new dispositions concerning Calzar Vintu affected the Muratos in the area; however, it was felt that the event created distances amid both sides, as friendly relationships were previously the norm. For example, it was not uncommon to see people join together to catch rabbits with the help of tracking dogs, or to build putukus according to a Murato technique as they claimed. This was done by drawing a perfect circle with the help of a cord and a stick driven into the floor to create the wall plan, as well as for preparing the dome-shaped roof using sod-blocks or champas. Román Calle, one of the Asurcollu members, commented how putukus became fashionable as jant’as (shelters), because less building materials were needed and the construction was finished in almost two days. The main advantage of putukus, he claimed, was the possibility of sheltering more people as long as they accommodated with the heads leaning on the wall and the feet towards the centre, following the circular form. Román Calle had preserved a good relationship with Muratos from Llapallapani (e.g. Severo Choque), from whom he bought a boat that had to be transported from there some years ago. Regrettably, the boat was damaged when it reached K’uchu Pampa, in the neighbourhood of Mount Sato.

In 2003, the jilaqata of Suxtita (see Fig. V.1) could not tell us how many people lived in each of the communities of Suxtita; neither could other people interviewed during the fieldwork. Migration seems to be one of the main reasons why people do not reside permanently in the area; another reason is the mortality rates of children. We observed that every family mentioned at least one young child who had passed away. They also mentioned that some families are considered residentes, a category used to refer to people who have left the ayllu – due to migration or other causes – but who still keep in touch and assume their responsibilities in the fiesta-cargo system of Pampa Aullagas.

The fiesta-cargo system mentioned above should be further discussed. This system seems to be common all over Latin America as a combination of town council office and religious obligations and, as Abercrombie (1998) puts it, town council officers are chosen not by popular election, but by the performance of specific periodic duties connected to saints’ festivals. The resulting combination of religious and civil offices into fixed sequences constituting fiesta-cargo careers seems to be a widespread but exclusively colonial phenomenon. Abercrombie mentions that there is no direct Castilian model for the straightforward merging of civil and religious posts into individual career sequences as we see them in the Andes and that, within the urban context in Spanish America, the Spanish model predominated. This consisted of artisan guilds as well as voluntary associations organised as confraternities, where membership required the payment of fees and costs for processions and masses in honour of their saintly patron. In general, confraternities devoted to each saint seems to have included the whole community in its membership, and just as each parcialidad, moiety, and ayllu was to take its turn providing officers to the town council according to a fixed rotational system, so did rural festivals in...
honour of saints seem to have been sponsored. The documentary record does not say when the turn systems regulating the allotment of religious festival posts merged with those distributing town council offices, partly because such fused systems were clandestine, Abercrombie claims. There was no provision for them in colonial law and the pattern of moiety alternation in each office and the orderly, interwoven succession of civil-ritual careers are “the stuff of unwritten social memory. Historians are unlikely to find written records of merged systems in archives.” (1998, pp. 291–93).

This topic is the result of the peculiar way in which the Toledan ordinances concerning town council merged sometime between the 17th and the 18th century with those related to religious festival posts. These institutions, separate in the beginning, are the result of a process that started with the allotment of a town council for each town, similar to those that Castilian villas enjoyed to help the priest round up his parishioners for indoctrination, and to aid in the delivery of tributes and mita labourers. For Andeans, according to Abercrombie (1998), this was another radical break from the past. The diarchy mallkus had directed their own subalterns, called principales or jilaqatas, of whom there was at least one for each of the sub diarchy units called ayllus. Very likely, such authorities had in the past filled inherited posts, perhaps linked to lineage ritual duties in honour of the ayllu’s ancestral mummies, wak’as, and paqarinas (place of origin. See Glossary). Now, however, the Castilian way was to prevail and the new towns were not only to take the shape of a Castilian town, but also to be ruled by a council of officers charged with applying a strict order of behavioural rules. For example, inside the town council offices (referred to as the cabildo, consejo, or regimiento) there was to be a locked room and, in it, a lockbox with three keys. This was called the community chest and it contained two chambers: one to hold the community archive, and one to deposit moneys from tributes, salaries earned by mita workers and others who hired themselves out, fines and rents collected in the name of the community, and profits from the dairy production and wool of the community herd. The books to be deposited in the community chest were account ledgers, wills and census materials. In this way, each town was simultaneously a unit of civil administration (reducción) and a unit of ecclesiastic ministration (doctrina). The priest assigned to religious ministrations of the town, the doctrinero, was charged with carrying out stringent measures to convert his flock to Christianity and make sure they did not wander back to ancient idolatrous ways. Chief among these measures was weekly and sometimes daily preaching, especially to children. However, the regular Christian calendar of holy days was also to be observed, and to guarantee properly performed rites and full devotion to Christian saints, several sorts of specialized roles were assigned to Indians, ranging from choirmaster and musicians, to mayordomos, alférezes (see Glossary) and other functionaries of regular cult to the saints. Taken together, they reduplicated the kinds of devotional offices attached to all Spanish churches and the kinds of posts that in Spain belonged to semiautonomous lay confraternities (cofradías) charged with cult to the saints (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 241–44).

On the civil side, administration of the community chest, the collection of tributes, levying of labourers, capture and trial and punishment of delinquents as well as services to aid in the indoctrination efforts of the new town’s priest were entrusted to a town council, a consejo or cabildo or regimiento meeting in the building with the same name. This council was composed by several kinds of offices and numerous individuals who were elected every New Year’s Day by the retiring members of the council. The new council included four regidores (aldermen), two alcaldes (mayors), an alguacil mayor (major bailiff) as well as two alguaciles menores (minor bailiffs), along with a scribe, a fiscal (prosecutor), a schoolteacher and a mayordomo. Each office was to be occupied for one year by men elected to office by the previous year’s authorities, new ones replacing old ones on January 1st of each year. Toledo’s general ordinances specified that no more than half of these posts could be held by privileged relatives of the noble cacique lineages; the rest should be held by common Indians. In establishing this balance of power, which closely resembled the balance between town councilmen and feudal lords in Castile’s seigniorial towns, Toledo struck yet another blow against what he regarded as the overweening power and pretensions of tyrannical native nobility. The freedom of action of caciques and the town council was constrained further by granting final say on many issues to Crown administrators, especially the corregidores who in Castilian towns defended the king’s
interests against both lords and councils. *Encomenderos* were enjoined from visiting their *encomiendas*, deprived of Indian labour, and “effectively eliminated from the equation” (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 244–46).

Now we are in a position to better perceive the nature of what we have so far described as a parallel structure representing local authority in Pampa Aullagas (see above). Such parallel structure is the *Alcaldía* on the one hand, and the *Corregimiento* on the other, each with a hierarchical staff that we have also described. It is interesting to note how the names of the authorities overlap with the ones quoted above. How should we understand this intricate way of combining two different colonial institutions? It seems better to begin with the question of not when but how civil and ritual posts came to be merged. In each reduction, both kinds of authority were supervised most closely by a single individual, the Spanish priest, who was charged in Toledo’s ordinances with making sure that obligations of all sorts were fairly distributed among the reduction’s constituent units. Priests knew the hierarchic order of such units through their parish registers, just as town councillors knew them through *padrones* (census list in colonial times, see Glossary) locked in the community chest, but also more permanent scribes or *quipu kamayuqs* (specialists who knot and interpret *khipu*, the Andean system for record keeping; see Glossary) knew them through one or another accounting technique. Inhabitants of towns construed the two kinds of rotational systems – and those regulating other duties such as service in *tambos* (or rest stations) and turns in the *mita* (coerced labour system of colonial period) – by the same principles. Having said this, the best evidence for the colonial emergence of fiesta-cargo systems can be traced from litigation records, trial transcripts and administrative reports from the period of the 1780s rebellion. Such evidence reveals that hereditary lords in the Charcas region, i.e. native authorities, were more often targets than leaders of rebel violence; priests were usually spared by rebels.

The reason why *priests*, unlike *corregidores* and the *caciques* who collaborated with them, enjoyed immunity from immediate execution by rebels was that like saints, they had become a fundamental part of the new order. Priests were now no so much directors of Christian cult in which Indians participated as a kind of honoured part of the hired staff that was required for functions in the Indians’ own cosmos and polity-sustaining ritual system. Andeans, Abercrombie claims, “contrived to use performances of Christian festivals to overwhelm their enemies in a Trojan horse manner” (1998, p. 294). For this, they arrived in traditional moity groups to perform a ritual battle in the saint’s honour, and then united to transform what normally was a ritual battle between them into a rout of Spanish observers. The first to die in the revolts of the late 18th century, however, were native lords, targets of the social groups that now defined themselves through festival sponsorship in *reducciones*. The native lords had become heavily hispanized functionaries of the colonial state, acting as the right arm of *corregidores* by collecting tribute and *mita* labourers and by helping *corregidores* collect payments for the mules and cloth they forcibly sold to Indians. Denouncing such abuses, the priests became further allied with the communal authorities “who had sprung up from below, the town councilmen, whom Toledo had intentionally set up as a counterweight to native noble pretensions” (Abercrombie 1998, pp. 293–96).

I find this account of events fascinating, because it provides one of the most interesting elucidations for the “historical amnesia” mentioned above while, at the same time, it illuminates the origins of the social structure that we discovered in places such as Pampa Aullagas or, in this case, Suxtita. A closer investigation shows that our *Corregidor* in Pampa Aullagas is a local authority who has duties connected to problems affecting the members of the ayllus; that the *jilaqatas*, authorities elected to take office on January 1 of each year, are local representatives of their communities, *vis-à-vis* the *Alcaldía*, where the official State has its representatives. Nonetheless, the members of the Alcaldía are also performing in their capacity as members of the community or ayllu, i.e. Pampa Aullagas. They are expected to assume responsibility not only in the *cargo* or Alcaldía, but also in the *fiesta* system, particularly on September 29, when the patron of Pampa Aullagas, San Miguel Archangel, is celebrated with festivities lasting at least a week. In fact, the *jilaqata* of Suxtita, Máxima Chaparro, gave her excuses for being unable to fully assist us during the fieldwork in 2002, as she had obligations to fulfil in relation
to the *prestes* (*fiesta* sponsor, see Glossary) and the *cabildo* during the celebrations. The same was heard from our acquaintances at the *Alcaldía*.

Regarding the *alojados*, the name used for referring to Uru Muratos, this was not acknowledged as a familiar term within the ayllu members. They all insisted on identifying themselves as *Aymaras* including women with whom they were related through marriage, who had come from different communities in the same ayllu or from other ayllus such as Sakatiri, Choro and Taca (*Taxa*).

A perspective on the *Ayllu* and the Population

Maxima Chaparro, the *jilaqata* of ayllu Suxtita in 2002, (see Fig. V.1) explained to us in 2003 how they see the origins of the ayllu and the population:

They say that the lake was larger in ancient times, and that it covered all the territory that today we see as firm land. There were only two pieces of land and these were Choro and Suxtita, so they say. On those two pieces of land there remained only some people, both men and women; the rest was born from them. Those people were the first inhabitants in the area and that is why they are called *Chullpapuchus* today; that is how they call the inhabitants of Choro and Suxtita: the rejects of the *chulpas* (July 24, 2003, mt).

As I have already mentioned, *Chullpapuchus* is the name used to refer to Uru people. I had started the investigation precisely with the idea that Choro and Suxtita were Uru areas, i.e. that their inhabitants would be Uru. Furthermore, we have seen how these two ayllus were precisely those excluded from at least part of the *fiesta-cargo* system by not allowing them to be part of the rotating hierarchy by which one of their representatives would assume the post of *Corregidor*, i.e. the leader of the *jilaqatas* that represent the six ayllus in Pampa Aullagas. As explanation, we heard that there were too few people in these two ayllus; however, we found that Choro had *four* communities, the same as ayllu Qullana, and that Suxtita, similar to the largest Aymara ayllu Jiwapacha or Sakatiri, had *eleven*. I have also expressed the theory that they were excluded from the system because they were seen as *Chulpa Puchus*.

The perspective I have just translated in regard of the origin of the ayllu explicitly refers to this situation and some would willingly put the myth-of-origin label on this. It sounds very similar to what we found when describing what was seen or understood as Uru. Furthermore, the situation with Choro is unclear. As mentioned above, Alfonso Choque, the *jilaqata* who assisted us during the first stages of our research, was not willing to accept any connection whatsoever with Uru people. He showed no signs of identification with *Chullpapuchus*, contrary to the *jilaqata* of Suxtita. In general, when it comes to communal activities connected with political and economic circumstances, there seems to be an open identification with what is considered as Aymara, i.e. the language, the type of organisation and the occupation patterns that they all seem to follow. None of these seem associated with the possibility of, for example, utilising the resources of the lake which, in turn, are identified as proper “to Uru Murato population from Llapallapani” (!)

At this point, we were shown how the construction and reproduction of identity in Suxtita did not pass through self-identification. The specific situation or condition of the ayllu had to be understood from the perspective of the ayllus that define themselves as Aymaras. That, in turn, means that the name of *Chullpapuchus* has become a reference for the other and the reason why an objective, material difference can be established in a political organisation that excludes, at least in part, both Choro and Suxtita.

But how do people from Suxtita cope with this conspicuous way of defining the other and, at the same time, making room for such an otherness? What can we say, for example, about the way Calzar Vintu was taken away from their territory and moved to the Aymara ayllu of Sakatiri? Would this make Suxtita less of an *alojado*, or guest, in the territory? What lies behind the constructions that the literature defines as ethnic identity and or *ethnicity* (Ardener 1989, Just 1989, Limón 1991, Pitt-Rivers 1992)? Let us move further into the territory chosen and dive into the occupation patterns of the members of ayllu Suxtita.
Communal Lands and Economy: an overview of Suxtita

Access to communal territory is closely linked to kinship. The tendency to patrilocality makes it obvious for every community to maintain one single patronymic, from which it is possible to establish the right to have access to territories in the different ecological niches. The example of Asurcollu might help to understand this (see Kinship Diagram Nº 1), knowing that the local patronymic is Calle (see Table V.2 below), carried through four generations. In the Kinship Diagram we can find people we refer to in this text, such as the jilaqata Máxima Chaparro Morales and we can see that she comes from Kalpata; likewise, Román Calle, who is cousin to the children of Máxima. We also find Cristina Cayo, originally from Sato, married to the brother of Máxima’s husband, i.e. Atanasio and Doroteo, respectively.

It becomes evident that married women leave their community of origin, i.e. the community of their fathers, to reside in the community of the husband, thus granting their children the right to access the communal lands of their own father. In the past, the tendency, not the prescription, seemed to be endogamy at the level of the ayllu or, in other words, marriage between members of the communities in the ayllu. The system favoured the permanent redistribution of resource utilisation and the control of communal population, as there are ecological niches with limited resources that would not bear the burden of a larger population.

As part of this organisation, each family asserts their belonging to the ayllu by means of tribute paid in their quality of contributors, amounting to c. Bs 6, i.e. less than one US dollar per year. However, there are those who do not pay the tribute because, for example, they are newly formed families and exempted until they build their own house; or because they see themselves as foreigners or guests of the ayllu (alojados). This category includes not only Urus, but also Aymaras and Quechuas who might have married local people and being widowed, they had no other place to go. Staying as foreigners or guests exclude them from consultation in ayllu matters, tribute, and fiesta-cargo obligations. People can also evade their obligations because they lost or conceded the use of their lands to others, owing to migration or change of activity, as was the case with some people who took up teaching in schools. Furthermore, nobody seems to have heard of foreigners buying land in Suxtita. The migration rates might explain why the idea seems to be out of place. However, at the same time, the new dispositions regarding land (Law INRA of 1995), preclude the sale of communal land as people were granted the use of territory in their capacity of TCO’s (Tierras Comunitarias de Origen or “original community lands”), since they had proved occupation since ancient times. Thus, they were given exclusive rights to such territories that were once granted to them, according to the colonial dispositions mentioned above.

Raising llamas and sheep is the main activity complemented by farming. The animals are sold on weekly markets or ferias such as in Challapata, where the meat, the skin, the wool and the viscera are sold together with llama foetuses, called sullu, destined to what is called Andean rituals. Almost every community have grazing fields in the surrounding plains and slopes that end up near the lake where the herd finds water when wirjiñas or shallow water supplies are scarce. However, there are no specific limits of these areas for the communities, making it possible for the herd to graze mixed with somebody else’s; this makes it important to maintain control, including flocking together the animals every afternoon to avoid losses, such as the animals grazing too far away or being attacked by foxes.

Farming focuses on cultivating bitter potatoes called luki, or the varieties called pali, sani and piñu rojo; people plant in October and harvest in May (see Table V.1). The freeze-dried potato called chuño for the annual family needs are prepared between June and July. Barley and quinua are also cultivated, including royal quinua and the variety called pantula that is pink, planted in September and harvested in March or April. These plants are very much dependent on weather conditions, such as the intensity of winds that take away the grain as well as on the grazing herds that could get too close to the fields in searching for water. Onions, tomatoes, carrots, lettuce and radish are sometimes cultivated by families enjoying access to wirjiñas or wells. Communal parcels are located on the slopes of mount Pedro Santos Willka that lead to
the lake, such as Lupikipa and Chullupampa, and have been available to all communities from what they consider to be “the times of our grandparents”, meaning no specific time in relation to our own perspective.

### Table V.1 Cultivation in Suxtita Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTIVATION</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>SOWING</th>
<th>HARVESTING</th>
<th>CONSUMPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potato (Solanum tuberosus)</strong></td>
<td>Plots close to communities and mount Pedro Santos Willka</td>
<td>October and November</td>
<td>April and May</td>
<td>Family consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Pali</em> and <em>piñu rojo</em></td>
<td>Plots close to lake Poopó</td>
<td>October and November</td>
<td>April and May</td>
<td>Family consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varieties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Luki</em> and <em>sani</em></td>
<td>Plots close to communities and mount Pedro Santos Willka</td>
<td>October and November</td>
<td>April and May</td>
<td>Family consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(when there is no frost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quinua varieties:</strong></td>
<td>Plots close to communities and mount Pedro Santos Willka</td>
<td>September (from the 8th up</td>
<td>March and April</td>
<td>Family consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal or Pantula</td>
<td></td>
<td>to the fiesta of San Miguel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>Chenopodium quinoa</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arcángel, the 29th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barley (Hordeum vulgare)</strong></td>
<td>Plots close to communities that usually plant quinua</td>
<td>September (from the 8th up</td>
<td>March and April</td>
<td>Family and also animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to the fiesta of San Miguel</td>
<td></td>
<td>consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arcángel, the 29th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onions, tomatoes, carrots, lettuce and radish</strong></td>
<td>Plots close to <em>wirjiñas</em> or wells</td>
<td>October and November</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family consumption and occasionally for selling to families in communities deprived of soils for these produce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maxima Chaparro, the *jilaqata* of the ayllu, commented that they have plans to gain access to water resources from the lake and for this, they are trying to form a fishing cooperative. However, the criteria to establish access to these resources would be based on a family practice in respect of community activities; that is, it would be an activity for members only. In general, all communities are similar in terms of the economic activities described and the occupation patterns established. However, in order to gain a better perspective and uncover some of the differences related to the ways of making use of lake resources by some of the families, or the trips organised to transport salt that were mentioned by others, I will now describe each of the communities visited as territory of the ayllu Suxtita. These will appear following an order connected to the position in respect of Pampa Aullagas; that is, those located on the road to Orinoca and farther from the town will be listed first whereas the ones closer to the town will come last. After this, the communities located in Mount Pedro Santos Willka will be described.
Communities in Ayllu Suxtita

Suxtita, the ayllu mentioned in the written sources and which we have access to today, is organised into eleven communities as illustrated by the following table (Table V.2) prepared in 2003:

Table V.2 Communities of Ayllu Suxtita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Family names (Patronymic)</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Translation offered locally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asurcollu (Asur Qullu)</td>
<td>Calle</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, amid a marshy ground (bofedal) and sand dunes. Tola shrubs.</td>
<td><em>Asiru qullu</em>: mount of the snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challa</td>
<td>Rosales</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, marginal to Suxtita sand dunes, close to Asurcollu</td>
<td><em>Ch’alla</em>: sandy soil, sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tola Collu (T’ula Qullu)</td>
<td>Villca (or Willka)</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, on the sand dunes, close to tola shrubs</td>
<td><em>T’ula Qullu</em>: mountain where tola grows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Challapuju</td>
<td>Lázaro</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, on the plain facing the sand dunes, surrounded by grazing land and close to salt pan Jayu Quta</td>
<td><em>Ch’alla puju</em>: smooth sandy soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kalpata</td>
<td>Chaparro</td>
<td>Road parallel to Pansuta area (ayllu Sakatiri), in between dunes and close to a salt smaller than Jayu Quta</td>
<td><em>Qallpata</em>: sterile summit or top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Añawani (formerly Silupata)</td>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, on a dune marginal to the road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jaransirka</td>
<td>Rosales</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, on the sand dunes of Suxtita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bella Vista (formerly Ukatuju)</td>
<td>Pizarro</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, on a marshy ground close to Pampa Aullagas and the dunes</td>
<td><em>Uka tuju</em>: “that rabbit over there”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nueva Florida</td>
<td>Rosales</td>
<td>On the road Orinoca – Pampa Aullagas, on a marshy ground close to Pampa Aullagas and the shores of river Lakajawira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kaqasa</td>
<td>Chaparro</td>
<td>On mount Pedro Santos Willka, on a slope in front of Calzar Vintu and the area of river Lakajawira</td>
<td><em>Q’asa</em>: broken, half piece of something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lupiquipa (Lupikipa)</td>
<td>Castillo</td>
<td>On mount Pedro Santos Willka, on a slope preceding sandy areas of the mount and the marshy ground surrounding Lakajawira</td>
<td><em>Lupikipa</em>: where the sun warms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have noted before, communities usually share lands fit for cultivation with those without lands. Pairumani, described above and also known as Ancient Pairumani, was once part of Challapuju and now its desolate aspect seems to suggest no one wanted to remain here. However, some of the still useful cultivation fields and corrals are used by families from Challapuju. On the other hand, all communities have an individual space in the town of Pampa Aullagas, that is, every ayllu is represented in the town in the form of a “head office” (*sede social*), usually a small house erected on a plot around the main plaza. In the case of Suxtita, their house is located a little further away, in Plaza Tola or Plaza Verde, named after the shrubs...
that grow there. It was built with the help of all members of the ayllu to hold meetings and fiestas, such as the celebration of San Miguel Arcángel, when all move to town to participate in the festivities. While away from their own hamlets, they stay in the town lodged at their house (c. 14 x 5 m in size).

Most of the communities listed were reached and visited thanks to the cooperation of people such as Maxima Chaparro, the jilaqata of ayllu Suxtita in 2002. They spontaneously helped during preliminary observations carried out while trying to understand the landscape in the area between the town of Pampa Aullagas and the next section to which it borders, Orinoca, in South Carangas. At least five of these communities are placed over sand dunes and the very name ch’alla denotes sandy soil; marshy ground and salt pans are also common features, while the last two communities are settled on the slopes of Mount Pedro Santos Willka.

Being so close to Lake Poopó is of course one of the reasons for the sandy soil and the salt pans, as well as for the marshy ground. Would it also be a reason to designate this as Uru territory? We posed some initial questions on the subject to people during our visits in trying to find out whether they saw Uru people as native of the area. The general reply was that they saw them as exclusively fishers and hunters, not farmers or herders as the Aymaras; that they had no relationship whatsoever with them, not even in terms of trade such as buying their fish or selling them agricultural produce or meat from their animals. However, they complained the Urus sometimes acted as if they owned the lake, and were seen patrolling in their boats or walking along the shores not allowing others to fish. However, our informants did not seem to see this as a threat.

In what follows, I present a description of each of the communities or settlements listed in Table V.2 above. There is a short introductory paragraph for every community, followed by details on the location, inhabitants, characteristics of the area, how they use the communal space as well as and the economic activities.

**Asurcollu or Asurqullu**

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. The inhabitants are mainly members of a family called Calle. When our fieldwork notes were completed in 2003, we had obtained the following perspective on this family: Eusebio Calle, a native of Asurcollu, was the father of Atanasio, Lucia, Doroteo, Luisa and Fernanda Calle (see Kinship Diagram Nº 1 above). Atanasio and Doroteo, the male brothers, had married Cristina Cayo and Máxima Chaparro respectively. Cristina moved from Sato to live with her husband Atanasio, while Máxima moved from Kalpata to marry Doroteo. The reason why the latter became jilaqata of the ayllu is connected to a family feud that, in this case, aligned its members in her favour. Her husband Doroteo, together with his brother Atanasio, were residents in Oruro where they performed as musicians in one of the many local bands, and he had tried to take away the herds of llamas and sheep that make this family so important within the ayllu. Doroteo was by then engaged in a relationship with another woman from Oruro and, in connection with this, he had attempted to recover part of his herd. He was met with the disapproval by his own family, the Calles. Since he used violence to do this (Máxima was shot together with Zenón Rosales, from Challa, keeper of the llamas and sheep while the Calles were in Oruro), he had been jailed in Oruro. Fortunately, Cristina, who was also there, was not hurt as a consequence of the incident. Under the circumstances, the Calle family supported Máxima Chaparro, Doroteo’s wife, who initiated the divorce (and asked us to testify in her favour).

Asurcollu, if written properly in Aymara, i.e. Asurqullu, is a contraction of Asiru qullu, referring to a toponym, a place-name that in Aymara language translates as ‘mount of the snake’.

**Location.** Located northwest of Pampa Aullagas, c. 13 kilometres on the road to Orinoca, it is the most remote community of ayllu Suxtita, settled amid marshy grounds (bofedal) on a plain with some tola shrubs, many sand dunes and some areas where ch’iji grows. The wide extensions are covered with large amounts of llama and sheep manure. To the east, the closest
community is Challa and the protruding landmarks are Mount Pedro Santos Willka and Lake Poopó. Large sand dunes and a plain with salt remains called Jayu Quta to the southeast are also important.

**Inhabitants.** Three families Calle headed by two brothers and one sister live in the place (see Kinship Diagram Nº 1 above). Two of them have permanent residences in the community while the third, although still maintaining a house, has moved to a hut located at the end of the road recently built by PLANE (National Plan for Emergency Employment). At the time of the fieldwork, the brothers were away (in Oruro), but the community was not abandoned, since a keeper (Zenón Rosales) was in charge of the houses, the herd and the chapel. The keeper, a member of the community of Challa, shared the profit that came from the herd, in a modality called al partir (Sp.: “go half and half”). However, not being from the place, he could not say when the settlement was established, although he suggested that “he always knew about the community”.

**Characteristics of the area.** In the central area of Asurcollu there are seven domestic houses distributed in three groups, each with their own stove and corral but sharing a well, an oven, a grinder and the space where a chapel has been built (see Figs. V.2–V.5). All houses have a rectangular plan and adobe walls. Wooden or metallic doors face the east and at the right side of each, there is a minuscule window c. 30x20cm; only three houses contained extra windows with glasses c. 30x40cm, facing north. One of the houses had a hole, c. 20 cm in diameter, on the upper part of the southern wall, in all probability an air vent. None of the thatched roofs had the typical small wooden cross we found in other communities as protection from lightning.

The communal well is situated in the central part of the community unprotected by an external wall, although some tin plates, black stones and planks have been used to cover it. The grinder is close to the well, placed over a rectangular base built with white stones called janq ’u qala, with an oval hand of the same stone, c. 50 cm long and 30 cm high. The oven has also been built in the central part over a square base of stone and adobe, with a dome-shaped wall covering it, made with the same sod blocks as the houses. The two spaces used for the stoves are surrounded by a circle prepared with tola sticks and in the middle stand the mud stoves with two or three rings and some ceramic pots and pans bought from Choro, as well as aluminium saucepans bought locally. Stone artifacts were also present such as a small rectangular container, a circular vessel called takira to shell the grain as well as a small mill with two stone wheels.

Amid the two central groups of houses, there is also a corral, bordered by the walls of the two houses, where some llama skins have been piled together. To the southwest, there is a corral with square holes in the walls, and to the north there is another square corral built with black stones piled up to one metre high. One last corral lies to the northeast with adobe walls in a square plan.

The chapel has been erected at the entrance of the community. This consists of a rectangular house with an altar, where a ceramic vessel turned upside-down has been placed together with a small wooden cross. Both are surrounded by a wall, in front of which stands a brick tower covered with stucco used for incense (see Chapter 6). Both the walls and the chapel are built with adobe; the inner walls are stuccoed with mud and the floor is covered with bricks. A stucco table contains four small altars, three of which are dedicated to the Virgin of Presentación and to San Antonio who, it was claimed, was the patron of llamas. Above the larger altar, there is a dove representing the Holy Spirit and an image of Santa Veracruz Tata has been placed on top of the altar. There are smaller crosses made out of quina wood (Sinchona calisaya) brought from San Pedro of Potosí, covered with red, green and orange wool. In addition, there are aluminium candle holders adorned with what looks like the wings of a butterfly (see Figs. V.6–V.7). The roof is made from straw, but the ceiling consists of logs of cactus wood, tied with cords of llama hide holding the totora framework. The most important celebration in this chapel, unlike in other communities, is for Santa Veracruz Tata on November 21 when a priest and members of the surrounding communities used to attend. This tradition is now discontinued.
Present activities are reduced to lighting candles on Thursdays to express gratitude and to ask for protection for the herd.

There is a choza (see below: Chachacomani) in the neighbourhood that belongs to the community and where one of the Calle brothers has settled. This consists of six houses together with three corrals, one stove, one oven and a space surrounded by a wall of white stones (janq’u gala), apparently for storage.

Four of the houses are no higher than 2 m with rectangular adobe walls, thatched roofs and metallic doors oriented to the north, with windows in the wall opposite the door. The other houses are oriented to the east with doors and windows oriented to the same direction, consisting of thatched roofs and adobe walls; one of these is different with a dome-shaped roof and a small door 1.30 m high and 1.5 m wide.

The dome-shaped oven has a door that opens to the west. Corrals are made of tola sticks tied together to form a fence, and the stove is placed within a circle of firewood not used as a fuel, but as a protection against the wind. In the centre of the settlement, there is another square structure with walls c. 80 cm high protecting a tree plant that we could not identify, as well as two ceramic vessels, one of which was similar to a wine container and the other to a four-legged animal lacking the head.

Use of communal space. Both at the rancho or central part of the community as well as at the choza – usually the houses located on the outskirts of the rancho – people expressed their idea of belonging to ayllu Suxtita while, at the same time, seeing themselves as owners of the territory where they lived. One of the reasons why they talk about ownership might be connected to the fact that they actually pay for the right to live in the territory, a tradition that originated in colonial times when the compulsory tribute paid to the Spaniards was considered equaling a right to stay on their lands. This has been superseded by more recent dispositions, one of which is connected to the Law of Popular Participation (1994) mentioned above. Nonetheless, people in Pampa Aullagas still collect the money representing tribute; a very small amount if compared with what a current tax on the use of land would be. This is then deposited with the local ayllu authorities to assist with local needs. In 2002, the total amount collected from all the families in ayllu Suxtita was Bs 60 – ten families = Bs 6 each – or c. US$ 10 for that year. Although symbolic, it still represents a right to stay in the place where they were born.

In line with the communal contribution mentioned, people in Asurcollu are also entitled to access water sources including wells and wirjiñas, to use grazing lands entailing the surrounding pampas, the sand dunes and the shores of Lake Poopó and use to lands for cultivation near the community.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation:** This is seen as a secondary activity. One of the families mentioned cultivating potato (luk’i) only for family needs, avoiding other cultivations such as quinoa, because it would involve too much effort and difficulties in controlling the animals who would try to eat it. In addition, there was the problem of sandy soil and it was feared that the strong winds would remove the grain.

- **Herding:** This is the main activity and involves raising llamas (more than 200) and sheep (more than 100). The figures vary and are directly connected to difficulties related to grazing fields, water supply and extreme temperatures. Animals are butchered at home by the owners and then transported by bicycle or on donkeys, a distance close to 30 min to the town of Pampa Aullagas, where the bus stops for the Challapata fair where they usually sell it.

- **Other economic activities:** In this community, we did not see families dedicated to complementary activities such as fishing or hunting in the areas close to Lake Poopó, and apparently, the only extra occupation was the collection of salt, firewood and straw for domestic needs that include the building of stoves, corrals and roofs. Regarding salaried jobs, the National Plan for Employment (PLANE) seemed the only local
opportunity while building connecting roads in the area. Otherwise, migration to the valleys seemed to be the norm for at least part of the year.

Challa

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. Zenón Rosales is one of the members of this community together with his wife and children, and he has already been mentioned mainly as the keeper of Asurcollu herd that belongs to the Calle family.

Location. Challa is located c. 11 km northwest of Pampa Aullagas. Access roads are as follows: a recently built one connecting with Asurcollu, one path leading to the town of Pampa Aullagas as well as a new way leading to the main road Pampa Aullagas – Orinoca. Neighbouring communities consist of Asurcollu to the west, Tola Collu to the east, Challapuju to the south and Lake Poopó to the north, the latter being the closest landmarks as well as Mount Pedro Santos Willka.

It is surrounded by a plain (pampa) covered with sand where tola and wild straw grow; to the north the plain is covered by ch’iji and llapita, where rabbits have dug many holes.

Inhabitants. Five families inhabit the site, although only four were found there in 2002, corresponding to the same number of brothers (Rosales’ people). When asked about the date when they settled there, we were told that they had been there “since the times of their grandfathers”, i.e. no specific date in time or any specific reasons for settling there were given.

Characteristics of the area. Unlike other settlements where houses are close to each other, here they align with each other at a distance of c. 200 m, facing the new road that leads to the main one connecting Pampa Aullagas with Orinoca (see Figs. V.8–V.9). The eleven houses are oriented to the east, built on a rectangular plan, with walls of adobe and thatched roofs. Doors are made out of wood planks and metallic plates and no windows were observed as in other houses, nor the wooden crosses on the roof except for in one case.

The only stove found was similar to the ones in the neighbourhood, with semi circular walls made of piled tola as well as an adobe oven. Ceramic pots and vessels in ochre were found in situ close to the stove and oven and we were told that they were bought from Kalpata, in ayllu Choro. Aluminium pots, a grinding stone and a takira were also part of the cooking utensils, the latter inherited “from the grandparents”, as they claimed.

The only corral in use was located to the rear of one of the houses grouped in the centre of the line, built with tola sticks tied together.

Use of communal space. The Rosales family was found settled in the territory that belongs to ayllu Suxtita; thus, they owned no particular part of it on an individual basis. Access to communal areas for cultivation, such as those close to the lake, and for herding in the surrounding pampas and water sources including wells and wirjiñas are, nonetheless, similar to in other communities, where everybody is granted access as long as they are members of the community.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation**: Production of potato varieties such as luki, llokalla and pali is widespread, the latter considered the best. The area dedicated to this activity covers half of a hectare and land is covered with sheep manure as a fertiliser before cultivation. The harvest, intended for family consumption, is stored as chuño or chuñu pali. Close to Lake Poopó, they also cultivate barley and quinua, trying to prevent rabbits and other rodents from ruining the crops. On the shores of the closest wirjiña, they also claimed having succeeded in harvesting onion and broad bean, although only sufficient for family consumption.
- **Herding**: Llamas and sheep are raised and graze on the surrounding pampas but sometimes reach the lake shores searching for fresh water and grass. The meat, the skin and the viscera of these animals are sold including llama foetuses, called *sullu* (see Fig. V.24), intended for rituals. The meat is transported by bicycle or on donkeys to the town of Pampa Aullagas and further by bus to the *feria* in Challapata. Inhabitants claimed that prices were not adequate, as lately, grazing fields and water had become scarce. Thus, the animals were scrawny and some were even dying, making replacement very difficult, as it takes at least three years to raise an animal. Although it is possible for the animals to breed when they reach their first year, they would give birth to only one cub. In addition, given the problems mentioned above in respect of the brothers Calle from Asurcollu, they were also in charge of tending the llamas and sheep of this family and a half-and-half agreement was established on the profit generated from these animals.

- **Other economic activities**: Collecting eggs on the shores of Lake Poopó was a supplementary activity. People mentioned that while doing this, they would be careful not to bother Uru Muratos, as the Urus should be the only ones patrolling the shores collecting eggs and hunting *pariwanas* that they sell at the *feria* in Challapata. Thus, the Urus control that others do not have access to these resources, which would confirm the view that the Urus see the resources as their property. Another important activity mentioned was the transport and selling of salt to the valley of San Pedro, close to Llallagua, the mining district of the Department of Potosí, bordering Oruro to the south. For the past four years, however, this had not been done. It was common to do this in the month of March and even in May, returning on “July 16” with maize and wheat exchanged there. Particular to this trip was the use of llamas instead of trucks to transport the salt, which was obtained northeast of Challa in an area of communal property. Regarding salaried activities, the construction of the road was the more recent one but it was also mentioned that two brothers worked as teachers in public schools.

### Challapuju

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. As we have seen, Pairumani was once part of Challapuju and now it was abandoned, although some of the still useful cultivation fields and corrals were used by the families from Challapuju. Teodoro Lázaro was a member of this community.

**Location.** Located c. 9 km northwest of Pampa Aullagas, access to Challapuju is gained through a recently constructed road (built by PLANE) no longer than a half kilometre, connecting to the main road between Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca. However, similar to the other sites, the area is very difficult to transit, particularly when a sandy plain covered with *tola* and wild straw is reached. The closest neighbours are Tola Collu to the north, Añawani to the east, Asurcollu to the north and Mount Pedro Santos Willka to the east. Mount Coroma is located south of the site. The lake is located northwards at a distance from the community.

**Inhabitants.** Although this is one of the largest settlements, the 39 people who see themselves as *contribuyentes*, i.e. tribute payers, in the area do not dwell in Challapuju on a permanent basis. Only six people were found in the main settlement of the community, together with one family living in a neighbouring *rancho*. They all claimed that they had lived there as children, for these would have been their lands “since the time of the grandfathers”.

**Characteristics of the area.** There are five clusters of houses oriented to the east. Six houses are in the process of being built while one seems abandoned, judging by the condition of walls and roofs. All plans are rectangular with adobe walls and thatched roofs, although some roofs are missing or even collapsed. Doors are metallic and to the right there is a small window, the only one in the house. No crosses on the roofs were noted, perhaps due to the short time of residence.
of the inhabitants who seem to have migrated, possibly remaining in Cochabamba (east of Oruro).

It was observed that the single room houses are intended for the following: one house for sleeping, one for storing things and sometimes one additional house used as kitchen. The common feature is the semicircular tola “wall” protecting the stove and the utensils for cooking (see Figs. V.10 – V.12). There is no communal oven and the only one found was placed inside a room used as kitchen. The only corral, on a square plan of c. 5x4 m, was placed to the north amid the roofed houses and surrounded by c. 1 m high adobe walls (see Fig. V.13).

Use of communal space. The Challapuju inhabitants have settled on the territory of ayllu Suxtita; thus, the land is not divided into individual properties. As tribute payers, they are allowed to access grazing lands close to the community where extensive plains surround the cultivation areas located close to the lake shores, wells and wirjiñas.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation**: The irrigated lands located close to Lake Poopó allow for cultivation of potato varieties such as luki and sani, mainly intended for family consumption, although some are also able to sell produce in Challapata. Cultivation of quinua is not considered profitable, as the animals tend to destroy it when trampling the plots or to eat the grain similar to wild animals. In this community, some simple tools were observed such as a wheelbarrow and a shovel.

- **Herding**: One of the persons with whom we had the chance to talk (Teodoro Lázaro) mentioned that the people living there had, on average, fifty llamas and twenty sheep grazing in the neighbouring pampas, where the wirjiñas are located. These animals are traded in markets such as in Challapata, where the meat is transported with the help of donkeys from the community to the town and then on the bus to, e.g., Challapata on Saturdays and Sundays.

- **Other economic activities**: Migration to Cochabamba and Chapare in particular, the tropical area of the departamento seems quite common in Challapuju. Here, they find salaried jobs such as caretaker or mason, although keeping permanent contact with the community. People living in Challapuju have also salaried activities such as those financed by PLANE, which recently built the road in ninety days.

**Tola Collu**

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. At first, nobody seemed to reside in the area at the time of the visit, but then we met Apolonia Willka, one of the members of this community.

**Location**. Tola Collu is located c. 9 km west of Pampa Aullagas, connected to the main road between Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca through a newly built road, c. 2 km long. The area is an extended pampa covered by tola and wild straw although sporadically also covered with sand. The community of Asurcollu borders to the west, to the south, Challapuju, to the east, Mount Pedro Santos Willka with Lake Poopó to the north and the road to Orinoca to the southwest. Some chozas from the comunarios are visible quite distant from the community, connected by paths that take c. 30 min to walk.

**Inhabitants**. The first contact took place in one of the chozas close to the rancho, or densely inhabited area, where we found a woman who claimed not to be from the area but had moved there after marriage to one of the members of the community. On a second visit to the community, it was possible to ascertain that the inhabitants consist of two families with children, one unmarried woman as well as third family who left the area to migrate to Santa
Cruz. Their situation was similar to other members of the community who migrated to Chapare (Cochabamba), where their activities are not known to their families.

The Willka family who currently inhabits the area refer to their “grandfathers” to explain their presence similar to in the other communities.

**Characteristics of the area.** There are ten houses distributed into two groups, each with circular stoves surrounded by piled tola sticks c. 1 m high. All houses have adobe walls, thatched roofs and one single small window, generally placed to the right of the doors, which are made from cactus wood or metallic plates. Four houses have been abandoned, one of which had a llama skin on the roof and two other had wooden crosses, which, according to Apolonia Willka, are good for protection against lightning (see Fig. V.14).

Two ovens were observed (see Fig. V.16): one rectangular built from adobe c. 8 cm high and 90 cm long, covered with metal plates and adobe. This was used to cook *pampaku*, a local dish prepared with potatoes, *oca* (a variety of tuber) and llama meat. The second oven was circular and dome-shaped, c. 1.5 m high, on a rectangular base of 2 m long, built from adobe and *champa*. Close to the latter was a rectangular and dome-shaped construction used for storing salt; it was claimed that salt cannot be stored indoors as the humidity it absorbs causes deterioration to the houses. The semicircular stoves were placed outdoors and were built behind piles of tola to protect the stove from the wind. The stoves were made from mud or stone. Ceramic pots of different shapes and sizes lay close to the stove although many were being used as containers for water. Ms. Willka claimed that they were bought in Pampa Aullagas.

At the entrance of the community, there was a small chapel with a single room, surrounded by a patio with walls, in the centre of which there was an altar. The altar was different from those in the other communities, as this was built with bricks and crowned by a ceramic vessel turned upside-down. The thatched roof of the main building was supported by cactus logs tied with *phala* or cord made with twisted wild straw. The walls were stuccoed with an earthen floor and an altar where two saints representing Saint Agustin had been worshipped “since the time of the grandfathers”, to whom candles are lit every Thursday. The fiesta was celebrated in August. There was also a table where tin candle holders were placed. Between the wall and the roof of the chapel, shelves for small ceramic statues of two llamas, two bulls, and thirteen sheep (see Figs. V.19–V.20) were found as offerings to the saints. In the outer limits of the patio and facing the arch at the entrance of the structures, there was a three floored tower c. 2 m high, with an adobe square base. We were told that it was used for dispensing incense by turning it around on your knees.

There were two corrals; one was larger than the other with adobe walls and two cactus planks tied with *phala*, the cord made out of wild straw. The second corral was entirely made from adobe (see Fig. V.14).

The *choza* mentioned above (see Fig. V.15) had two square structures with adobe walls, thatched roofs, metal plates as doors and a single window covered with sheepskin in both cases. They were used as a sleeping room and for storage. In front of them, a semicircle of adobe walls 1 m high had been built, delimiting a space used as kitchen. Here we found a mud stove with two holes intended for aluminium pots, and a third hole for the firewood previously piled up to the right of the stove. A little further, a *pirwa* or barn was found, a square structure with an adobe base c. 1.5 m high and 3 m long, used for storing potatoes covered with straw (see Fig. V.17).

All buildings in the settlement were oriented to the east except for the kitchen where orientation was to the west. Both the family well and the *wirijaña* were located c. 6 m from the dwelling.

**Use of communal space.** Lands in use by the community belong to ayllu Suxtita, therefore no private property existed. Grazing lands close to the settlement were shared, as well as an area including wells and *wirijañas*, the waters of which drained from Lake Poopó. Each family established rights to access the areas mentioned through the economic contribution described above, in favour of the ayllu, which in this case amounted to Bs 6 (c. US$ 0.90 in 2002) per year.
Economic activities:

- **Cultivation**: Cultivation of potato varieties such as *luki* and *pali* were common in the lands close to the shores of the lake (see Fig. V.18). The explanation for not using the lands close to the community was that changes in temperature, the sun and lack of humidity in the soil were not good for cultivation. Quinua was also seen as inconvenient, as it was usually trampled by the herd and affected by the wind. No specific details concerning amounts of seed or area of land cultivated were given as they claimed it had to do with the possibilities of each family and or the weather conditions. In general, produce was for family consumption, therefore *chuño pali* were also made.

- **Herding**: This was the main activity in the community, aimed at trading in local markets such as the *feria* in Challapata. The income generated was used to cover other needs as well as buying what was not locally produced, such as rice and sugar. The price paid for llama meat was considered low, as it only reached Bs 1 or Bs 2.50 per pound (the exchange rate at the time was ca. US$ 1 for Bs 7). Llamas were the most common cattle, and the Willka family owned c. eight hundred head. However, there was also a large quantity of sheep, the number of which was not easy to specify as they claimed that the snows in winter diminished the amounts of alfalfa and water needed by the animals. However, animals lost to this problem were used for producing *charque*, a method of preserving meat by sun drying and salting.

- **Other economic activities**: Many members of the community had migrated to areas in Cochabamba or Santa Cruz to get salaried jobs. PLANE projects for road construction were the more recent opportunities for salaried jobs in the community. Fishing activities were seen as “Uru Murato occupations” and apparently avoided. Other activities such as collecting tola were essential for domestic needs. Transport and the selling of salt were seen as traditional activities, and we were told that there was a tradition of travelling with fifty or sixty llamas carrying salt to San Vicente and Toro Toro in Potosí, from where they returned with maiz e after three months. In 2002, they were unable to carry out the trip owing to what they explained as the scarcity of llamas.

**Añawani**

This community was visited for the first time in 2002 and some people referred to it as the “ancient Silupata”, a name no longer used for the place. The Morales family inhabits the area and we met Sofia Morales, one of the members of this family.

**Location.** Located c. 7 km northeast of Pampa Aullagas, Añawani is reached by a pathway and road recently built connecting it to the main road between Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca. However, none of these is fully accessible for transit with vehicles since, people claimed, they were built on sand platforms not compact enough.

Neighbouring communities are Challapuju to the west, Kalpata to the southeast, Jaransirka to the north and, similar to the latter, it settles over sand dunes covered by tola shrubs, from where the main landmark is Mount Pedro Santos Willka. There is also a broad pampa or plain where many *wirjiñas* have allowed for the formation of *kulcha* or grass cover for llama feed.

**Inhabitants.** According to a woman we met in the area, who claimed an Aymara identity since she was able to speak this language, the area became settled by “their grandfathers” before she was born. In 2002, there were still two brothers with children and grandchildren in the area; the children who were still attending school shared a house in Pampa Aullagas during the week, returning to the community only on weekends. The older ones, that is older than sixteen years of age had already migrated to other areas of Santa Cruz, where they were working as drivers of “taximotos”, in domestic service or as employees in the construction field, thus unable to return to the community to tend the herd or the houses.
**Characteristics of the area.** Añawani was formed by eight houses in a single cluster, located around a square patio, apparently divided into two parts from north to south. All houses had a rectangular plan and were built from adobe; some of the wooden doors were bought from elsewhere, as well as the metallic plated ones. One of the houses had two doors oriented to the east. None had windows, although one of them, now intended for llama skin storage, but initially built as kitchen, had a chimney of adobe on the northern wall built as a tube, adhered to the wall from the base up half way to the roof (see Fig. V.21).

On the northwest side of the settlement there was also a circle formed by piled tola, intended for the stove and the kitchen utensils. There was also an oven with two holes in the dome, corresponding to an opening and a lateral hole to control the heat generated when burning the firewood that was stored in the open close to the place.

Central to the patio was the black grinding stone, together with three *morokos* or round stones used to grind the grain over the grinding stone, all three in different sizes and shapes (two oval ones and one pyramid-shaped). According to our informant, they belonged to “the grandfathers of the family”, together with a stone vessel where water for the hens was placed.

Facing these artefacts, we also observed a henhouse with four holes, two of which were made using the mouth of the ceramic pots to obtain a circular shape (see Figs. V.22 & V.23). The remaining two were square-shaped after the stones and adobe had been piled up to form the wall and support for the thatched roof. On top, a wire was positioned to place the pieces of llama meat to dry in the sun, together with a llama skin (see Fig. V.21).

To the southeast, there was a further construction, a circular corral made out of blocks prepared with llama manure, where the sheep and llama manure is accumulated over the soil to protect the animals from the cold as we were told. To the east, at a distance of c. 250 m, the well and the *wirjiña* of the community were located, the former covering an area of 1x1 m, lined with stones, and the latter in the open air to allow the herd to drink water from it.

**Use of communal space.** In this community, the territory was seen as part of ayllu Suxtita and although they could not remember whether they had paid the annual contribution, they had access to the communal spaces for grazing. This included the pampas or plains and the *wirjiñas* to the west, the tola shrubs in the sand dunes to the east, the cultivation areas on the shores of Lake Poopó as well as to the south. In addition, access was allowed to other areas for water supply close to the grazing lands.

**Economic activities:**

- **Cultivation:** Although this was not the main activity, the two families of the community dedicated different areas to cultivation. One of them cultivated potato *luki* by the shores of Lake Poopó, while the other family cultivated potato *pali* and *piñu rojo* in the southern part of the sand dunes, adding sheep manure as a fertilizer, as they claimed that the soil was still fertile under the sand. However, both cultivated only for family consumption, obtaining *chuño* from the surplus potatoes.

- **Herding:** Ms. Morales, member of one of the families in Añawani, said that her livestock consisted of sixty llamas and thirty sheep, intended for trade in Challapata where the wool, the skin, the meat, the viscera and the *sullu* were sold. However, she knew that some of the animals would be dead before they were ready for market, as grazing fields and water were insufficient and the heat of the sun was excessive for some of them to survive, let alone those that were lost or were attacked by foxes. While not grazing, they tried to protect the animals by keeping them in corrals with the help of black dogs and whistles that frightened the llamas.

- **Other economic activities:** The only additional activity mentioned in the community was the collection of tola as, according to Ms. Morales, fishing was not possible. The only person entitled to do this in the area was Mr. Choque (from Calzar Vintu), who was mentioned again as “the owner” of all the resources coming from the lake, thus preventing them from participate in such activities. Most of the members of the Morales
family in Añawani had had salaried jobs in places such as Santa Cruz where they worked as temporary staff.

Jaransirka

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. Nobody was in place at the time, but later we met Florinda de Rosales and José Rosales.

Location. Located c. 5 km north of Pampa Aullagas, following the route connecting the community with Orinoca and articulated through a new diversion covered with sand, the site is located on top of a sand dune. From here, it was possible to observe the two main landmarks, the wide sand dune landscape close to Lake Poopó to the north and Mount Pedro Santos Willka to the east. Neighbouring communities were Añawani to the southwest and Tola Collu to the northwest.

Inhabitants. During our first visit to the village, it was not possible to meet any of the members of the community, i.e. family Rosales. During a second visit, we met Florinda Rosales. She could not tell about the origins of the settlement as she was born in Cochabamba (Capinota), and she claimed that she had not asked her husband, who was born in Jaransirka. However, she could tell us about the economic activities in the community.

Characteristics of the area. There was only one family in the community, and only one group of houses in the settlement formed by two rectangular houses, with adobe walls, thatched roofs, windows and metallic plated doors. One house formed the sleeping area and the other was used for storage. There was an outdoor semicircular kitchen with piled tola walls and a stove in the centre together with kitchen utensils (see Figs. V.25–V.26).

To the north, it was easy to observe what looked like a corral, covered by a piece of plastic or nylon, locally known as kerayo, intended to store kitchen utensils, aguayos and some adobes. There was also a grinding stone with a hand of stone and a small moroko (another pebble stone hand).

There was an oven built in adobe and plastered with mud and, while keeping a dome-shaped form that leaves a hole in the upper part, it had been traversed by a plank that protruded in the same part, creating an extra hole that allowed for graduating the heat in the interior. During the visit, the oven was being used as a henhouse but we were told that the owners used to keep it clean to bake bread.

In the outer part of the house there was also an abandoned well filled with mud, and another one close beneath the surface, still in use, covered with a piece of cloth weighted with adobes to avoid contamination of the water. However, it was clear that sand had blown in to the well.

To the northeast and northwest, two square corrals walled with straw were placed at the borders of the community. To the southeast, we observed a wide area where cultivation was protected with tola walls, leading us to believe that this was a corral.

Use of communal space. The members of Jaransirka expressed their feelings of belonging to ayllu Suxtita, and thus contributed with the payment of territorial “tribute”, the construction of roads etc, which gave rights to access grazing areas on the eastern sand dunes and on the northwestern pampa. They also had rights of access to the surrounding areas for cultivation in the community and to water sources including wirjínas and wells that were shared with Añawani.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation**: Close to the family house, cultivation areas had been fertilised with sheep manure to produce quinua, the sprouts of which had been covered with wild straw planted provisionally next to each of them as protection from the wind and animals. This kind of protection did not exist for the barley planted in the same area. Located at a
distance, two cultivation areas close to a well filled with water from the family well, had two furrows for planting onions, carrots, tomato, lettuce and radish. Since this soil was sandy, it was humid enough for this kind of cultivation. Here, a couple of scarecrows were erected, dressed in cords holding plastic bags, old kitchen utensils such as pots and mugs, an old woolly jumper and the skeleton of a local bird (*allqamari*) from the crow family, still with the feathers (see Fig. V.26).

- **Herding**: We were able to observe many groups of llamas returning to their corrals, although some of them belonged to Añawani. The pile of skins close to one of the houses showed the trade in llama meat. Florinda Rosales stated that she owned thirty llamas and thirty-five sheep, “including the children” she said, that needed special care as they should not enter cultivation areas nor get lost. Similar to their neighbours, the family traded meat and skin from the animals at the Challapata market.

---

**Nueva Florida**

The first community visited in 2002 was Florida, or Nueva Florida, which was easy to reach from the main road between Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca and the village closest to town, i.e. c.2 km, although sand dunes have to be traversed to reach it. We met Sergio Rosales Pizarro who lived there with his brother who was deaf and mute.

**Location.** The community is located northwest of the town of Pampa Aullagas, at the limits of the sand dunes bordering Lake Poopó, although not settled on the sand as such. The closest road was the one connecting Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca, from where a diversion was recently built c. 500 m from the community.

The landscape consisted of a few wild straw shrubs, grass covered with some layers of salt, heaps of llama manure and many burrow holes by rodents. The main landmarks were Mount Pedro Santos Willka to the southeast, the town of Pampa Aullagas in the same direction, and the plain preceding the sand dunes to the northwest.

**Inhabitants.** According to Sergio Rosales Pizarro, a member of the community, the settlement covered a surface of c. 15 h. This included one of the residential and grazing areas, to which twenty-six people were allowed access by paying the communal contribution. Three interrelated families lived in the community: a father and his two sons with their children and grandchildren still living in the houses. Many had migrated to Oruro, Santa Cruz and even to the bordering Brazil.

**Characteristics of the area.** Two residential groups were occupied by each of the two larger families (see Figs. V.27 & V.28). The first one, Pizarro, consisted of five independent structures used as kitchen, sleeping room and storage, with a patio where the oven dome was lower than 1.6 m. Unlike other communities, there was also a latrine and a corral located outside the residential group, as well as the area intended for storage of firewood. All structures were rectangular and built with adobe walls. One exception was the latrine, which had a roof made from corrugated tin plate; all other structures had thatched roofs and a metallic plate for doors, with a single window c. 40 x 20 cm. We also found a patio walled with adobe.

In the second residential group, the grandfather lived and it was not delimited by a patio. There were five structures used as sleeping rooms, kitchen and storage; the oven, the firewood place, the latrine and a corral similar to the one in the first group, were located outside the houses.

Both families shared a well surrounded by black stones brought from Mount Pedro Santos Willka. They had also jointly used a greenhouse – the only one found in the whole ayllu – built using funding from foreign cooperation, and utilizing the same material as for the houses. The greenhouse was abandoned at the time of our visit as, they claimed, they lacked the nylon cover for the roof.
Use of communal space. The territory where the community has settled belongs to ayllu Suxtita; thus, the members of both families were registered as tribute payers, paying Bs 6 per year (exchange rate in 2002: US$ 1 = Bs 7). They also assumed responsibilities in the fiesta-cargo system, such as representing the community before the Corregimiento, as a preste for the celebration of Virgen de la Asunción on August 15 or Virgen de Guadalupe on September 8. They also participated in serving as jilaqata every four years to collect the tributes as well as volunteering for communal work of the ayllu.

With free access to the community lands, the only area fit for cultivation was located over a strip of land on Mount Pedro Santos Willka, where the herds were not allowed. Grazing fields were located around the residential areas, as well as the water sources, i.e. the well and the wirjiña exclusively intended for the animals.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation**: The community cultivated potato, quinua, barley and wheat. Quinua was problematic as “the wind”, they said, “covers it with sand”. Potato was only cultivated on 2 ha land, the produce being intended for family consumption.
- **Herding**: Both families owned c. one hundred sheep, one hundred llamas and three hens. Apart from family consumption, they were also intended for sale in the markets such as Challapata, where one kilo of llama and sheep meat could correspond to Bs 6 (less than one US dollar), while the skin might get a price of Bs 7. The viscera were intended for both family consumption and the market.
- **Other economic activities**: For a while, the greenhouse enabled trading of tomato, lettuce, spinach, swedes and turnips, although most of the time they were cultivated for family consumption. However, a strong snow in July 2002 destroyed the roof and stopped the production; to replace the roof would cost c. Bs 350 (ca. US$ 50), a sum they could not afford with their present income. Other activities related to salaried jobs included masonry and ice-cream vending in Cochabamba.

The communities of Kalpata and Bella Vista or Ukatuju

When these communities were visited, their members were celebrating the Ascenso al Calvario, i.e. climbing the calvary or via crucis as part of the celebrations for the fiesta of San Miguel Arcangel (see above). This made verbal contact difficult. On a second visit, only the people of Kalpata could be contacted. I will start with the details obtained in Kalpata.

Kalpata

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. Located on top of a dune, it was difficult to reach. Dionisia Cari de Chaparro told us that she and the family of her mother-in-law were the only people left in the place, the rest having migrated or died. The Chaparros and the Condoris were the families who belonged to this community.

Location. To reach Kalpata, we left the main road between Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca, and headed to the southwest, through a diversion bordering the sand dunes of Suxtita to the west. After 9 km, it was possible to see a very high dune on top of which a thatched roof was visible. After climbing the dunes for c. 20 min, we found the community located settled in the middle of a depression created by other two dunes.

Inhabitants. Two interrelated families inhabited the area: the father- and mother-in-law and their widowed daughter-in-law (Dionisia Cari de Chaparro), who lived in two residential groups. The remaining two groups were abandoned because one of the owners had died and the other had
migrated. Dionisia mentioned that her two sons were away, one in Oruro and the other in Pampa Aullagas, both attending school.

*Characteristics of the area.* Three residential groups located c. 100 m apart formed the central part of the settlement. A second residential group was located on the outskirts of the first, c. 250 m away. All houses had rectangular plans, adobe walls and thatched roofs, with wooden or metallic doors and small windows to the right of the doors. The windows were striking owing to their ochre colour and the llama skins used to cover the glass.

Two of the groups oriented to the south consisted of two and three houses respectively. However, the third group was larger and consisted of six houses located around a central patio rectangular in shape, and a corral with mud walls instead of adobe, covered with a thatched roof that protected many llama skins within. The northern border consisted of two rectangular houses, one of which was a kitchen, and in between the houses, we found some llama skins drying in the sunlight. On the western border, three rectangular houses were located, one of which had a door with the following inscription: *Casa de Bolivia,* ‘House of Bolivia’. On the eastern border, yet another house was located with the same characteristics, but unlike the others, it had a wooden cross on the roof and a small arch that gave access to the patio, built with the same adobe similar to the other houses. The entire group shared an oven shaped as a small house, with a semicircular adobe wall supported by the external side of a wall delimiting the patio, built with manure bricks. The manure was stored on the northwestern border of the community, close to a corral made with tola. There was another corral between the smaller and the large residential groups (see Fig. V.29).

Between the three residential groups, there was a mud oven with a pointed dome placed on a square adobe base (see Fig. V.30). This seemed to be the only shared structure, as every group had a semicircular kitchen surrounded by piled tola. The residential group placed on the outskirts was not immediately visible, as it was behind a dune. Here, three houses with similar characteristics were found, together with a corral divided into two. Additional corrals, one of which measured c. 6 x 8 m, extended down the dunes towards the road; these were used to keep llamas at night.

*Use of communal space.* The community made use of the surrounding grazing areas for the herd; because of the characteristics of the sand dunes, cultivation areas were located some way off such as in Kosmina and Titiluna, where they grew barley, alfalfa, quinua, potato *luki* and a variety of corn, small and compact. This was the only place where we heard that special names were given to the cultivation areas; we were told that Titiluna is shared with Kaqasa while Kosmina was located close to the lake and “belonged” only to Kalpata.

Cameloids and sometimes donkeys were raised, the latter recently reduced from thirty to nineteen, as the owner, being an old man, was no longer able to tend them all. These animals enabled trade in markets such as Huari and Challapata, and the income was intended for the purchase of complementary goods.

No other details concerning economic activities could be collected as we found nobody to talk to, apart from Dionisia.

**Bella Vista or Ukatuju**

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. According to our informants, this was previously part of Nueva Florida (see below for details). The Pizarros were the families who belonged to this community and it was interesting to hear that jokes referring to the descent of the famous conquistador Pizarro were constantly made. Such was the case when the name of the Major of Pampa Aullagas, Román Pizarro, was mentioned.

Northeast of Pampa Aullagas, c. 3.5 km from the entrance to the sand dunes of Suxtita, the community was located on an elevation from where a wide pampa covered with *ch’iiji* was visible, as well as grazing llamas. Bella Vista was also known as Ucatuju or Ukatuju, as this was the name of the original community that separated from Nueva Florida, after the families
Pizarro and Rosales had a dispute over the grazing lands facing Ucatuju. Consequently, the Pizarros formed a new community, Bella Vista, in the 1980s.

Six houses, one kitchen, one latrine, two corrals, one hen-house and one well were found in this community (see Figs V.31 & V.32). The houses had a rectangular plan, adobe walls, thatched roofs and they surrounded a patio. One of the houses, oriented to the south, had two doors, one in wood and the other covered with a metal plate. The other two houses also oriented south had a single door made from wood and metal. To the east, two houses were visible, one of which had a window oriented to the south and the other to the central patio, with a metallic door oriented to the west. The last house was located on the eastern border of the residential group, next to a semicircular kitchen protected by piled tola as well as a rectangular oven used for pampaku cooking.

In addition to the houses, two corrals were found walled with tied tola sticks. The latrine, measuring c. 2x2 m, was located c. 30 m further away. The walls were made from adobe and it had an unusual roof of corrugated tin. The well was located to the west of the settlement, next to entrance road, protected by rectangular blocks of black stone, over which lay a rusty metal plate for cover. Close to the road, c. 100 m away, two large corrals stood with adobe walls. Heaps of manure were visible as well as skins placed on the roof of some of the dwellings. This contrasted with another residential group consisting of two abandoned or unfinished houses located c. 60 m north. No other details could be collected as we found nobody to talk to about the activities in this community (see Figs. V.31–V.32).

**Kaqasa**

This community was visited for the first time in 2003. As already mentioned, the Chaparros were the members of this community.

**Location.** Located to the east of Pampa Aullagas, the community is situated on the hillside of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, facing Mount Sato and the town of Quillacas, separated from the latter by an extended pampa followed by the shores of the lake to the north. Some members of the ayllu considered this community part of the territory of Kalpata (above) as they claimed previously to have had had access to cultivation areas near the settlement.

The closest neighbouring communities were Lupikipa to the west, Calzar Vinto – now part of ayllu Sakatiri – to the north and other communities and land belonging to ayllu Sakatiri to the northwest.

Unlike the settlements located close to the road between Pampa Aullagas and Orinoca, Kaqasa was not located on the sand dunes or on sandy soil, but partly on stony soil and partly on land suitable for cultivation. Tola shrubs were scarce and the most visible vegetation were some cacti and thorny bushes that covered the paths leading to the upper parts of the mount; however, in the nearby pampa a large amount of ch’iji was visible as water sources were abundant.

**Inhabitants.** At the time of the visit, five families inhabited the community, all of them members of ayllu Suxtita, although one family also had a cultivation field in ayllu Sakatiri. None of the families mentioned a relationship that would confirm their previous situation as members of Kalpata, and the size of the community seemed to confirm its status as an independent community.

As it was close to the town of Pampa Aullagas, they lived in their houses in the community on a permanent basis, and only the children lived in Pampa Aullagas to attend school, returning to the community on weekends and holidays.

**Characteristics of the area.** Five residential groups were part of the community, settled on the hillside of Mount Pedro Santos Willka. They were oriented to the east or to the north, according to the central position of the patios, although most of the entrance parts to the houses were
located facing Mount Sato (eastwards). A pathway bordering Pedro Santos Willka thus became the main access to the community.

Three of the residential groups were built close together in the north part of the settlement, whereas the remaining two were built further from each other in the southern part. All groups consisted of houses with thatched roofs, built with adobes and, unlike other houses in the ayllu, these houses had a basement c. 80 cm high, built on black stones from the mountain.

The first group in the north consisted of three houses oriented to the east, two of which had metal plated doors and one with a wooden door. One additional house with a wooden door and thatched roof was used as kitchen, although to the east there was also a semicircle formed by stones that bordered a black grinding stone and a stove with two holes for pots and one for firewood. Between two of the houses towards the east there was also a corral, protected by stone and adobe walls. The whole settlement was delimited by a stone wall c. 1 m high and in the corner, to the northwest, there was an oven for pampaku. This was made with adobe bricks covered with mud. In addition, there was a dome-shaped oven of mud placed on a base c. 80 cm high. In the centre, there was a small tree protected by a circular stone wall. To the southeast, outside the patio, there was a corral with stone walls divided in two parts, each with a door of tied tola sticks and with a floor covered in sheep manure. There was also a cultivation area for potato to the east, c. 50 m from the house as well as a latrine with adobe walls and corrugated tin roof to the south, at the time intended for storing firewood and sheep and llama skins.

The second residential group was located north of the first, and had the same orientation towards the pathway. It consisted of two houses without windows. The doors made from cactus wood faced the east. An oven made with mud, placed on a square base made with black stones was built north of the patio, which was surrounded by a stone wall c. 1 m high. The patio contained a stove as well as a grinding stone protected by a stone enclosure.

The third residential group consisted of one house with a cactus door and a lateral window to the left oriented to the east, one house with door and window to the north as well as third building, oriented to the east, that lacked both roof and door. This was the last settlement located in the northern border area of the community. As in the previous groups, the dwelling area was delimited by a patio bordered by a stone wall. To the southeast, there was a semicircle of tola and stones protecting the stove and a black grinding stone. In addition, in the outer part of this settlement, there was one square corral with stone walls and tola door built on a c. 30 cm high platform made from sheep manure. This was a wide square area delimited by a line of stones originally planned for cultivation, but at the time, only a small part was used for cultivating barley.

The fourth residential group, located far from the others and to the extreme south of the community, consisted of one house with metal plated door and a second house with a cactus door oriented to the east. Both were delimited by a patio enclosed by a stone wall. To the north and behind these constructions, there was another house built in stone, with a cactus door oriented to the east enclosed by a wall. The only stove was part of the patio of the other two houses and, similar to the other, a semicircle of stones protected the stove and a grinding stone. The well was located in front of the houses, covered with a heap of white and reddish stones. The single corral to the east was divided into two parts, each with a tola door. Manure from the sheep had been used in a cultivation area to the northeast, on the slopes of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, where quinua had been sowed.

The fifth and last residential group was located on the southern border, on one of the slopes of Mount Pedro Santos Willka. The group was placed at a distance from the others, and consisted of one house oriented to the east and a second oriented to the north. The houses were similar to the ones described above, and contained a similar patio, stove and grinding stone. However, unlike the others, the group of houses had a pathway bordered with two lines of stone leading to the hillside, where we found a cultivation area for potato and a wirjiña partially covered with Totora. We also saw two corrals with stone walls located north of the well where llamas and sheep were kept. A third corral made with sod blocks was located slightly further away, as well as an adobe building, still in the process of construction (see Figs. V.33–V.37).

From all residential groups, clearly located outside them, a long brownish line bordering the inhabited area, reaching up to the northern part of the town of Pampa Aullagas could be
observed. This was piled-up soil aimed to protect the community against floods from the lake, since we were told that there was a time when such floods forced the inhabitants to use boats as a means of transportation to the community.

Use of communal space. The territory is part of ayllu Suxtita and it was seen as a cultivation area, free to access for other member communities. The surrounding area was for the exclusive use of the inhabitants of Kaqasa to cultivate quinua and potato. Furthermore, the pampa near the lake shores was a grazing area belonging to ayllu Sakatiri, the closest neighbour, but it was also used by other Suxtita communities as it was the only access to water sources located next to the lake, although some wirjinañas were also located within the territory.

Concerning lake resources, the only aspect mentioned was the collection and transport of totora reeds that were subsequently planted in a wirjina within the area.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation:** Cultivation consisted of potato pali at the foot of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, as well as quinua and barley on the slopes. All cultivation was intended for family consumption, although production was higher than in other communities due to the quality of the soil. Apart from the areas used by the community, many cultivation areas delimited by stone enclosures were vacant and were intended for the use of other communities.

- **Herding:** All community members owned cameloids and sheep, at an average of one hundred sheep and thirty llamas per family, although more cattle were administered al partir (Sp.: ‘‘go half and half’’) by members of ayllu Sakatiri. Similar to in other communities, the animals were used for family consumption, using charque as a method to preserve the meat by drying it under the sun and then salting it. The animals were also used for rituals in fiestas, but mainly for trade in Challapata where, in addition to meat, skins, wool and sullu were sold.

- **Other economic activities:** Being so close to the town of Pampa Aullagas, there was no building of additional roads that would allow for a complementary salaried activity. No other such activities were mentioned, although it was stated that some members of the community had migrated to Cochabamba and Santa Cruz.

**Lupikipa**

This community was visited for the first time in 2002. The Castillos were members of this community.

**Location.** Located on the slopes of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, to the east of the town of Pampa Aullagas, the community was oriented towards River Lakajawira and the sand dunes of Suxtita, close to a recently built water source for the town to the west. In addition, a small chapel that was not part of the community was located nearby.

The closest neighbours to the east were the community of Kaqasa (above) as well as the area of Sato and Calzar Vintu to the north, belonging to ayllu Sakatiri. To the west, the town of Pampa Aullagas was located, connected to the community by a pathway fit for bicycles and vehicle transportation.

Wide cultivation areas existed in the surrounding landscape and although some surfaces were covered with sand, most of the soil was humid or stony. A few tola shrubs, wild straw, cacti and thorny shrubs on the slopes of the mountain and, close to the river, there were parts with ch'ji and yareta, an endemic plant of Lake Poopó (*Azorella compacta*). There was a large quantity of wild birds such as pariwana as well as varieties of duck.

**Inhabitants.** The community was formed by only one family, of which only an older woman permanently resided in the area. We were unable to meet her in person. Most members of this community had migrated after living in the area for many years.
Characteristics of the area. The community consisted of only one residential group with three rectangular houses located around a central patio (see Fig. V.38). The houses had stone basements, adobe walls, metal plated doors and thatched roofs. The first house, oriented to the east, had two walled-up windows located on either side of the door. The second house, oriented to the north, had no window while the third one, oriented to the south, had a small window in the wall opposite the door, apparently an outlet for the smoke of the stove as the house was used as a kitchen.

The patio was not enclosed by a wall but by the houses themselves; on the patio, it was possible to observe an oven for pampaku that, unlike the rectangular ones previously observed, was tubular (southwest). A semicircle of adobe protected the stove, a black grinding stone and some kitchen utensils such as pots and buckets (northwest). A henhouse consisting of two floors, c. 1 m high containing three holes, two square ones in the lower part and one circular in the upper part, was the only construction with a tiled roof (northeast) (see Fig. V.39).

Outside these constructions facing the water supply in the northeast, there was a deep well c. 1.5 m bordered with rectangular stones, as well as a wide area used for potato cultivation. The corral for the llamas and sheep was located on the slope of Mount Pedro Santos Willka, far from the cultivation area.

Use of communal space. Similar to Kaqasa, the community was allowed to access areas that belonged to ayllu Suxtita, as it was settled on cultivation areas belonging to all members of the communities. However, there was no reference to the reasons for this peculiar settlement, especially since almost all members were absent.

Regarding the water sources, the closeness to River Lakajawira and Lake Poopó made it easier to access this kind of resource. The pampas at the margins of the river and the lake were used for grazing.

Economic activities:

- **Cultivation**: Cultivation of potato pali on the slopes of Mount Pedro Santos Willka was the usual activity, used for family consumption only and stored as chuño for the rest of the year.
- **Herding**: We could not find any manure in the corral, nor see any other traces of animals, although we had previously been told that sheep are raised for trading at the market in Challapata.
- **Other economic activities**: As we were told about the migration of the inhabitants of the area, it is presumed that they had salaried activities, although no details were available.

Suxtita revisited in 2003

Based on the preliminary information obtained and detailed above, intensive fieldwork was carried out in 2003. The families in Suxtita were able to settle in all the areas previously visited (close to the lake, on or amid the sand dunes, or on the slopes of the mountain). The reason for this was, it was claimed, that a traditional relationship had persisted between the communities over time. This tradition was expressed in the way the different areas were used by all members. We returned to Suxtita to study this settlement pattern in detail.

The relationship between people and landscape

Although migration has been unrelenting, as well as internal changes adapting to family needs – health, education, larger income – and the search for appropriate territory to develop herding
and farming activities, relationships between people and landscape followed a path that, in a few cases, made it possible to identify. Here follows a description of such cases:

**Kalpata – Kaqasa:** Both communities – and the Chaparro families – were still connected, possibly because the families in Kalpata shared cultivation lands with Kaqasa (Titiluna). As the families were connected, residence exchange between communities also seemed unproblematical.

**Tola Collu:** The Willka family, with only few members left owing to migration to Santa Cruz and Cochabamba (Chapare), still maintained areas for cultivation and herding on Mount Pedro Santos Willka, although no consolidated settlement existed here.

**Asurcollu – K’uchu Pampa:** Asurcollu maintained a cultivation area in one of the ravines of the mountain otherwise known as K’uchu Pampa, an Aymara name that translates as “protected plain” (Ay. k’uchu = corner, angle). Here, a hut belonging to Román Calle (cousin to Cristina Cayo’s and Máxima Chaparro’s children) was found. He had converted the area into a jant’a or shelter because it was close to Calzar Vintu, he claimed, and also close to Kimsa Puju where he kept a herd belonging to Juan Cayo (from ayllu Sakatiri, community Sato), in the modality called al partir (Sp.: “go half and half”).

**Lupikipa – Challa:** Lupikipa used to be a territory belonging to Challa, and it seems the two communities were formed because one family left Challa and instead settled in Lupikipa. During our fieldwork visits, we found a woman and her daughter who claimed that they did not visit Challa any longer, since it was too far from Lupikipa. Although no contact existed at the time, the memory of the common origin of both families “since the time of the grandfathers” was maintained, although they had settled in different places at the time of our visit.

**Challapuju – Pairumani:** Both communities have been deserted because of migration to places like Cochabamba. Pairumani seems to have been abandoned first. At the time for the fieldwork, only one family belonging to Challapuju lived in the town of Pampa Aullagas while using the corrals in Pairumani for their sheep. They also used the cultivation area in Pairumani, converting the harvested potatoes into chuño in an area close to River Lakajawira.

**Jaransirka:** People from this community also maintained a cultivation area for potatoes west of Pairumani, although to a lesser degree of utilisation compared to other areas on the mountain.

**Bella Vista – Nueva Florida:** None of these communities seemed to occupy an area on the mountain. They were previously one single family who settled in the marshy lands close to Pampa Aullagas, located on both sides of the road to Orinoca. As mentioned above, Bella Vista was also known as Ukatuju, as the latter was the name of the original community until the families Pizarro and Rosales disputed over the grazing lands facing Ucatuju. The Pizarros then formed a new community, Bella Vista, and the Rosales settled in Nueva Florida, forming two independent communities in the 1980s.

**Añawani:** No relation with the other communities was discovered although, located close to Kalpata, farming activities might sometimes have been shared.

**Chachacomani / Inca-Crucero settlement:** Northeast of the central residential area of Asurcollu, there is a settlement where some members of the Calle family live. They are descendants of Crisisto Calle who was Eusebio’s and José’s brother; all brothers of this generation have passed away (see Kinship Diagram Nº 1). With the help of Máxima Chaparro (daughter-in-law of Eusebio Calle), we were able to better understand the occupation pattern of this area:

The settlement was previously described as the choza (see above: Asurcollu, “Characteristics of the area”), and in 2003 it was enlarged, a channel was dug and a wall built around it. Corrals made with qurpa (adobe made with compacted manure of llama and sheep),
observed surrounding the settlement, were generally recycled as fertiliser for the cultivation
fields, once the blocks and manure soils were smashed and accumulated in heaps. They were
then transported to the karateas (see below, section Fig V.42) with the help of donkeys or q'ipis
– bundles wrapped with awayus (or aguayo, knitted fabri – see Glossary) – carried on people's
backs. In the case of areas close to the residence, a wheelbarrow would suffice. Two smaller
corrals, built with stone and with small doors with a wooden arch, were used for storing barley
harvested in the karateas nearby, where plants would be uprooted when ready.

The houses of adobe and thatched roofs are the more recent ones, as opposed to the ones
made with tola and old adobe; they have the characteristics of a stone block or adobe step by the
doorway. The windows were smaller and covered with glass, and many had wooden frames.
The house made from tola was the oldest construction and, owing to the exterior chimney
covered by a ceramic pot, it seemed obvious that it was used as a kitchen. Outside the houses,
the circles delimiting the areas used as hearths were kept, although, in this case, protected by
adobe walls, replacing the janqu qalas (white stones) that were now used to fence three willow
trees planted near the house and the wirjiña.

Water supplies came from a very deeply dug well, with a lateral entrance where steps had
been dug to allow for access. A fence with high tola plants had recently been built in the
surroundings, delimiting a wide corral bordered by an irrigation channel that would protect it
from flooding. This corral will be used to distribute the herd between the brothers of Dionisio
Calle and, later on, to protect the flock at night and thus avoid family conflicts due to animals
mixed up or cubs lost. While covering the area, two pits were noted, one rectangular, c. 2 m
deep, apparently used as a latrine. The second pit, square and more shallow, was used as a
dump.

Sayjata, a sacred place in Asurcollu: During one of our visits in Asurcollu in 2003, Cristina
Cayo was able to join us since she was searching for a herd of llamas that had been released
early that morning. Together we crossed an area covered with tola until we reached a dune that
protruded from the community as the only elevated area or mound. Once there, we were told
that this was the sayjata, that is, the sacred place in Asurcollu because there was a samiri, or
protector of the llamas, inside. This is why one llama is sacrificed, usually in the month of
December, over a janqu qala oriented towards the calvario of the community. Calvarios (Sp.), or
calvary, literally “stations of the cross” or via crucis, are found everywhere in the Andes; they
are part of the Spanish legacy and derive from what has been called “extirpation of idolatries”,
as explained in Chapter III. Today, they formally represent within the local Catholic tradition
the via crucis or “calvary” that Christ suffered while carrying his cross before being crucified.
Calvaries are usually located on the paths of mountains that, as we have seen, are considered
mallkus or sacred places by Andean people. The twelve stations of the via crucis are signalled
by small altars in a line beginning at a point the near the local church, ending up at the top of the
mountain where a small chapel is also built crowning the sacred place. Quillacas has a calvario
on Mount San Julian Mallku and Pampa Aullagas on Mount Pedro Santos Willka or Santos
Mallku. The mountains carry the name of mallkus and form sacred places for the inhabitants,
who present offerings for protection of the community.

Around the same time of the year, i.e. December, the ceremony of the killpa is also carried
out. It consists of marking the llamas by cutting the tips of the ears of the males, keeping them
in a bag preserved by the male owner of the llamas (the husband, for example). The ear tips cut
from the females are, in turn, given to the female owner (the wife, for example), in another bag,
so that “there is always plenty of animals”. Cristina and Máxima told us how they had placed
several pieces of ears obtained from the killpa together with illas, i.e. the amulets intended to
promote abundance, beneath the stone where llamas are sacrificed, slaughtered and, later,
ritually cooked and eaten. Although they claimed that when turning the stones over it was easy
to see these ears and amulets, we were not able to confirm it once we approached the site.

The place consisted mostly of sand and several areas seemed to contain water at some time
during the year. The community saw it as a place of chullpas, because shards of pottery and
chips of stone were conspicuous, as well as two areas covered with stones forming small
squares on the sandy surface. Cristina said that every community had its own sayjata, similar in
characteristics; the archaeologists of the team estimated that it belonged to the formative period, c. 1800 BC–200 AD. This ethnographic record was complemented by the narrative of the ritual carried out here after a burial, where the old clothes of the deceased were normally burnt and the kitchen ceramic utensils destroyed, to facilitate the departure “to the other world”.

No reference could be established regarding the possibility of the area lodging the “original” Asurcollu, although the name of the community, as we have noted, refers to a mount (qullu) or elevated place. No traces of memory connected to the ancient inhabitants of the dunes were found either, the references being limited to comments on ancient times, generally referred to as “the age of the chullpas”.

Daily activities of the inhabitants: The community had been gradually abandoned by some families, and some of the members lived in Oruro, e.g. Doroteo and Atanasio Calle who, as musicians, were connected to festivities such as the well-known carnival in Oruro. The offspring of the latter also chose Oruro as place of residence, and, for example, one of the sons did his military service and the daughters taught in schools. However, the wives of both brothers still resided in Asurcollu together with the schoolchildren and the youngest ones. Under these circumstances, tending the cultivation areas and the herds was the responsibility of women and children, such as sowing, harvesting, herding, marking the herds, slaughtering and trading the produce. Although the subsistence activities were many, we could only participate in a few, such as gathering the herd together, collecting salt and slaughtering llamas.

Herds are gathered together before dusk and are normally put out to graze early in the morning. Herds are mixed with others from different owners and communities in the grazing fields shared by Suxtita members. This is why it is so important to know which animals belong to whom and llamas’ ears are marked with colourful threads of wool, k’illphaña in Aymara language, as the normal way of identification. We were told that llamas also recognise their owners as well as the dogs who shepherd them, thus obeying only them when they approach. *Uksu-uksu*, or *uxu-uxu*, is a sound utilised, we were told, to call llamas so that they follow the shepherd dog up to the corrals; it represents an imitation of the llama’s sound. Occasionally, some animals might rest overnight in the abandoned corrals at Challapuju, when the owner is not there to gather them together, but this is dangerous since some animals might be too far from the grazing areas, or may die on the pampas due to lack of protection.

Collecting salt is an activity that people in Asurcollu carry out in the area called Jayu Quta (Ay. ‘*lagoon of salt’*), a salt pan on Challapuju territory. In summer, the place is a small circular surface covered with water but in July, i.e. in winter, it is dry and a light cover of white salt remains instead which is removed using hoes or shovels. Salt is important since it helps in preserving the meat as charqui (see Glossary).

Regarding the slaughter of llamas, I would like to dwell on a few matters. To begin with, we did not witness a llama sacrifice, which is a ritual called *willancha* in the Andes, and involves picking the best animals, usually white male llamas, and spreading the blood out after the sacrifice. What we saw, instead, was part of what happens when animals are butchered to trade their skin, meat, viscera, even the eyelashes that will be used as brushes and in this case, also the *sullu* or foetus. Two llamas were picked for this occasion, a male and a pregnant female, after involving our research team. Reasons for our involvement could include

- **(a)** Transport facilities – we had a car and they had a bike
- **(b)** Protection – they had a family feud going on
- **(c)** Complicity – they needed us to obtain what they wanted, i.e. the produce of the slaughter, and apparently thought that we needed them to have the chance to watch what we witnessed; and last but not least,
- **(d)** a speedy development of the event – the consequence of having access to a car to go from the town (Pampa Aullagas), to the place where the events took place (corrals of Asurcollu), and come back to town again.

Máxima Chaparro and Cristina Cayo, married to the two Calle brothers mentioned above, needed cash. Rural areas, as we know, have ‘cash’ grazing the fields most of the time and, when the need arises, it is just a matter of deciding which llama will be marketed to cover family necessities. Families with no herd in the Andes are, therefore, the poorer among the poor in this
world which, many anthropologists claim, is the case of Urus. However, the husbands of Máxima and Cristina have many llamas in Asurcollu (c. 200), as many as to provoke a family feud (see above) that, among other things led to legal dispositions that hindered the women from accessing the herd while Zenón Rosales (Challa) was the keeper, as the Calle brothers were retained in Oruro. With the researchers around, the women had the perfect opportunity to “take us” to the corrals, to “show us around” and get close to the llamas without arousing suspicion and, perhaps, “fulfil” our “hunger” for knowing how to proceed when it comes to slaughtering llamas. We were, after all, the anthropologists/archaeologists in search of knowledge of the local customs. The team proved adequate helpers to the women. In addition, a sheep was carried alive in the car when returning to Pampa Aullagas.

However, Máxima and Cristina were still interesting for the research, as they helped to elucidate the remains of the peculiar circular structure excavated in Asurcollu described in Chapter VI.

**Occupation patterns in Suxtita**

The eleven consolidated communities that we have described as visited in 2002, made use of different ecological niches in the landscape of Suxtita, and were suited for the development of farming and herding activities. In the case of communities that were entitled to access areas on the mountain as well as those that were fully settled on it – such as Asurcollu, Tola Collu, Kalpata, Jaransirka, Challapuju, Kaqasa and Lupikipa – the occupation pattern corresponded to the combination of two axes:

The *horizontal axis*: refers to space and the various ecological niches of the landscape. These are Mount Pedro Santos Willka, the foot of the mountain, the marshy grounds, shores of the river, dunes and the shores of the lake. The horizontal axis is the one on which people move around in the landscape.

The *vertical axis*: refers to time and generation within the territorial space of the ayllu and the way in which the communities have settled in the landscape over time.

The lives of the people in Suxtita consist of continuously moving along these two axes, forward on the vertical one and to and from on the horizontal axis. The following table might help in the understanding of the way both axes were at work during the fieldwork: (Table V.3)

**Table V.3 Occupation patterns in Suxtita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological niches on the horizontal axis</th>
<th>Character of the occupation pattern</th>
<th>Territorial occupation on the vertical axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (a) Mount Pedro Santos Willka (upper part) | • Old communal settlements  
• New settlements  
• Corrals for sheep | • Ancient Pairumani and Lupikipa  
• Lupikipa and Kaqasa are settled below the two above  
• Reutilised in ancient settlements and built in new settlements |
| (b) Sandy foot of the mountain | • Potato and quinua cultivation areas (utilising animal manure) | 1. Kalpata  
2. Kaqasa  
3. Lupikipa  
4. Challapuju  
5. Jaransirka |
| (c) Shores of river Lakajawira (close to the mountain) | • Drinking trough for sheep  
• Area where chuño is processed | 1. Lupikipa  
2. Kaqasa  
3. Others closer to the area |
| (d) Bogs or marshy grounds (or bofedal) | • Jant’as used as from September  
• Llama and sheep herding | 1. Bella Vista  
2. Nueva Florida |
3. Kalpata
4. Tola Collu
5. Asurcollu
6. Challa
7. Jaransirka
8. Añawani
9. Challapuju

(e) The dunes
- Jant’as and corrals for llamas
- Areas for collecting firewood
- Karateas or areas where potato and quinua are cultivated on the margins close to the lake

(f) Bofedal and the shores of lake Poopó
- Area where chuño is processed
- Herding of llamas
- Jant’as for the herd (with corrals)
- Jant’as for farming (tending of cultivation areas and storing of chuño)

For the communities where no areas on the mountain were reserved, such as Bella Vista and Nueva Florida, the occupation pattern was limited to a river-marshy ground-dune relationship. The reason for this is probably a weaker relationship with the other communities. The following table lists the occupation pattern and the way space was utilised in both settlements: (Table V.4)

Table V.4 Occupation Patterns in Bella Vista and Nueva Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological niches on the horizontal axis</th>
<th>Character of occupation pattern</th>
<th>Territorial occupation on the vertical axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Bogs or marshy grounds or bofedal</td>
<td>Communal settlements</td>
<td>1. Bella Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herding of llamas and sheep</td>
<td>2. Nueva Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Shores of river Lakajawira close to Pansuta</td>
<td>Drinking trough for sheep</td>
<td>1. Bella Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area where chuño is processed</td>
<td>2. Nueva Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The dunes</td>
<td>Jant’as and corrals for llamas</td>
<td>1. Bella Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas for collecting firewood</td>
<td>2. Nueva Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas where potato and quinua are cultivated on the margins of the dune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The farming and herding calendar is directly connected to the occupation of communal dwellings and jant’as; thus, various possibilities were noted:
Temporary occupation: This includes unoccupied/temporarily abandoned huts or jant’as that are located in ecological niches, not requiring constant labour, such as the jant’as in bofedales, i.e. the bogs or marshy grounds that are uninhabited between April and September.

Parallel residence: This indicates economic activities within families, such as the distribution of family members in different jant’as and houses in the community. Cases include the Cayo family of the Sato community, where the women live in Chullpa to tend the sheep. They occasionally use a jant’a close to River Lakajawira, where they process and store chuño. The father lives in another jant’a on a marshy ground (bofedal) close to Lake Poopó to tend the corrals with llamas as well as a cultivation area, processing chuño in the sandy soils.

Definitive abandonment: Some jant’as might become the main settlement for a family or a community, and the original residence settlements become laqayas or “unroofed” houses (see Glossary). This was the case in Lupikipa, formerly a jant’a of the ancient Lupikipa that became the community found in 2002–3. Jaransirka people, on the other hand, returned to one laqaya abandoned by “their grandfathers”, i.e. some generations before. Asurcollu became depopulated because several families have settled permanently in their jant’as.

Calendar of activities in Suxtita

September, the beginning of the spring season, is usually the month when mobilisation of the inhabitants is more frequent at the jant’as; therefore, shelters in sandy areas, marshy grounds and shores of the lake were utilised. According to the agricultural calendar, cultivation began on the mountain and at the margins of the sand dunes, making it necessary to move the herds away from the cultivation areas. Regarding the herding activities, the grazing areas were scarce, making the animals weaker and unable to reach the corrals on the mountain. Thus, they were moved to the pampas or plains to keep the cultivation areas protected.

The agricultural calendar began in July (winter), when the soil was prepared for sowing. In the sandy soils, this meant removing the tola shrubs, fertilizing the cultivation areas by covering the sand with kulcha from the nearby bofedales and, occasionally, with llama and sheep manure. For cultivation on the mountain, the process required a gradual transportation of llama and sheep manure from the corrals, with the help of donkeys. After the soil had been tilled and fertilised, the sowing started in September, tending and weeding until January. Harvesting took place in March – April, culminating with the processing of chuño usually in June – July.

The herding activities were marked by the birth of young animals that, ideally, should take place in the spring, i.e. from September. However, flexibility in controlling reproduction of the animals seemed to be the norm, and so they gave birth in May or June as well, when the cold and scarcity of fodder could be dangerous for the litter. At the same time, there was no specific period for shearing or slaughtering, as this was connected with the needs of the family, such as schooling, which required extra cash, or other exceptional situations.

The following table illustrates the activities performed according to the calendar: (Table V.5)

### Table V.5 Calendar of Activities in Suxtita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June – July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>March – May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth of llamas and sheep</td>
<td>Birth of llamas and sheep</td>
<td>Birth of llamas and sheep</td>
<td>Weeding potato fields</td>
<td>Harvesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing of chuño</td>
<td>Preparation of the soil</td>
<td>Moving to jant’as at bofedal and dunes</td>
<td>Possibility of inundation on the pampas</td>
<td>Return to jant’as at mount Pedro Santos Willka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of manure and preparation of the soil</td>
<td>Sowing period</td>
<td>Utilisation of corrals at the sand dunes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An important activity that is no longer part of the calendar in Suxtita refers to llama caravans. They were discontinued c. eight years ago, according to Román Calle, a member of Asurcollu. Organising a caravan was part of a series of social relationships based on kinship and reciprocity, that facilitated access to a sizeable flock of male llamas from different owners who lent them in exchange of produce transported from the valleys. In general, a caravan required sixty to eighty animals aged between four and seven, because the younger llamas were able to travel only as far as Challapata. Generally speaking, well cared for domesticated individuals can live for more than 20 years, but the average is about 15 years. Every journey started early in the morning and finished at noon so that the animals could rest and feed. Every load of salt, i.e. c. twenty-five pounds on each llama, would damage the back and hooves of the animals to the point of making them bleed. The llamas therefore had some small uxuta or special shoes called also abarcas (sandals), manufactured from llama neck hide, which is usually thicker and more resistant. Every trip had two main stages:

Trip to the salt pan of Uyuni: this took place in March and covered a route starting at Urqwanu, close to Asurcollu where the male llamas were gathered together, ending in Saxi, in the big salt pan of Uyuni. The load of straw transported on the outward journey was employed, when returning, in wrapping the blocks of salt. The salt was stored in Suxtita for two months, while the animals rested.

Trip to San Pedro: it began in June and was a seven-week round trip with many stopovers on the following route: Urqwanu – K’uchu Pampa – Kichu (Condo) – Junuta (Llapallapani/Huari) – Challapata – Peñás – Wilaqullu – Parlascanchis – Jurnuni (Potosí) – Achuqu – Titilliri – Llallagua – Uyuni – Kulcha – Jalsiri – San Pedro (between Potosí and Chuquisaca). The salt was exchanged for maize. No other produce from the valleys were involved from the valleys were involved due to preservation problems during the long trip.

The changes over time have clearly affected this tradition that, for obvious reasons, has fascinated both anthropologists and archaeologists. Most exchanges with the valleys now consist of either migrating directly for salaried work, buying the produce previously exchanged for salt. Those who can afford it can make use of modern trucks to transport local llama and sheep wool, freeze-dried meat and potatoes, rather than salt, since salt cakes cut directly from the soil have become old fashioned.

**Occupation patterns on Mount Pedro Santos Willka**

Figure V.40 shows the distribution of cultivation and herding areas in Mount Pedro Santos Willka that belong to ayllu Suxtita, whereas Figure V.41 shows a general perspective where the different ayllus of Pampa Aullagas and their areas for cultivation and herding are distributed on the same mountain. From left to right, I list ayllu Taxa on the upper part. Below, ayllu Suxtita and ayllu Sakatiri with the Chullpa settlement. On the upper part, ayllu Jiwapacha is depicted next to Taxa. Ayllu Choro is shown as settled at the back of the mountain and, finally, ayllu Qullana to the right.

Figure V.40 illustrates, from left to right, the following occupation pattern for ayllu Suxtita, including ayllu Sakatiri:

a. To the left is the territory occupied by Kaqasa and Kalpata on the Mount where three corrals and two cultivation areas are depicted. The cultivation areas as well as a corral lie on the slopes while the other two corrals lie at the foot of the mountain.

b. Tola Collu has one cultivation area on the slope with the corral located at the foot of the mountain.

c. K’uchu Pampa, a cultivation area belonging to Asurcollu is located in a ravine of the mountain. Here, a small figure representing the Virgin Mary was found in the sand, and where the new small chapel was built to celebrate festivities such as Alasita (see below).
d. I have explained the relationship between Lupikipa and Challa, reflected in their occupation on the mountain. Lupikipa antiguo (ancient Lupikipa) had a corral, whereas the people who came from Challa had a cultivation field on the site called Lupikipa, the “new community” formed by the family who settled there.

e. Chullpa is a settlement that belongs to ayllu Sakatiri, located between Lupikipa and Pairumani/Jaransirka. A corral and a cultivation area lie on the slope of the mountain.

f. Pairumani, slightly on the upper part of the slope, has previously been described and in Figure V.40 we see the corral and the cultivation field still in use by people from Challapuju.

g. Jaransirka, to the extreme right, is depicted with its potato cultivation field.

h. Two additional fields over the pathway to Pampa Aullagas are in use. The one to the left is used by both Lupikipa and Chullpa for cultivation as well as to freeze-dry potatoes. The one to the right is also used by both communities to freeze-dry potatoes, as the flat soil is quite appropriate for these activities.

The area begins at the grazing lands originating near River Lakajawira and reaches the cultivation areas, following a straight line towards the mountain. The cultivation areas are succeeded by a fringe formed by tola, wild straw and prickly bushes that grow on the dunes. There is also a dune area without vegetation, followed by old cultivation areas and sand dunes fit for cultivation, succeeded by a space covered with tola and wild straw, and an old residential settlement amid the sand dunes. The corrals currently used are located on the mountain slopes together with the houses of the residential area.

When reaching Kaqasa in the afternoon, we found a wirjiña (well) almost dry; next to this, we saw the corrals on the slopes of the mountain and on the mount itself, the houses. In front of the corrals, there were three large wirjiñas, the first of which was almost full, the second drying up while the third was already dry. Facing the wirjiñas there was a bath 40 cm high to protect sheep from mange. The corrals belonged to Lucas Chaparro from Kaqasa, who claimed that the bath belonged to his neighbour. The landscape can be described as follows: The grazing fields are succeeded by the mountain slopes where the cultivation fields are located and bordered with stones; the houses are situated close to the fields, followed by corrals located behind the mountain where llamas rest overnight. According to Lucas, llamas are let out at noon to reach the grazing areas and sometimes the shores of River Márquez, where they get water. The manure is accumulated and then used as fertilizer for potato and the small corn cultivation mentioned above. Cultivation lands are surrounded by stones forming a protective structure for the herds so that they do not trample the plants.

After meeting Lucas Chaparro, we also met his daughter-in-law, Justina, married to Eduardo Chaparro, his son – all cousins of Máxima Chaparro. Justina raised sheep that were kept in a corral next to her house located at the foot of the mountain, near the areas of cultivation. The heaps of manure accumulated in front of the house were to be used as fertilizer.

Occupation patterns on the shores of Lake Poopó

Although all communities, except Nueva Florida, mentioned cultivation areas in communal lands located on the margins of Lake Poopó, the only area dedicated to these was the four chacras or plots of land we found ploughed by a Caterpillar and used for potato cultivation. However, both ayllu Suxtitá and ayllu Sakatiri were active in the area.

Ayllu Suxtitá

Regarding the shores of Lake Poopó, Suxtitá territory began in Kimsa Puju according to the recent land distribution and, having lost Calzar Víntu to Sakatiri, it was distributed according to
the cultivation and herding needs of the communities. Figure V.42 shows the distribution of areas per community in a territory called Tola Churu Pampa. Here, Kimsa Puju is the first area where the cultivation calendar begins and, therefore, the first fallow period. Kalpata takes for the second fallow period; both fallow areas were used by Kalpata.

The areas used for quinua and potato cultivation are called karateas (see below). Figure V.42 indicates that Jankoma (or Janguma) was the cultivation field of Asurcollu, whereas Tatankara is an area where small corrals belonging to both Challa and Asurcollu were located. Further south, Orkwano or Urqwamu, the common area for the Ayllu is located at the borders with Asurcollu. Here, corrals for male llamas have been built, as this was the starting point for the llama caravans travelling to Uyuni.

Karateas: The area is characterized by tola and wild straw as well as by potato luki cultivation (subsequently freeze-dried). As this is close to the community grazing fields for llamas, the family members settled in the area have built a fence made of tola and champa to protect the ploughed fields. The sandy soil would normally have been fertilised with kulcha and tola that grow in the surroundings, but the community had chosen to use llama and sheep manure from the corrals as fertiliser. The internal grid resulting from the horizontal and vertical ploughing marked the borders between what the different families were cultivating for family consumption. This was harvested in March and April, although some potatoes were still being extracted with the help of a hoe.

Nearby, a jant’a apparently shared between the families, was occupied by Dionisio Calle, a cousin of Máxima Chaparro’s husband, Doroteo. Made with adobe and a thatched roof, this hut was built on the margins of kulcha and the dunes, with a space for the stove formed by a rectangular hearth surrounded by stones. As mentioned, the jant’as were not intended as permanent residence and were only inhabited while the cultivation areas needed tending, for grazing the herds and collecting firewood.

Ayllu Sakatiri

This is what the inhabitants openly claim to be an Aymara ayllu, thus the research focused on the areas close to the territory of Suxtita and, particularly, of Calzar Vintu, previously belonging to Suxtita. Observation and conversations with Máximo Cayo, a member of the community Sato belonging to Sakatiri, of whom we heard while visiting Julián Choque in Calzar Vintu, provided the following information, beginning with a description of the jant’as found in Calzar Vintu, followed by jant’as associated with Chullpa, both used by Máximo Cayo.

Calzar Vintu: Three jant’as were built in this area, to be used at various times, according to the requirements connected with cultivation and herding activities of Sakatiri.

1. Jant’a on the sand dunes: located close to the borders with Suxtita, i.e. at Kimsa puju (see Figure V.42), with a main dwelling consisting of a small hut on a square plan, with tola twigs stuck vertically to form walls and tied together with a branch horizontally placed and partially plastered with mud. The thatched roof fell vertically on one side of the dwelling; the floor was slightly rammed and in one of the corners, it was covered with a plastic foil for quinua storage. There was an outdoor rectangular stove, delimited by stones as well as a corral with tola walls divided into two parts, where sheep were kept. Several natural corrals, formed by sand circles surrounded by tola, used for llamas were situated nearby, as well as tola shrubs used as firewood. The jant’a was usually inhabited in March, storing quinua, and then in September to shelter the sheep.

2. Jant’a in Calzar Vintu: located on the marshy ground or bofedal close to Suxtita borders, it formed a permanent occupation. During June and July, it was used to shelter the llamas in corrals and to store chuño that had been freeze-dried in the cultivation area nearby, thus making the area inhabited between June and October. The jant’a was formed by one laqaya or unroofed house, oriented towards the lake (northeast), with sod blocks for the walls, a metal plated door and what was left of a thatched roof that had collapsed. In the interior of the
dwellings, to the right of the door on a corner, the remains of a two-hole stove were found and, on the next corner, a shelf made with brick pillars and horizontal planks. On the opposite side, a rectangular shape elevated over rammed floor, covered with straw and plastic foil, probably used as a bed. Surrounding the construction, some black stones similar in size to grinding stones were found; however, the three of them were located close to the door and were probably used as seats. The fourth stone was definitively a grinding stone, located by the left wall. Southwest of the *laqaya*, a dry wirjija with a metal bucket was found. Towards the sand dunes (southwest), a house in use was observed, made with sod blocks or *champa*, thatched roof with a cross on top, without window, but with a metal plated door with a hoe barring the entrance. In front of the door, we found some rolled llama skins and a sack knitted from llama wool.

On the patio surrounding the last dwelling, we found three small hoes and one pickaxe near the collapsed structure, to the right of the main house. The space was used as a henhouse, covered with a thatched roof, wooden planks and tola sticks tied with llama hide. The walls made from sod blocks or *champa* faced a square platform of the same material. Skins and llama feet were stored here.

Behind the platform, a grinding stone was found. To the right of the henhouse and the inhabited space, there was a kitchen, delimited by a circle of tola stuck vertically and wild straw that protected the outer part of the wall. In the inner circle and at the borders, a square stove surrounded by stones was found, as well as a similar stone that seemed to be employed as a seat. The kitchen utensils were limited to one ceramic pot and one ceramic vessel with wide mouth, two herring tins perforated as a sieve and one split barrel used as a washtub. On the other side of the house, to the left, many llama skins were piled up together with a white woollen ball.

West of the buildings, we found a corral made from *qurpa* (adobe made with compacted manure of llama and sheep), and a door of tola c. 0.8 m in height. Connected to this corral was a larger oval-shaped one made from the same material, although its south door and the northern part had collapsed. Both structures were placed higher than the rest of the constructions owing both to the shape of the dune, on which they were located, and to the manure accumulated in the interior of the dune. The walls stood on compacted straw. On the northeast border, a square basement surrounded with straw was visible.

Close to the corrals, we found an accumulation of llama bones and a heap of manure that, according to Máximo Cayo, was used on the cultivation areas on the mountain. Another corral to the southwest was made from compacted straw with a *takira* at the entrance. This stone vessel was used to shell grains, and was covered with a zinc plate that once made part of a boat, a ‘wara’ (or Sp. *vara* = oar) used to move the boat through water. As in the previous case, manure was accumulated to fertilize the cultivation areas. Behind the constructions lay the dunes and places where the straw for the corrals came from; on the *bofedal* facing these, we observed two square basements of corrals that had collapsed.

(3) *Jant’a near the Uru-Murato settlement area*: This was described above in connection with my first visit to Calzar Vintu and Julián Choque in 2002, together with the ethnographic details and illustrations. This part presents additional details collected during the 2003 fieldwork. The name of this *jant’a*, according to Julián Choque, is Estancia Sato. The name *Estancia* (Sp.) is usually found in official maps, designating the clusters of houses that form hamlets and are distributed among arable portions of the territory (see Glossary). It is located to the left of his house, i.e. to the northeast. The *jant’a*, he claimed, was where Aymaras tend sheep and llamas and cultivate quinua and potato. Estancia Sato was where Máximo Cayo lived, the owner of the land with the circular structure, land that stretched up to the borders with Suxtita. To the right of the circular structure, i.e. east, south and north, community Sato was located towards the river, with Kaqasa located towards the mountain, i.e. southeast.

Measurements of the circular structure were taken and profiles established, (see Chapter VI, Fig. VI.17 a–b) and measurements taken with GPS. In total, eleven structures, comprising the circular structure, were mapped (see Chapter VI, Fig. VI.7), from which ten were square or rectangular structures. Many had collapsed amid the remains of sod blocks cut *in situ*. The measurements of the circular structure were impressive, c. 8 m in diameter, and indicated that this was not a house, but rather a large corral intended at some stage to shelter the llamas that Máximo Cayo still raised (see ethno-archaeological discussion and diagrams in Chapter VI).
Only two structures were thatched, the rest seemed to have been used as corrals and other jant’as. Manure was still visible and a wirjiña was located to the south, close to the road to Orinoca. We were told that the hut, or jant’a, was used in the spring to gather the llamas together, but that very short time, when compared to others, was spent in the area owing to the wind and the cold.

To the west of all these structures, Julián Choque’s settlement was located: two rectangular single room houses as mentioned above. His wife Barbara rested (estaba durmiendo) in one (see Fig. IV.27), he claimed; in the other (see Fig. IV.26) he kept his belongings and his dog. Julián confirmed all previously gathered information, and showed us to the places where his relatives had built houses or putukus that were no longer standing and the traces of which were fading in the sandy soil facing the lake. He groomed himself to take the opportunity to go with us back to Pampa Aullagas where he had to wait for a phone call of his son living in Tarija. He said, “I am going to wash my head (cabecita)” while we were watching the landscape formed by the Estancia Sato and the canchones, formerly Calzar Vintu, where his family used to live. He returned with clean shirt and jumper, and a black hat with a red satin ribbon – apparently a present from a former preste who had been kind enough to invite him to the celebration of Pampa Aullagas festivities in the past. He placed his bike on the roof rack of the car and left us in K’uchu Pampa while we continued to our next stopover.

Chullpa

This is a settlement located on Mount Pedro Santos Willka, close to Kaqasa and Lupikipa, between the Lupikipa and ancient Pairumani (see Figure V.40). Maximo Cayo and his family had settled there as members of ayllu Sakatiri, and they also kept a house in Sato community. Unlike other jant’as, the three women in the family – mother, daughter and mother-in-law – established a permanent residence here. The houses are made from adobe, with thatched roofs, metal plated doors and windows on either side of the doors. The kitchen is formed by a circle of tola and adobe, with a stove inside. A sheep corral is located nearby. The interesting feature in this settlement was the jant’a located on the bofedal, near River Lakajawira and the sand dunes of Calzar Vinto.

Jant’a in Chullpa: The structure consists of corrals for animals, placed amid the sand dunes and the grazing area. A horizontal description shows the dunes, a small cultivation area followed by the next dunes and some old collapsed structures and corrals, still in use. There is a small circular shelter – putuku – built on an old structure with a square basement with two small huts showing signs of recent occupation in front. Another hut had almost collapsed. All structures were built on grassy lands reaching river Lakajawira where llamas and sheep grazed. Vegetation on the sand dunes consisted of wild straw and a few tola shrubs.

Archaeological sites were found in this area, yielding ceramics and lithics; particularly interesting was an arrow point found amid the dunes (24 July, 2003). A description of the structures found follows, complemented by Fig. V.43. The structures are numbered from one to thirteen:

Number one: The first mapped structure shows two ancient divided corrals. The whole structure measured 7x11 m, divided into two corrals of 3.7x7 m and 7.3x7 m. The two entrances to the corrals face River Lakajawira and are 1 m wide. The structure has completely collapsed and only the basement is visible c. 10 cm above the floor; it is located c. 30 m from the nearby sand dunes. The floor was covered with grass, which also grew on the basement and the surrounding area.

Number two: C. 60 m to the east of the above structure, placed on the diagonal, the present corral was located. It was rectangular, measuring 4.6x7 m with a height of 1.2 m. The entrance for the animals faced the east and was 80 cm wide. The corral was built from sod blocks and the interior was covered with manure.

Numbers three and four: These structures were connected by a canal filled with water. According to people living in the area, it was used long ago as a bath to protect animals from
mange. It was built from adobe. Structure number three measures 6x5 m; structure number four measures 5x4 m.

**Number five:** This was a 2 m high circular structure with a diameter of 3m. It was used as a temporal shelter for people who grazed their herds in the area. It was built on a square plan that showed remnants of an old structure, thus re-utilising old spaces.

**Numbers six to nine:** The basement of these structures had collapsed and the area was used as corrals. The sizes differed as follows: structure number six measured 14x10 m; structure number seven 6.50x4 m; structure number eight 11x12 m; and structure number nine was 18x11 m connected to another corral of 8x11 m. Structures eight and nine were located on the sand dunes.

**Number ten:** The structure is a single room house built from adobe, measuring c. 3x2 m, used for storing freeze-dried potato (*chuño*), sheep and llama skins.

**Number eleven:** The structure, c. 3x2 m had collapsed and was built from adobe. It lay close to structure number ten and to a stove, c. 3 m wide.

**Number twelve:** This is an old corral that had collapsed, built from adobe measuring c. 3x7 m.

**Number thirteen:** The structure is divided into three parts. The first measured 7x3 m and was used as a corral for sheep; the second, 4x3 m, without entrance, seemed to be used as storage for straw and quinua, while the third, 4x3 m was not in use.

A conversation with Máximo Cayo provided a better understanding of the characteristics of the settlement. He mentioned that the *jant’a* was the original settlement of his family who moved from Sato when he was ten years old (he was now in his sixties). The structures currently in use were not older than ten years as, he claimed, i.e. the average duration for the sod blocks or *champas*. One of the houses he called “tent”, was built on the basement of an original house that had collapsed. This was only three years old, but notably deteriorated since it had not been properly constructed: the walls were not vertical and, in the end, that caused the roof to collapse. The “tent” was only used in September as a dwelling for one of the women who tended the sheep sheltered in the corrals nearby. The rest of the time it was used for storing *chuño* and grinding quinua on the grinding stone placed at the entrance.

The *putuku* built on the square basement was the property of his nephew Evaristo Cayo, who lived in the Sato area; the visible basement was part of a former sheep corral. The oldest structure in the settlement was the canal with stony steps used as bath to protect sheep from mange. This was the only structure that survived after the last flood that had covered the area for three years (probably in the 1980s). The corrals nearby were subsequently rebuilt but one had collapsed and a lateral corral lodged the animals leaving the bath. The corrals still standing were used for the sheep, particularly in September. The visible basements were large corrals for llamas that the father of Mr. Cayo had built c. fifty years ago; they had been rebuilt many times until the last flood occurred.

The area bordered by a channel, behind the house and between the sand dunes and the pampa, was used for cultivating potato *luki* and was fertilised with the manure from the corrals. Although not mapped, two additional corrals located in the dunes nearby were also part of this settlement. Both were used by llamas and were built from compact straw; the oldest was c. eight years old and the newest three years old at the time for the fieldwork.

As an additional observation, a kinship relation between the women in Chullpa and Lupikipa was noted which, together with the patrilocal system, allowed for access to the territorial spaces of Sakatiri.

### Occupation patterns in Calzar Vintu revisited

Further observations were carried out as, in addition to the information gathered previously, we now wanted to see how this area was used by both “Ayllu Uru Muratos” (or what was left of them in Calzar Vintu), and Sakatiri, the “Aymara” ayllu. Sakatiri was allowed to label the Urus as Chullpa Puchus, but the Aymaras would never expect to be labelled as Urus in turn, despite
the fact that they had managed to gain access to areas traditionally believed to be Uru. How would Julián Choque Moya, the “last of his kind”, cope with this?

The previous description of jant’as in this area provided an understanding of the landscape and the way people settled it. We have seen that Julián Choque lived in two rectangular houses with his wife Barbara (see Figs. IV.26–IV.27), both members of Ayllu Uru-Muratos with residence in Calzar Vintu, claiming to be the only (únicos) inhabitants of this Ayllu when we were there between 2002 and 2003. The house where his wife rested when we last visited them had the entrance oriented towards Lake Poopó, i.e. the north, and the house where he kept his things, was located diagonally and to the west, the door facing the east and River Lakajawira. As the sod block walls were deteriorating after eight years of utilisation, Mr. Choque had started to extract new champa blocks to rebuild the walls of the houses.

The occupation pattern he described to us appeared to be related to the resources in the landscape, that is, River Lakajawira, Lake Poopó, the sand dunes, and the bofedal or marshy ground, as shown by the following table (Table V.6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological niches on the horizontal axis</th>
<th>Character of the occupation pattern</th>
<th>Uru occupation on the vertical axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sand dunes</td>
<td>• Family settlements</td>
<td>Calzar Vintu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Areas for quinua cultivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wirjiña and broad beans cultivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Area for collection of firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Bogs or marshy grounds or bofedal</td>
<td>• Area for hunting rabbits</td>
<td>Calzar Vintu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Area where sod blocks are cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) River Lakajawira</td>
<td>• Area for hunting pariwanas</td>
<td>Calzar Vintu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formerly, the shores were used as potato cultivation fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Lake Poopó</td>
<td>• Area for hunting pariwanas</td>
<td>Calzar Vintu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Julián Choque was no longer cultivating as, being now located on the lands of comunidad Chullpa of Sato, these were used by their owners, ayllu Sakatiri and Máximo Cayo in particular, to graze the herds. He claimed that this would lead to conflicts since the animals would trample his cultivations. Choque suggested that the community had offered him a place for settling on the mountain, but he was not interested in abandoning the place where his family had originally settled, although none of his children was willing to stay in the area. His sons had migrated to Tarija and other Muratos of the area had already passed away or moved to Llapallapani, where they were enjoying “exclusive education and health services”.

How did previous members of Julián Choque’s family settle in Calzar Vintu? He told us that, originally, the Uru Murato settlement in Calzar Vintu was located in the plain or pampa covered with kulcha, facing the shores of River Lakajawira and that the settlement initially consisted of what he called canchón or cultivating area, putuku, and a house. He made it clear that he did not have a canchón. All members of the settlement had come from Puñaka (Puñiqa) and Orinoca (Urinaqa), for unknown reasons. Five families had settled in the area, having built structures with sod blocks and thatched roofs, detailed as follows:
One ‘tent’ house: (or carpa, Sp.) built on a rectangular plan and consisting of one single room, used either for sleeping, cooking or storage of the produce from hunting and fishing – such as pariwanas or pejerrey (Basilichthys bonariensis) – or farming (potato and chuño).

One putuku: or circular structure, generally used as a shelter.

Cultivation areas: walled with champa to avoid the intrusion of herds first from Suxtita, and then from Sakatiri. Potato called luki was generally cultivated here.

Julián Choque had built yet another putuku near the lake where he kept his traps for pariwanas. The yellowish colour of the sod blocks made it difficult to see it in the landscape.

Julián Choque also stated that his settlement was c. fifty years old. He said that some twenty years ago, a flood destroyed the settlement forcing families to migrate. He had migrated to Challapata and returned only ten years ago. Before the flood, the settlement was rebuilt at least twice, he said, because of the champas that deteriorate in approximately ten years. He also showed us the places where his kin used to live; facing their house are their canchones and places where they built houses and putukus, as follows. “Pedro Flores – to the left” (kin of his wife Barbara Conde Mauricio, born in Puñaka), “Crisanto Moya – my uncle” (his mother’s brother), “my father” (Eusebio Choque, married to Concebida Moya), “and Apolinar Choque – my elder brother”.

In order to better understand the connections between Uru-Murato people who settled in Calzar Vintu, we tried to sketch a kinship diagram depicting particularly those who preceded Julián Choque in the area. A preliminary identification gave an account of the five heads of family mentioned above, as follows:

- Pedro Flores Mauricio – connected to the Mauricio family from Puñaka, thus related to Julián’s wife, Barbara Conde Mauricio
- Eusebio Choque – Julián’s father
- Crisanto Moya – Julián’s mother’s brother
- Apolinar Choque – Julián’s elder brother
- Severo Choque – Julián’s elder brother’s son who moved to Llapallapani

Kinship Diagram number two (below) depicts the relations between family members. Neo locality is favoured, that is they move to places where conditions for the families might prove better, and the kinship relations are established both from the mother’s and the father’s line. This could be proved by showing that the community originated in the family members of Julián’s father (Eusebio Choque), the family members of his mother’s brother (Crisanto Moya), the family of the eldest son/brother (Apolinar Choque), the family of the eldest grandson (Severo Choque), and one family connected to Puñaka origins (Mauricio).

Tendency to endogamy implied, furthermore, choosing people of ‘Uru origins’ and only one case was registered where a women of an Aymara father and an Uru mother lived with a male member of the community. All generations mentioned have tended towards neo locality, although some show a preference for settling in Llapallapani, as it seems that fishing activities are favoured there and access to school is granted for children.
CHAPTER VI
ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY IN ASURCOLLU

Introduction

Why Asurcollu? After I visited Calzar Vintu, where I suspected that the large circular structure was connected with ancient Uru occupation, I was now ready for the observation and analysis of the settlement structures that would be representative of my area of investigation. Among these was yet another large circular structure found in Asurcollu. Having studied the area previously (see fieldwork in 2002 for Suxtita in Chapter V), we returned to Asurcollu in 2003 for the last fieldwork season to pay particular attention to the settlement patterns of this community.

Both archaeology and anthropology guided my approach. Together with the selection of three settlement areas (see Fig. VI.1) encompassing the landscape stretching from Pampa Aullagas and its mountain (Pedro Santos Willka) up to the furthermost community related to the lake (Asurcollu), anthropological interviews and descriptions were carried out as described in Chapter V. In addition, archaeological descriptions and sampling of the sites as well as mapping of the round structure in Calzar Vintu were completed together with mapping and excavation of the structure in Asurcollu. This part of the chapter particularly dwells on the latter, a conspicuous circular structure found c. 60 m in front of the chapel at the entrance of the community presented in Chapter V.

In addition to the investigations of the settlement areas, another visit was made to San Miguel de Uruquilla, described in Chapter IV, where sampling was carried out in what is also known as a tambo area and the chullpas (burial structures) on the cliffs directly above this area. The two round structures mentioned, one at Calzar Vintu and one at Asurcollu, were mapped, and the one in Asurcollu partly excavated to reveal their character of a house and a ceremonial site respectively.

In the whole of the investigation area, there was no accumulation of “cultural layers” (Renfrew & Bahn 1993, Schiffer & Miller 1999, Shennan 1989, Ucko 1989) in the traditional meaning of this term and its underlying concepts. This is to say that the human activities themselves have not given rise to permanent layers of earth, containing garbage, dung, manure, waste etc. Finds could be covered in the droppings of llamas and sheep temporarily, but these heaps of manure disappear completely in a few years and one can expect the phosphates to sink deep into the sandy soils. Most of the manure gathered in and next to the corrals of the settlements was intended to be spread on the fields as a fertiliser; in this way, a number of artefacts, especially ceramics, are likely to be secondarily deposited in the fields. Here we found them on the surface or as deep as the hatchets have penetrated the sand. In these field sites, the ground often slopes and the artefact frequencies are low with comparatively little lithic waste. Fragments of hatchets, however, were relatively common.

The second way in which artefacts can accumulate in a layer is owing to the fact that all settlements are linked to dunes or sites exposed to sand accumulation and depositions of sand related to the often strong winds in the area. In the dunes, it is obvious that a certain covering of artefacts has taken place, and testing such sites we found artefacts as deep as 15–20 cm below the surface. However, in all probability, there are sites with much thicker layers of covering sand. This fact would have been a disadvantage to the sampling method, had it not been equally common to find a site from which all the sand had been removed by the winds, leaving only the artefacts to cover the slightly harder original surface of a pampa or bofedal level. Such sites may
be single- or multi-period ones, and the variety and frequency of artefacts per square metre is high, although only ceramics and lithics, the slightly heavier artefacts, have survived.

There are of course a number of covered sites that cannot be securely sampled without extensive excavations of seemingly empty dunes or sites covered in sand, which by chance may eventually have become pampa. However, the general picture of the settlement situation and system can nonetheless be sampled, since the movements of the sands, as caused by different winds, will change accordingly at different points within the overall systematic distribution of dunes and sands, thereby covering and uncovering sites. It was the sand and dune pattern that attracted the settlers in the first place and it would seem that the preferred site was a southern slope or an area surrounded by dunes (see Figs VI.2–VI.5).

Since we have investigated three settlement areas where only settlements and sites with a clear link to subsistence economy have existed, we have found only the occasional stray find outside the settlements themselves, i.e. on the pampa or grassland, dropped without being covered some time during the last three or four thousand years. In the search line between Asurcollu to Tola Collu that covered 0.25 sq km (see Fig. VI.1), we found only four stray finds in the pampa of tola. Owing to the character of the sites, the modern ploughing-up of large fields in the pampa, using tractors or bulldozers with deep-reaching ploughs, has had only a marginal effect on our area of investigation in terms of destroying settlements, although it must have increased sand transportation in the area during later years. However, at a *tambo* site such as San Miguel de Uruquilla it has had devastating effects. Here the ploughing has turned up strips of earth forty or fifty centimetres thick, and covered most of the finds once dropped on the ground.

In the end, sampling showed itself to be a reliable method in order to get a general view of the character of the settlement system. Excavation was carried out to get a better interpretation of one of the circular structures as the context of this structure suggested excavation. Mapping the other round feature gave sufficient information about its function. The reasons for sampling San Miguel de Uruquilla were secondary to our investigation. We sampled three areas characteristic of the landscape: a mountain slope, a dune area and a tola covered pampa with small sandy hillocks or dunes.

The area, known as Andes Sur Centrales or South Central Andes in the literature (Lumbreras 1981), covers from Lake Titikaka up to the northwestern Chilean territory, i.e. from 16° to 25°S. It has been adapted to cover the central plateau where Oruro is located, thus Lake Poopó. The chronology generally accepted by archaeologists for this area is as follows (M. Michel, *pers. comm.*) (Table VI.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Generally accepted name</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000 – 2000 BC</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Hunters, gatherers and first cultivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 BC – 300 AD</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>First hamlets (Wankarani)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 – 900 AD</td>
<td>Middle Horizon</td>
<td>Early Regional Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 – 1450 AD</td>
<td>Late Intermediate</td>
<td>Late Regional Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450 – 1540 AD</td>
<td>Late Horizon</td>
<td>Inka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Archaic period is currently poorly understood, but indications of arrowheads together with occupation on the shores of palaeo lakes, e.g. Pocuyo, have been evidenced in the area. The Formative refers to the first hamlets of cultivators and herdsmen located on the shores of Desaguadero River and other rivers connected to Lake Poopó, that also reach the valleys, e.g. Cochabamba. Early productive centres have been identified in this period and there is evidence
of early exchange of local produce, e.g. black basalt employed in the manufacture of hoes. The Middle Horizon covers the formation of large farming settlements corresponding to different local regional developments, defined mainly by the identified ceramics, eg. Yura, Uruquilla, Puqui, Taltape, Cabuza. These are the first large-scale farmers evidenced in the terracing of the local mountains and implying ecological exchange of produce and caravans of llamas. The Late Intermediate shows the first fortresses built with one access door only and located on heights connected to the settlement pattern. The ceramic style is unified under one name, i.e. Quillacas. Different developments in the Altiplano in the form of confederations are evidenced in the early Spanish chronicles as Señoríos, a Spanish denomination for lordships, and in the Inka kipus. The Inka period, or Late Horizon, is connected to the arrival of the Inkas to this area, c. 1450 AD. No evidence of the conquer pattern has been documented apart from two Inka roads running parallel to Lake Poopó and reaching a common point at San Miguel de Uruquilla, thence to Argentinean territory. Tambos are also conspicuous evidence, e.g. Paria to the north, Andamarca, Orinoca and Aullagas to the west; Pazña and Sevaruyo to the east, and Quillacas to the south. On the whole, the general chronology presented for the area has been established on the basis of surveys carried out in recent years, and there is a proposal for understanding a chronology for the area that is forthcoming (Cf. Michel 2004; also M. Michel, pers. comm.).

The First Settlement Area

The first settlement area is situated at the northern slope of the Mount Pedro Santos Willka; its main part consists of a trajectory through a small amphitheatre-like area called K’uchu Pampa (see Fig. VI.1). K’uchu Pampa is therefore our name for this area. The trajectory gives us a diagnostic profile of the slope settlements around the whole mountain and in this capacity it also explains a site close to the foot of the slope, as well as the newly deserted settlement Pairumani. The settlement was sampled in July 2003, and is situated at a rock by the foot of the mountain where the slope begins (see Figs. IV.13–IV.19). The mountain, Pedro Santos Willka, is characterised by a number of ridges and what looks like a twin top. The gentle parts of the slopes of these culminations, as well as the small valleys in between, are covered by partly terraced fields situated on the mountain above the settlements. One such field was sampled this year.

The K’uchu Pampa trajectory was c. 700 m long, formed by and sampled in a series of 16 squares, each 10 by 30 m, designated by the coordinates of their central point. In addition, two more samples were taken to give a more substantial understanding of a settlement area, not least to prove or disprove the existence of a phase belonging to the formative period. Four field walkers walked down the slope with the light coming in from their right hand side. They aimed at picking up every fourth artefact together with whatever significant artefact that met their eyes. In spite of the measures taken to do a systematic sampling, the dense squares tended to be less thoroughly sampled than the sparse ones. For this reason, the interpretation is based on the relative distribution of ceramic forms within the samples, without paying much attention to small differences.

As mentioned, the sampling showed the location of a settlement situated close to the top of the slope, a little below the foot of the steep mountain ridge. The site was characterised by ceramics, lithics (not least production waste) and grinding or mortar stones, so called batanes. The latter were not sampled. Above and below the settlement there were a number of field related finds. At the bottom of the slope, some small dunes form a thirty metres wide brim facing the river Lakajawira. It was on these low dunes below the Pairumani site that a formative period settlement was sampled in 2002. Just south of the trail, a part of the dunes has been ploughed-up with a machine in recent times. Today, the dunes are growing again and their direction is parallel to the river and the foot of the slope, i.e. northeast–southwest (see Fig. VI.6).

The character of the slope was analysed by means of 18 ceramic samples that gave evidence to approximate chronological patterns. The settlement in the slope might have been formed in the Tiwanaku period if not in the Late Formative. It was possibly abandoned in Colonial times.
The small number of Republican and modern sherds signifies that the settlement area was turned into fields in later periods. This fact was made evident by the stone walls and the rows of stones that marked out fields and plots over the whole settlement area. Further down the slope, the chronological composition of the ceramics showed the deposits to be of a younger date dominated by ceramics designated Intermedio Tardío, i.e. 900–1450 AD (see Table VI.1). This pattern suggests that eventually the field systems connected to the settlement increased. The altitude of the settlement is similar to that of Pairumani and other present day settlements around the mountain. Based on the sample from 2002 and the sample from Pairumani, which contains ceramics from the Intermedio Tardío onwards, we can draw the following conclusion: Some time in the Late Formative or Tiwanaku Period, the dune-related settlement must have been accompanied by settlements in a new situation further up in the landscape, on the slopes, or on protruding cliffs such as the Pairumani settlement, c. 60 m above the dunes. This situation continued to be the preferred one up until the present, and it has, it seems, become the main settlement pattern, because even Pampa Aullagas originally had this position in the landscape. Today, almost everybody in the area will have residence housing in Pampa Aullagas as a sign of the ultimate success of the mountain-related settlements.

As hoped, the trajectory for the diagnostic did indeed describe the introduction of the slope settlements related to the mountain. Based on the sample from the mountain field above the slope settlements we can conclude that these fields were part of an intensive field expansion from the Intermedio Tardío onwards. The fields include terraces and only the steepest and most rock-covered spots have been considered impossible to turn into a field.

To sum up: in the light of the evidence currently available, the first settlement area would seem to date the introduction of the slope settlements and the mountain field systems to the Tiwanaku Period if not to the Late Formative. This settlement pattern appears, therefore, as an addition to the already established flatland settlements related to the sands.

The Second Settlement Area

The second settlement area is characterised by a settlement zone that covers both the outer part, i.e. the edge, of the dunes and the flat grassland, the so-called bofedal, next to the dunes stretching towards river Lakajawira and the shores of Lake Poopó. This settlement zone forms an angle delimitating the southeastern corner of the dune area north of Pampa Aullagas (see Fig. VI.1). This zone is about three kilometres long and it makes up a settlement area in its own right with clear boundaries in the southwest and the north. Today, this singular zone is related to several settlements outside it and only one name is primary to the zone itself, namely Calzar Vintu, which is the part facing the Poopó rather than the Lakajawira. We therefore call the area Calzar Vintu. The zone has fulfilled many purposes related to settlement, cultivation, herding and hunting from the earliest formative period until today.

The Calzar Vintu area was investigated by means of mapping, description and sampling. The features were numerous and points, polylines and polygons taken from a GPS, were used to create an overview (see Fig. VI.7) In this map, different features relating to basic elements in the subsistence system, such as fields, corrals, dwellings and garbage areas were marked out. In nearly all cases, the features were represented by a perimeter linked to a code referring to “field”, “corral”, “dwelling” etc. In addition, schematic measurements and descriptions were made of a number of sites that could be related to people still living in the zone. The fully surveyed area was c. 2.3 sq. km. The investigation did not cover the interior of the dunes other than in a corridor, in which only corrals were found, despite there being some “floors”, where prevailing winds had removed all the sand and uncovered an original surface. Further out towards the edge of the dunes, such “floors” are often covered with artefacts. The dunes may well contain further sites, but should that be the case, it would hardly change the picture of the area and its typical settlement zone.

In the area, the pattern of the sands shows that the formation of dunes stretching from the southeast to the northwest is an ongoing process. There are two indications of this process. The
part of the zone that faces the Lakajawira is characterised by five settlements, some almost abandoned with secondary habitations, some in clearly visible ruins and some almost disappearing. In connection with these settlements, it can still be seen how the fields of these farms once stretched from the settlements into the dunes. Only in the eastern part, a ploughing along the edge of the dunes has destroyed this picture. The tilling of the fields prevented the formation of the dunes, but today when the fields are abandoned, and only two of the sites used secondarily in connection with animal husbandry, we see how the sands start to form new ridges between the old fields. These ridges tend to be orientated SE–NW.

Just behind the edge of the dunes, a little east of these new sands, we found a large site apparently dated between the Formative and the Colonial Period. A large part of this site consists of a “floor”, a surface full of artefacts, and the result of the winds having carried off the sand in which the artefacts were once buried. The orientation of this “floor” is clearly SE–NW and it runs between two dunes that have the same direction. In other words, the context must be dated as formative and perhaps even post Colonial. If we compare these results with those from the first settlement area, we can conclude that there is a tendency, prevailing today, for the dunes to be orientated either SW–NE or SE–NW, i.e. at right angles, the predominant orientation being SE–NW (see Fig. VI.1).

As mentioned above, the use of the settlement zone starts in the Formative Period and in the earlier, rather than later, part of this period. 1500 BC might be suggested as a temporal reference point. The use of the zone for settlement continues until today, although no more than a handful of people occupy it permanently or temporarily. The archaeological investigation showed that the zone had been used mainly for settlements, cultivation, animal husbandry and activities related to such phenomena. Since there are indeed many facets of these activities, the features in the zone are varied.

Regarding settlements and their houses, we know nothing of the dwellings of the early sites in the dunes. Nevertheless, we found everything from temporary or more permanent shelters made of tola and grass as well as the remains of the fore and aft of a small boat (see Figs. VI.8 & VI.9), to small huts, mostly rectangular, but also some round ones, as well as farms with dwellings, outhouses and probably kitchens (see Fig. VI.12). Only one of the larger houses was a round one. Shelters, called *jant’as* locally, are always related to corrals and so are the regular farmhouses, but the small huts or chozas, with or without a bench for sleeping, could be built in the middle of grassland or pampa or as temporary abodes in connection with animal husbandry situated as secondary buildings in a ruined farm (see Chapter V). All the recorded houses were situated outside the dunes, although two, the ones still inhabited by Julián Choque (our Uru Murato inhabitant) and Máximo Cayo, stood at the very edge of the sands (see Figs. IV–26 and IV.27).

The corrals used in animal husbandry show considerable variation both in construction, size and situation. One reason for this is the tradition of building them from material in their immediate surroundings, the so-called *champas* (see Fig.VI.10). There are, moreover, natural corral sites, i.e., sites sheltered by the dunes and marked only by the burnt-off tola shrubs, the fire of which protected the animals and warmed the shepherd during the occasional overnight stay (see Fig. VI.11). The corral constructions vary considerably in size according to rules and purposes that cannot easily be figured out archaeologically. Size, however, is not a decisive factor when it comes to linking corrals and settlements (see Fig. VI.12). That link could be missing completely or consist of a shelter, a hut or farmhouses without relation to the size of the corral. The fences of the corrals themselves could be made of adobe bricks, tola or indeed a mixture of sand, grass, tola, turf as well as the odd piece of almost anything, such as a cactus or a sheet of metal or zinc plate as has been described in Chapter V. Corrals can be found in the whole zone. In fact, they have the widest distribution of all features situated close to the water as well as far into the dunes. They fulfil many functions in connection with animal husbandry, such as protecting the animals, but they are also the right place to slaughter an animal (see Fig. VI.12 & VI.13). All corrals, however, lead to the production of manure and most of the corrals in use are therefore signified by a heap of dung. Not all animals are kept in corrals and therefore the area around a group of farmhouses may be covered by llama and sheep dung (see Fig. VI.14 & VI.15)
The remains of fields in use in the whole Aullagas area of investigation are of two kinds. First, ploughed-up pampa of which there is no obvious example in the area, although Máximo Cayo occupies such a field some kilometres north of his home. Secondly, the dune related fields, which are obviously the older ones. However, some of them seem to have been ploughed up with a small plough drawn by a machine. These fields follow the fringe of the dunes. Otherwise, the fields are located among the dunes, where they are sometimes situated next to a well or wirijña. They may also be a small cultivated spot in the sand next to the farmhouses, e.g. on the present settlements of Julián Choque and Máximo Cayo. Samples suggested that some of the fields in the dunes could have been used already in the Intermedio Tardío, owing perhaps to the existence of a well. The field belonging to Máximo Cayo was still in use.

In the second settlement area, archaeological documentation and interpretation tell us about the long-term use of an intermediate zone between dunes and water. Most of the visible features are no more than one hundred years old, judging from their state of preservation and the dates of some of them given by the people living in the zone today. One man, Julián Choque (see Chapter IV), lives in what is now a relatively well-preserved ruin that was his father’s homestead. This means that the deep roots of the flatland settlement system, contrasted by the later and eventually more successful slope settlements, are also related to much ethno-archaeological information that mirrors the usage of some of the last flatland settlements. It is interesting that the two men who live in the area as neighbours and who use the resources of the zone in the way that they, in an archaeological perspective, would have used them during thousands of years, define themselves as an Uru and an Aymara respectively.

Summarising, the second settlement zone contains a settlement pattern that is different from the slope pattern of the first area. The second area seems to indicate a zone characterised by features related to self-subsistence, and what may have been produced on the side. Today, this zone is no longer that; on the contrary, it is dominated by the peasants who belong to the slope settlements and who consider the area to be grassland, i.e. bofedal, or commons shared by several different ayllus in the Aullagas community, if not dryland farming fields. However, some aspects of the varied settlement structure that would have characterised the zone earlier on can still be discerned.

The circular structure in Calzar Vintu

In Asurcollu, as well as in Calzar Vintu, the large circular structures were explained as corrals by the inhabitants. In Calzar Vintu, where dozens of more or less ruined corrals were described and mapped, this explanation was definitely not to the point.

The circular structure was found during the field season in 2002 and in 2003, it was visited again in order to decide in what way it should be recorded (see Fig. VI.16). The last visit made it clear that drawing a plan and a profile of the structure would reveal its true character (see Fig. VI.17 a–b). When a corral in the bofedal collapses, the debris forms a symmetrical pattern around the centre of the wall, with half the adobe inside the corral and the other half outside it. The corners, owing to their construction, are better supported, and here more than half of the debris is likely to fall on the outside of the structure.

However, the profile (see Fig VI.17 a–b) as well as the photograph (see Fig VI.16) of the round structure showed that almost all the debris around the perimeter had fallen on the outside of the wall. This distribution can only be explained by the fact that some force or other must have prevented the adobe bricks from falling into the structure. The natural explanation to this kind of debris pattern is to infer the forces of the rafters in a collapsing roof that would tend to press out the walls while falling down. In addition, sloping walls could make the inner wall face more stable than the outer one. That in turn indicates that the circular structure was indeed a house and not a corral. The doorway to the circular structure, moreover, had a threshold – a feature never observed in a corral, where animals are supposed to enter and leave freely when the gate is open.
The Third Settlement Area

The third area is centred on the community of Asurcollu, stretching as far as Inka Crossing (Inka Crucero) in the northeast and Tola Collu in the southeast. Outside the settlements, the area has been surveyed unsystematically except for a c. 100 m broad search line connecting the two neighbouring estancias Asurcollu and Tola Collu (see Fig. VI.1 and Fig. VI.18). Apart from the present day settlements and their present and ruined fields, corrals, waterholes etc., the area contained a number of settlements. It was clear that besides the obvious grassland opportunities in this tola-covered pampa, the low sandy hillocks and the dunes with their easily cultivated sandy soils have attracted people from the Formative Period until present times. The settlements are attached to the low sandy hillocks, ridges and dunes because of the possibilities these soils present to dress the bare sloping ground with hatchets, in fields where a harvest of quinua or potato destined to be converted into chuño (see Fig. VI.19 a–b) could be taken during the rainy season. On the hard tola pampa, the relatively fragile hatchet with its thin and light basalt blade would have broken immediately. Now and then, it also breaks in the sands; nonetheless, the highly sand-polished fragments recovered during our sampling bear witness to their suitability to these soils.

In the third settlement area, the fruitful collaboration between anthropology and archaeology in its ethno-archaeological aspect became apparent (Adams 1977; Birks et al. 1988; Bringéus 1998; Deetz 1977, 1991; Gibbon 1984; Hodder 1982, 1998, 1999; Moore 1996; Robbins 1966; Wallin 1993). Asurcollu is an independent and wealthy community or estancia, although it is of course affected by the hard times and changes in life conditions that today characterise much of the Altiplano. Nonetheless, Asurcollu is still a small society characterised by features and structures related not only to subsistence and surplus production but also to ideology. Since Asurcollu is a settlement in its own right (see description in Chapter V), the contextual qualities of the site, the current situation of its inhabitants and their approach to archaeologists and anthropologists came to a certain extent to govern both the archaeological and anthropological investigations. The archaeological survey can be described as investigations in Asurcollu and foot surveys departing from it to places in the surroundings related to the estancia.

Mapping, following the same principles as in the second area, was carried out. Sampling was partly related to the sites that make up the Asurcollu of today, among others its ranch with the thought-provoking name Inka Crossing (Inka Crucero, see Chapter V and Fig. VI.20). The sampling was complemented by fieldwork in a c. 100 m wide transect from Asurcollu to Tola Collu. This walk made it clear that there was a connection between sands, settlements and fields. This relationship could also have existed in the second settlement area, but since we worked simultaneously in the three areas, the relation was first understood in the third area. In Asurcollu, one could say that we learned where to go in the landscape in order to find an early deserted settlement or an ancient field. Asurcollu, Inka Crossing and Tola Collu being such sandy hillocks, we registered four similar sites in the area, but no sites in the tola pampa in the surrounding area. Had we surveyed all of the sandy areas, we would of course have found more sites on the hillocks.

Two sites stood out in this connection: first, the llama offering site, which is located at an abandoned settlement dating mainly to the Intermedio Tardío. Today, the offering place is a limestone slab, quarried at a formation north of the estancia. The relatively abundant limestones in the estancia all come from this quarry. It is worth considering the possibility that the offering site is the original Asurcollu, which retained the offering site when the settlement moved to its present situation some 500 m to the east.

The second site is the context made up by the chapel in Asurcollu and its two outer altars, one within the church enclosure and the other c. 60 m away, situated in its own square enclosure, originally a small wall built of four courses of limestone and c. 50 cm high (see Fig. VI.21 & VI.22). The peculiar character of these structures is evidenced by two observations. First, the alignment of the chapel, altars and enclosures points exactly to the church or bell tower in Pampa Aullagas. This, it could be said, is a manifestation of the dependency of the
place in the periphery to the central religious place. The procession from the church to the altars is, apparently, the first steps towards Pampa Aullagas. The second observation is the stratigraphic fact that the outer altar was built partly on top of a circular limestone structure with an opening towards the northwest of the settlement. Owing to the complexity of this context, it was decided to excavate part of the circular structure (see Fig. VI.23).

Irrespective of their dating, the settlements in Asurcollu are all related to the sands, as are the fields. Today, the estancia is dominated by llama husbandry mixed with a relatively limited number of sheep. Husbandry and hunting, i.e. pampa-related economies, must always have been essential to those who settled on the sandy soils with dwellings, corrals and easily tilled fields. Asurcollu covers the greater part of the northern end of the “peninsula” which makes up the whole investigation area, and its tola pampas are vast. Settlements in the area probably date back to the Formative Period. With access to vast pampas, the Colonial and the Republican Period with a large part of the transport economy based on llamas must have been prosperous for the estancia. Moreover, the ceramics would seem to indicate that already in the Intermedio Tardio, the estancia developed its economic strength. It is reasonable to believe that there is a link between the symbolism of the structures and the economic growth characterising the second millennium of our era.

Although, Asurcollu had its roots in the Formative period, similar to other sandy soil settlements, the estancia had the opportunity to adapt to the classic llama-based production and transport economy of the Altiplano and gain a surplus. In this way, what would initially have been a disadvantage, i.e. the lack of contact with water that was the advantage of the second settlement area, turned out to be most beneficial. The estancia benefited from its relative isolation. The ability to turn these two factors, isolation and grasslands, into an advantage constitutes the difference between the second and the third settlement areas. The former could not develop in the way Asurcollu did owing to its nearness to the dominant slope settlements and relative lack of grassland.

Although a higher water level in Lake Poopó would have made Asurcollu a more water-related settlement, its economic raison d'être is the tola-covered northern tip of the peninsula, where even today more than one thousand llamas are grazing. It is reasonable to think that in the Formative Period, this tola pampa was principally used for hunting local fauna.

**The circular structure in Asurcollu**

This circular structure was first thought to be a ruined foundation wall, since in the debris, some larger lime stones seemed to outline the inner perimeter of a circular wall (see Figs. VI.24 & VI.25). From the great number of ceramic sherds which covered much of the structure and its interior and its particular position, we considered the possibility that the structure might be a site related to offerings, although we were told that the structure was yet another corral, and indeed, llamas had covered the inside of the structure with their droppings. We decided to excavate and to see for ourselves what kind of circular structure we were facing this time.

Excavation proved the structure to be a circle divided into seven segments, one being the wide opening towards the northeast and the settlement. Between the segments, there were regular opening patterns. One was excavated and with that information at hand, the others could be seen in the debris (see Fig.VI.26). The excavated segment was stone-lined and divided into two sections, thus making up a pair (see Fig.VI.27 & VI.28). It was only fair to expect the five other segments to have been divided in the same way and to have had the same layout. The other segments, however, were not excavated. Two were partly destroyed by the outer altar or “tower” and its square-shaped enclosure, and because the openings were visible in the debris, it was considered unnecessary to damage the construction.

The excavation also proved that above, between and around the stone lining, which consisted mostly of stones set on the edge, there was a homogeneous mixture of sherds, small broken limestones and limestone chips. The debris was in other words not the debris of a wall, but rather a material with a relation to the segments similar to that of the sherds. Once we had the segment and its sections disclosed by the excavation, Cristina Cayo was asked to help with
her understanding of this place. She told us that the structure was part of one of the local celebrations known as *Alasita*.

*Alasita* is one of the typical Andean celebrations, the peculiarity of which is the representation of the “real world” and its components in small versions of same; that is, miniatures of objects, particularly the most desired ones, that are fabricated for the occasion and bought as an amulet that represents what the object-to-be will sooner or later be possessed, or hold as one’s own when luck and abundance favours the owner. Ethnographic accounts mention that it is connected to *Iqiqu* (Ay.) or *ekeko*, the deity of good luck and abundance (van den Berg n.d.). *Alasita* commonly takes place after the annual saintly patron celebration in the Altiplano, and in La Paz, the capital city, it is celebrated on the week after the 24th of January. We have seen that the *Virgen de la Presentación* was the patron celebrated in Asurcollu in October every year, together with the *preste* activities and, of course, the *Alasita* that took place then. The circular structure that we excavated was used as the framework for that celebration where, we were told, the “segments” described above represented miniature constructions of houses, *canchones* and whole “neighbourhoods” (*barrios*) in small versions of an ideal Asurcollu (see Figs. VI.29 & VI.30). Bread and potatoes were also placed next to the representations and visitors, particularly children, were allowed to bring the ceramic sherds – called *jik’illa* locally – that we found covering the place, together with *janqu qalas* or “white stones”, as a “currency” to be exchanged for the bread and food. In this way, they could obtain a “real thing”, i.e. the bread, in exchange for some sherds and stones. The sherds were collected, we were told, in the neighbouring salt-pan described previously as *Jayu Quita* (see Fig. VI.31). After the *Alasita*, the whole representation of houses and everything was usually demolished, broken and dismantled until the next celebration. Today, the site is no longer in use; the celebration has been abandoned for some four years ago for different reasons, such as the priest no longer willing to come to the place, the family feuds still unsettled and, for Cristina and Máxima Chaparro, their being the only inhabitants of the area as a consequence of the feuds. Instead, *Alasita* seems to have moved next to a miniature church erected on the northern slopes of Cerro Pedro Santos Willka, close to Lupikipa, where a virgin statue was found in the sandy soil and is thus considered a miraculous occurrence.

The circular structure, it seemed, was a ceremonial site created before the chapel and the tower were erected, but used even after their construction. Judging from the distribution of limestone and ceramics, all the segments were used. Dividing a circle into seven parts is not done by chance. Moreover, adding openings and leaving out one segment to create an entrance results, in the case of the heptagon, in a pattern with a baseline and a symmetry line and thus an orientation of the whole circular structure. In the Asurcollu case, the orientation is exactly towards the peaks of the mountains of Quillacas (see Figs. VI.32 – VI.34).

The ceramics found on the site allow advancing a dating of the structure to the Intermedio Tardío (see table VI.1). I argue that an original pre-Christian ceremonial site with an ideological link by means of orientation to a holy mountain, as is claimed to be typical for the Andes, was eventually occupied and changed into a more suitable Christian orientation, reflecting a new religious orientation towards the new centre in the local society, i.e. the colonial town of Pampa Aullagas. I conclude that, with the Spanish occupation, new divisions of the landscape were introduced, particularly symbolised by religious beliefs. Since the circular structure turned out to be a ceremonial structure with no less than twelve offering sections for niches, or representations of houses (three walls and a roof – see Figs. VI.29 & VI.30) in six pairs, it is only fair to compare the structure to the impressive round building in San Miguel de Uruquilla (see Fig. IV.11) and its niches, which are indeed ordered in pairs.

To sum up: today, offerings can be performed at any place which is felt to be suitable – be it a mountain top, next to a miniature church or next to a large concrete platform like the one constructed in Pampa Aullagas some years ago. The ceremonial site in Asurcollu, however, reflects a more complex pre-Christian offering situation. First of all, it takes the roots of such offerings down into the Intermedio Tardío, but at the same time it proves that in pre-Christian and indeed pre-Inka times, a ceremonial place could have a religious orientation linking it to a religious landscape characterised by the so-called central places (O’Connell 1997; Renfrew 1983; Renfrew & Bahn 1993, 1995). Alignment and geometry were felt to connect places in this
landscape and its society. It is therefore possible to recognise the religious landscape amidst the everyday and functional landscape of the flatland settlements partly hidden in the dunes or behind the sands.

**Brief archaeological discussion**

The fieldwork during the 2003 season revealed two different understandings of the Altiplano landscape. The oldest one refers to the flatland landscape favouring the light soils of sandy hillocks, or dunes and sites near rivers and lakes. The other landscape is that which is characterised by the slope settlements and intensive mountain cultivation with terraced fields. From the Spanish occupation up until today, the mountain centred society has strived to control the flatland, by means of creating *jant’as* managed both from the mountain villages and by peasants living in the flatland on farms, with a husbandry based both on cultivation and on animals.

What we see is two rivalling understandings of the landscape and the original one, the flatland that aligned itself to the holy mountains without occupying them, cannot compete with the new one that occupies the mountains and overlooks the flatland. In several ways, the two landscapes and their subsistence economy seem to be inversions of each other, but it is also obvious that the ideas behind the mountain landscape, the one apparently favoured by the Spaniards, try to take over some of the notions of the flatland. The realignment of the ceremonial site in Asurcollu is an example of this. It is typical for the two archaeological projects that they, to begin with, adhered to the prevailing understanding of the landscape and looked at Quillacas, an obvious mountain settlement, as the centre, while not much attention was paid to San Miguel de Uruquilla, which is probably a centre related to the flatland settlements. Today, both projects are more orientated towards understanding the long-term changes in the region.

That people respect the holiness of the mountains, while occupying as many as possible, shows a shift in the notion of power relations in society. It shows that it is no longer necessary to clearly differentiate between human and supernatural. Mountains are no longer seclusion and holiness; some may even be the home of worldly powers. This shift in the conception of holiness is often the first step towards the conception of holiness as an indoor phenomenon rather than an outdoor one. In the Altiplano, this shift was perhaps about to be introduced in places such as San Miguel de Uruquilla, but essentially, it was imposed upon the population by Catholic priests. They did not succeed in taking away the holiness from the mountains, nor stop the outdoor offerings, although today, the direction of the offer is no longer a matter of aligning oneself towards a distant regional holy mountain.

There is little doubt that the slope settlement and mountain-based landscape has come to be considered an Aymara landscape. The flatland settlement landscape, on the other hand, links in with what has come to stand for Uru qualities. Considering the fact that moving people and cultivation to the mountains tend to make the flatlands into a bofedal and pampa, there is of course a reason for economic conflicts to arise between the users of the two landscapes, since it deprives the flatland dwellers of their fields. Additionally, if the flatland is seen as common pasture by the inhabitants in the mountain settlement, it also deprives the flatland peasants of their estates. The flatland dwellers, moreover, will tend to be marginalised in small settlements instead of becoming part of the new and larger collectives. In the splitting of the landscape into two, there are, in other words, very good economic, demographic and social grounds for the development of two groups, so-called ethnic, out of one original population, by means of defining conflicting issues.

Today, when extensive dry-field cultivation is moving down to the pampa from the mountains, their fields neither productive nor economically competitive and the landscape depopulated, a new cognitive landscape is on the brink of being created. This is based on machines, exploitation and fertilisation of a sparsely populated landscape where the social conflicts are not felt by the central government. Today, there are very few people left who believe that they thrive or survive because they are specifically Aymara or Uru.
CHAPTER VII

A WORLD WITH A SCIENCE MADE OF DISCIPLINES

“… what Science… needs… is lots of controversies, puzzles, risk-taking, imagination, and a “vascularization” with the rest of the collective as rich and as complex as possible.” (Latour 1999, p. 259)

Overview

This has been quite an experience. It has been an attempt to pull out the strings that became apparent in the interweaving of what can be called the textile of social fabric in Bolivia. I started with the apparent myth of the Urus, the legendary people who inhabited the primordial Andes. Now, from those Andes and the perspective they offer at c. 4000 m of altitude, an overview is in order.

To begin with, the anthropological discipline helped in organising my ideas about the concepts derived from the different sources consulted on the subject of the Urus. History and Sociology were sources of information and of inspiration. The archaeological experience with its method and techniques was there to make its point. And what was the point after all? Wachtel told us that it was a problem, that the Urus were problematic because they were, more or less, a living myth (1978, p. 1130, 1144). Hence, he advocated the use of various disciplines for tackling this problem, this puzzling group of people or, in his words again, this enigma (ibid. p. 1127). Inspired by this, I followed up the historical and anthropological connections on the Urus that he initiated.

More than one surprise occurred on the journey and, most welcome from my perspective, they are part of this overview. I will therefore start with the disciplines; I will call them standpoints for, while making their contribution to science, they have a position in this life and in this world. By this, I mean that they come from a specific moment in the scientific world of research and, once there, they take part of life in this world as concepts that transcend the specific moment that gave them a chance to exist.

The standpoints on their own

Having been trained mainly in the discipline of Anthropology was no doubt my bias in this thesis and I do not wish to deny it. I went back and forth to Anthropology in my analysis of the information as a perspective that, while aiming at covering every aspect of human behaviour, it involves the rest of the disciplines. I wanted to make the best of this understanding of Anthropology by taking this postulate not at face value, but by going one step further, i.e. dealing directly with other disciplines. Given the topic, it appeared to open more possibilities to understand a situation presented as problematic. In other words, to do anthropological history or anthropological archaeology for example, was not my intention, although, in a way, it may be argued that the result of this research does and should qualify for this. However, what I specifically wanted was to see what happened when the disciplines were asked to contribute of their own and on their own terms.

Here are the standpoints that the disciplines helped me to develop in analysing the topic of the Urus:
Anthropology

Analysing the anthropological understanding of the Urus, a thread called ethnic has proved persistent in connection to this group of people. The chapter dedicated to describing the Urus exposed the way in which the term “ethnic” has become a concept today. Clearly, the construction of the ethnic conceptualisation of such people is based not only on the historical grounds already described in this thesis – i.e. those representing the otherness (Tonkin et al. 1989) – but also on the obvious situation of people such as the ones called Urus, who were left to strive almost on their own, with few opportunities in a Bolivian society that I characterised in the initial chapters. In this way, the Urus more or less recur to the romantic (Cf. Lovejoy 1941, Mitchell 2001, Simpson 1993, Trigger 1995, Wellek 1949) understanding of their condition, i.e. as “the defeated of the defeated” as Wachtel has claimed – and still does (1997, 1992), and they keenly take for themselves the claim of a water essence for their being what they have been told they are, that is, an ethnic group.

The specific experience of the fieldwork in Pampa Aullagas and, particularly, in Suxtita, proved how the Urus were seen as alojados – i.e. guests of the ayllu, together with other inhabitants of the community. Because they married local people and eventually, upon the death of their spouses, had no other place to go, they stayed as “foreigners” or “guests”. Importantly, they were not seen as Urus but they were excluded from consultation in ayllu matters, tribute and fiesta-cargo obligations. A closer look at the cases of families asserting their belonging to the ayllu by means of a tribute that enabled them to access communal lands, hints that, before migration was possible on a large scale, the conditions by which some people could not afford to pay the tribute would have represented some of the Uru-construction mechanisms. These examples prove the neglect of the historical and social grounding of the so-called ethnicities, together with primordialist approaches that also fail to consider the historically situated and culturally constructed nature of the concepts that are central to the argument, that is, “ethnic group” and “nation” (Jones, 1997, pp. 70–1).

However, to understand where the concept comes from and how it becomes appropriated by people is one thing. The question of defining, identifying and classifying ethnic groups is also part of the topic and, among these questions, the most provocative is perhaps the one that mentions the existence of “ethnic markers”. This is provocative, because it begs the question of where do they come from at the basic level but also, at a more fundamental level, why is that they should be given credit. However, what do anthropologists mean by these ethnic markers? A variety of research literature deals with such ethnic markers, ranging from disciplines such as Biology and Genetics (Cf. Boyd & Richerson 1987, Ehrlich & Levin 2005, Hey 2005, McElreth et al. 2003, Razran 1950) to Cultural Anthropology (Abercrombie 1991, Banks 1996, Firth 1989, Roosens 1989) and History (Ardener 1989, Chapman et al. 1989, Jones 1997, Just 1989, Terrel 2001, Tonkin et al. 1989, Veit 1989). However, all of them often rely on the anthropological concepts for theoretical purposes. I will focus on the latter and particularly on the application of the concept – ethnic marker – to a specific situation, as this is the sensible way to use it for understanding its meaning in the Uru context.

Many anthropologists call the ethnic markers a “set of culturally transmitted characters” such as language, dress style, ritual and cuisine, but also basic moral values and standards of excellence, in line with Barth’s seminal introductory words to his study in 1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. In this vein, a PhD dissertation from the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago on Aymaras asserts that among the ethnic markers are language, clothing and diet. “Indian” characteristics such as speaking Aymara, wearing ponchos and sandals, eating foods such as raw broad beans and ground toasted barley, signalize poverty and inferior social standing; thus, we are led to understand, the chance of having met an ethnic group, i.e. the Aymaras. Moreover, it is said in the dissertation that there is an association between “Indian” backwardness, dress and diet and that peasants who adopt vecino, i.e. “urban-like” dress and lifestyles will never be “equal” (Barstow 1979, p. 135). This example provides a partial answer to the where question posited above. Not where the ethnic markers come from, but where are they applied for marking differences: in this case, an Aymara speaking population in the Carabuco area of Bolivia.
In the case of the *why* question I suggest that, together with the *where* question, we refer both to the origin of the word *ethnos* and the why and how it became to mean a group of people with shared characteristics, but also a term related to the idea of race (Tonkin *et al.* 1989, p. 14) that I have presented above. However, for now, I move to where our investigation was carried out and I analyse which ethnic markers were used to portray the Uru population.

**Dress style:** The apparently notable clothing or dress worn by the Chipayas, one of the most famed Uru groups, was described by Wachtel (1990, 1989), Posnansky (1938, 1957), as well as by others (Métraux 1935; la Barre 1946; Ruiz & Roca 1955; Gisbert & Mesa 1989 *i.a.*). A selection of photographs and pictures presented in Appendix 5 (Figs. A5.1–A5.9) portrays this ethnographic perspective of the dress style, the most relevant being Melchor Maria Mercado’s drawings of the 19th century (1991) where we can appreciate how Urus were perceived by the artist at that time.

We found no idiosyncratic way of dressing among the inhabitants of Lake Poopó. Whether described as Aymaras or as Quechuas or as Urus, they usually dress according to the changing times, that is, according to the fashion expressed in local traditions as well as by what the local clothing market has to offer. As the rest of the people – including those not labelled with any “ethnic” adjective – they would buy their clothes accordingly and would only rarely preserve the practice of actually weaving their own cloth to produce dresses. As this has become not only increasingly expensive but also dependent on the ability to obtain the necessary implements – such as wool or cotton – it only seems reasonable to sell the wool from their animals and then buy the cheaper clothes available at popular markets, such as the weekly Challapata fair. Moreover, the market system seems to show enough appreciation for locally woven cloth from the Andes to allow for the creation of a rather attractive source of income. This explains in part the recent development of a “native” woven-cloth industry.

Furthermore, the episode I will narrate below illustrates how this ethnic marker is used in the local milieu. It is the consequence of an event where perhaps the only famous Chipaya woman in Bolivia made a come-back to the stage. One of the local cinema directors, Jorge Ruiz, produced a film called *Vuelve Sebastiana* (Come back Sebastiana) in 1955, where he tried to portray the so-called Chipaya culture, by showing how a 12 year old girl (Sebastiana Kespi) is taught how to value her “culture”, presented as her people, family and friends in the film. Ruiz did this by means of contrasting Sebastiana’s culture with the so-called Aymara culture from the surroundings of Santa Ana de Chipaya, as it is also called the main community at Chipaya. Fifty years later, thanks to modern technology together with the interest that “ethnic differences” currently call forth in countries like Bolivia, a revival of the same film in November 2005 provided some people (Ruiz’s son among them), the chance to present a gala night for this re-editing together with Sebastiana Kespi herself, who is now in her sixties. It was said that, because of the extremely difficult living conditions for people living in Chipaya, Sebastiana had moved in the meantime to a place in neighbouring Chile. Nevertheless, she came to La Paz together with some members of her family, and was presented to the general public together with the new copy of the film. She was dressed in what was seen as a typical Chipaya outfit. People paid much attention to her hairdo that consisted of several plaits – “sixty” as specified by the press articles – and headdress together with the typical *poncho* worn “in the way Chipayas do”... After being presented as the movie star who was chosen back in the 1950s in spite of her being “the most stupid of the class” – as reproduced by the media, few realised the importance, because of its transcendence, of the interview she offered (in Spanish), when she was asked the following:

Q. Were you pleased with this reception? Did you expect something like that?
A. After so many years, I am thrilled. Lots of people have showed up. The authorities, they all have given a speech, but... I am not pleased.
Q. Why?
A. I did not receive a salary and now I want them to help me, at least with my younger daughter who is attending secondary school, I have three daughters... I am very sad, my husband passed
away on the 30th of April, I am alone now… I am very sad. My daughter wants to continue her studies, my grandson has finished his military service and he also wants to be helped.

Q. What do you do nowadays?
A. I still keep on tending sheep. Until when will I be forced to do so? I do not want to be in the countryside anymore, I want to come to the city. I do not want to suffer in the countryside anymore. There is not even firewood there, only the pampa…

Q. What is lacking in your village?
A. I want them to help my community. We have electricity in Chipaya, but nothing in my ayllu: there is no electricity or water. Everything is lacking, even food. Children are always hungry.

Q. Is it true that there are problems with the neighbouring Aymaras from Corque, Province of Carangas in Oruro?
A. That was long ago, in the times of my grandfather, of my father. Not anymore, but they do not like us, neither do we.

Q. (General elections were programmed for December 2005) How are you going to vote doña Sebastiana?
A. I do not know, for nobody. Is it going to make any difference in my life?

(Revista ¡Oh!, edited by Los Tiempos, Cochabamba, November 13, 2005, mt)

Sebastiana was perceived as both a “movie star” and a “Chipaya Indian”, in everyday language (see Figs. VII.1 & VII.2). Little would people care about the reasons she had for being dressed the way she was – it was a taken for granted. Little would they know about the ways of dressing in the countryside as, for many, the common reference is the beggars that “migrate” with their “peculiar” clothes to the cities seasonally and then return to their places of origin together with the cash they were able to collect. Sebastiana must have reminded them of these beggars if they had the chance to see her, without being able to tell whether her dress was Chipaya or nortepotosino, i.e. from northern Potosí. At any rate, women become conspicuous in this respect as men accommodate quickly to more urban-like outfits, specially when they do not want to be called “Indians”.

However, it is precisely this peculiar dress attributed to women from the rural areas – also called peasants, or “cholitas” or, most of the time, Indians, by some – which I find interestingly relevant. The so-called traditional dress that some women wear in Bolivia, particularly the ones called “cholas” or, commonly, “cholitas” (see photographs in Appendix 5) might be seen as the conspicuous “ethnic marker” for an anthropologist or an ethnologist in this case. Even then, it is common knowledge by now that such “traditional dress” (wide skirt, blouse, shawl, bowler hat and flat heel shoes) is the result of the old Spanish dress that women wore in the late 17th and early 18th century. It has been mostly attributed to Aymara women, and the reason why this dress is still popular among women called “cholitas” is the subject of debates connected to ethnicity (Cf. Rivera 1996a, 1996b, 1993; Spedding 1996) and the influence of the Spanish colony in Bolivia (see photographs depicting Indios and Mestisos in Appendix 5). In Lake Poopó, one can easily find women with this kind of dress, or a version with local variants. However, being a trait of colonial times, it is expected that anthropologists will argue, as they indeed do, in terms of a process of ethno-genesis connected to this “ethnic marker”, articulating explanations on the way a colonial feature becomes “native” in the process of “creating identity” (Cf. J. D. Hill 1989; Hill 1996; Roosens 1989; Anderson 1991, 1994; Hobsbawn & Ranger 1983; Appadurai 1997; Handler & Limekin 1984). Furthermore, it is common knowledge that eventually, many cholitas will opt for a more western-like dress, which might be translated into common skirts that vary according to the fashion trends that the so-called western society seems to promote, as well as trousers, jackets and other common trendy clothes, arguing that it is costly to dress as a cholita.

We also found such women in Lake Poopó and, in this respect, the same is easily observed in places other than Lake Poopó. Wachtel also described how the changes he perceived in Chipaya have affected the way of dressing (1990, 1994), and the drawings (Appendix 5) show the way in which women looked in the 19th century, when Melchor Maria Mercado captured the difference in dress for the local population.

The last picture in Appendix 5 shows how an Uru girl of Lake Titikaka on the Peruvian side looks like today: a mixture of cholita with the two plaits, not “sixty” as Sebastiana, and an
attractive red textile, not black, that she seems to be folding while a modern motor boat lies close to a totora house over a floating island.

**Language:**

*shibboleth*: (2) a custom, word, etc. that distinguishes one group of people from another. Origin: from a Hebrew word meaning “ear of corn”. In the Bible story, Jephthah, the leader of the Gileadites, was able to use it as a test to tell which were his own men, because foreigners found the “sh” sound difficult to pronounce. (Oxford Advanced Genie)

Another aspect that seems of importance from the perspective of the ethnic markers postulate is language (see below contribution of the discipline of Linguistics to this topic in the thesis). We already had the opportunity to understand that both Aymaras and Quechuas were classified as groups based on the language they were speaking in colonial times. What about the Urus? In the chapter dedicated to a description on and of Urus, we learnt that they were known both by this name and also as Uruquillas.

A discussion on whether the term Uruquilla belongs either to a language or to an ethnic group is still ongoing and, in this respect, the linguist Alfredo Torero (1992) contributed with a meticulous argument, postulating that the name Uruquilla was related to a linguistic family. This family of languages was spoken by the Iruitu or Ancoaqui people (see Posnansky, 1938), living close to the region of Desaguadero and in the southern area of Lake Titicaca – and also by Chipaya people, although Wachtel claims that they “speak” Puquina (Cf. Wachtel, 1989).

Torero argues that Puquina and Aymara were two different linguistic families (1992, p. 172), and that Iruitu-Ancoaquis currently speak Aymara, or Aymara and Castellano, i.e. Spanish, whereas Chipayas, in addition to their own language, Uruquilla, also speak Aymara and Castellano (1992, p. 174).

Torero also mentions the attempt of Nathan Wachtel to create contacts between Chipaya and Iru-Itu people in the 1980s, as seen above. For this, Wachtel induced a conversation in their allegedly Puquina language that, according to Torero, ended up in both groups resorting to a different language as a means of communication, that is, *Aymara* and not Puquina or Uruquilla (1992, p. 181).

Thus, if the two groups of Urus that Wachtel tried to connect through “their” Puquina language, as he insisted that the Uru language was called (1990), were actually speaking Aymara, we certainly have no way of ascribing Uruquilla language to them as an ethnic marker, particularly if this is a family of languages that extended in the areas of River Desaguadero. Neither can this be done with Puquina. Language is a tricky thing, but it helps in advocating ethnic belonging. It is just that anyone is more or less able to learn and speak a language that is not her first language, or mother tongue as it is usually called.

**Houses:** What are the local traditions regarding houses? How do houses qualify for the ethnic markers? We have seen that for Urus, references to the round, straw-covered huts grouped in moiety in seemingly chaotic clusters, were made by Nathan Wachtel when describing the Uru-Chipaya (1994, p. 2). Although he saw this as “distinctively Chipaya” and these, in turn, as “the only Uru subsisting today as an autonomous group” (1989, p. 53), he provided nothing apart from these words as a description accompanied by a photograph with the following statement: “A Chipaya rural house. It is different from the urban house in the plan, the roof and the material utilised for the construction” (ibid.). Four other photographs (see Figs. VII.3 a–c) where the “round, straw-covered huts” are conspicuous, have been used to show a “view of Chipaya”, a “view of ayllu Aran-Saya”, then a “sacrifice of llamas”, and a “Chipaya sunset” (Wachtel 1989, pp. 52–5).

In a complementary article issued in the same magazine (*Encuentro*, Nr. 5), we find a proper description made by architects Teresa Gisbert and José de Mesa (1989), stating that the Chipaya have two types of houses: one urban and the other rural (see Fig. VII.5). The urban house has a circular plan with a diameter of 4 m. The walls are not vertical but rather slightly sloping toward the interior and they use the system of false vaults. These walls are not made from adobe but from sod blocks cut directly from the ground and placed on top of one another
without any kind of mortar. The roof is formed with bundles of straw, tied together by means of a net made with cords to prevent the wind from dragging it away. The stove stands barely a span above the floor inside the house. Chipayas sleep on the floor. The rural house is similar to the urban but lacks the thatched roof as the walls slope in a vault that form a cone. They are also made from sod blocks cut directly from the ground. As trees do not grow in the Chipaya area, they utilise large cacti cut longitudinally instead of wood. With these cacti, they make doors by tying the pieces together with the help of hide cords. They also use this material for the construction of the thatched roofs (1989, p. 55).

Arthur Posnansky, after claiming that he carried out “personal observations from 1903 to 1932” among Uru people, described both Uru and Chipaya houses in 1938. He wrote that in remote times they lived in circular sunken huts that they excavated in the soil and covered with a thatched roof. Stones from the surroundings were used to shield these “dwellings-graves” as he called them. These underground dwellings were apparently common in the Andean region in ancient times and minuscule dwellings were found in Tiwanaku by Posnansky, who also mentions references from Spanish chroniclers about Urus living in basements (1938, p. 69). Then he claimed that “now as in the past”, they lived in round shacks of cactus wood that were locked by means of “an ingenious device made of a quite strong wood”. The reason for constructing their houses in a circular shape lied in the facility with which they could build a roof over the primitive rooms that they still kept in the countryside, i.e. the estancias. To build this type of house they marked a circle on the ground, some two arms long, and three rows of stone were piled up afterwards to build a round wall, utilising “a sort of natural adobe that they cut from the very surface of the clayey soil”. This material preserved a compact weft of roots, as part of the vegetation that grows on the surface. As the walls rose c. 2 m, they sloped towards the interior of the room and the diameter decreased in such a way that it closed the roof, scarcely leaving a hole the size of a fist on the upper part. The smoke was released through this opening in the dry season and it was covered with one adobe in the rainy season, the smoke then releasing through lateral holes left open near the stove. Posnansky mentions that Uru houses “were round and elliptical in old times, but now Urus build rectangular houses” (1938, p. 69, my emphasis, mt)

The round and elliptical houses were called Chujllas or Khuya by the Urus, says Posnansky (1938, p. 69), with walls slightly sloping towards the interior, built with adobes and one door opening towards the sunrise. On top of the door and at the opposite part of the wall they placed a stone slab, on which a thick round stick was laid supporting the sloping roof. In this way, the Urus obtained a firm structure for positioning the elements that were fastened with strong wild straw (estipa hichu or paja brava) cords to the walls so that the roofs, called montscha, could resist the strong winds frequent in the area. This thatch of wild straw cords, called khesana, was made of totora reeds as wide as ten centimetres to cover the structure (1938, pp. 48, 69). When it became old, it was not removed but covered with a new one. Totora thatches are waterproof and preserve the temperature in the interior. The walls had small niches indoors, used to place common objects and wooden pegs where they could hang clothes, fishing nets etc. Water pitchers and a two-pot stove were placed along the walls and were built with adobe. A sort of cupboard made with mud sheltered manure, food supplies and others things (1938, pp. 69–70, mt).

Posnansky describes how Chipayas, and “all those who still sleep on skins on the floor in round houses”, lay with the head towards the wall and the legs towards the centre of the room and all family members lay in a circle, “together with young people, guests and servants” (1938, p. 48, mt). They all covered themselves with a single blanket, under which additional blankets for sleeping were used and in this way they “share the heat that the many bodies irradiate”. Modern houses of Chipayas in their town were also circular when Posnansky visited them (1938, pp. 48–50, mt).

---

1 Wild shrub that grows all over the Altiplano, better known as jicchu (A.) or wicchu (Q.). The particular type used for thatching roofs is called sikuya, and the wild straw with strong needles is named iru. Paja brava is the general Spanish name for this plant.
The name putuku that we have heard from Uru Muratos, such as Julián Choque from Calzar Vintu, meaning the “rural” houses, is mentioned as “round shacks” by Posnansky. He only uses the name putukus to designate the houses of Urus living on a small island called Simillake, in the lagoon Hakonta Palayani, close to River Desaguadero in Peru (1938, p. 108 and Fig. 104). Posnansky calls these putukus “beaver caves” and he mentions that only “two of these shacks” are still standing, surrounded by the ruins of “many others” that are proof of a “more active” population in the past. He describes Simillake not only as an island located amid the totora reeds – some eight kilometres from the mouth of lake Titicaca and measuring “some three hundred and sixty metres long and sixty six on the wider part” – but claims that that is where Urus from the community of Sojopaca, in Simillake, were builders of totora rafts. A “pre-glacial megalithic building in Kalasasaya style” (1938, pp. 108–10, mt), i.e. from Tiwanaku, lies in ruins before the eyes of Posnansky but he cannot tell more about it and speculates that, being this a “proto-Arawak” building, it would prove the descent of Urus from this “race” (ibid.).

An even more detailed description is found in Alfred Métraux, a French ethnologist concerned with the “imminent loss” of Uru people who, as many in his time, believed that they were about to disappear. In an article called Los indios Uru-Chipayas de Carangas (1954 [1935]), he dwells on the “material civilisation” of these people and in addition to what I have previously presented, we learn about names for:

- the “cylindrical” (sic) shape of the houses, i.e. Kxoya;
- the soil from where the sod blocks were extracted for the buildings described, i.e. phaya;
- the wooden plates used for the doors, i.e. cereus;
- the “false vault” of the typical roof of circular houses, i.e. phurna;
- the weft for the roof formed with tola, i.e. coksa or coxa;
- the straw cords, i.e. kxara;
- the plaster used to cover the weft, i.e. pirina;
- the wooden needle used to sew the straw on the external part of the roof, i.e. capa;
- the mud stove described in the indoors of the house, i.e. wit;
- the large woollen blankets used for covering the whole group of people at night, i.e. cusí or chusi;
- plus the sizes of the sod blocks, i.e. “70 centimetres long, 30–35 width and 15 thick”.

As an interesting detail, he mentions that “the roof is crowned with a cross made of straw which, according to local beliefs, will protect the hut from the effects of the lightning” (1954, p. 25, mt). We have seen crosses on the houses of both Quillacas and Pampa Aullagas that were described in the previous chapters.

As the round houses or, for what matters, circular plans are so insistently associated with Urus, the particular disciplinary contribution dealing with archaeological architecture is presented below. Should we think of Urus as inventors of the “circular plan”? It would be tenuous. Should we rather think of Urus as attributed such invention because they were, as the myths claim, the “remains of chullpa people”, that is, ancient inhabitants of the Andes? More so, but accepting that they are the descent of ancient inhabitants of the Andes called Urus, implies that we must have had the possibility to prove such extreme and this is not the case. Indeed, we will never be able to prove this assertion. Recent technology can help in trying to prove that humans were in the Andes “before the solar age” or, for what matters, before the last glaciation but, this is not how we are going to prove that they were Uru.

What other ethnic markers do we have for Uru people? Apart from the descriptions above, we may add the so-called myths (see Appendices 3 and 4). A revision of them proves a repetition of the same old version: the chullpa people who survived the cataclysm of a coming sun because, alas, they happened to be there before the rest of the inhabitants of the Andes. Interestingly, the myths selected in the appendices also refer to the Christian religion in the way that they are told to the ethnographer. Regarding ritual, Wachtel describes the different Chipaya
cults (1990) connected to fertility but here, again, it is possible to see how Christianity has made its imprint and merged with local beliefs in supernatural powers.

History

Moving to the written sources that qualify for historical accounts on the Urus, it was interesting to trace the thread that made Indians part of the history of the Bolivians. Moreover, as Indians are still seen as real in places such as Bolivia, people called Indians are therefore, with the help of anthropologists, classified into “different” ethnic groups. Some of these are the Urus, but also the Aymaras and the Quechus in the territory of the Andes, as well as in places such as Santa Cruz in the lowlands. How do they tell Indian from non-Indian? If we read the historical sources we realise that the caciques and jilaqatas mentioned above, allies of the Spaniards in the early colonial years and who managed to situate themselves as part of the elite, soon came in the way of other “Indians” in search of rapid advancement within the colonial society. They were thus, as we have seen, eliminated from the panorama but, by then, they were no longer seen as “Indians”; at least not as equals of those who took the lives of these elitist Indians, as described above.

A revival of these leaders in present Bolivia, as is the case, is easier to understand from a perspective that, while taking into account the changes that have been ongoing, in addition to the written historical events, helps to uncover their colonial role together with the transformed contents of their titles that symbolise at least two changes. The so-called caciques, a Taino word imported by the Spaniards from their first contacts in the new continent, had no actual connection with the local leaders who, according to the same sources (cf. Abercrombie 1998, 1991; Albo 1989 i.a.), were actually called kuraqkas, or curacas in the Hispanic version. They disappeared with the Spanish colonial regime. The jilaqatas (or hilacatas), on the other hand, were seen as the equivalent substitute of such leaders, but had already been deprived of their original role from the early colonial times and as such, distorted, have more or less been preserved up till today. Accordingly, the romantic view, having idealised an “Andean” past as it were, often perceives the survival of titles as the ones mentioned as connected to some sort of essence that would explain the “persistence” of such hierarchy and organisation.

The above directs our attention to yet another, pervasive, thread. The power of this one extends to what is also called primordial and, as a consequence, to the notion of essence (Brodwin 2002, Cliff 1996, Colledge 2002, Feenberg 1996, Hawthorne & Szabó 2000, Stein 1999). Starting with the concept of primitive as a “category of thought and a figure of speech and writing” (Fabian 1991, p. 198), this perspective leads us to understand a difference or, more precisely, a dichotomy – primitive vs. civilised – in terms of what Fabian calls time and space. By placing people in a time which is not ours, we gain the two types of distance that involve both time and space. By doing so, we construct the anthropological understanding of a difference perceived in another context, but also coming from another moment in history which seems only one from this perspective – the history of the civilisation – and is therefore used in comparison with the other’s history, as it were. Thinking in terms of the primitive (Fabian 1991, p. 198) is what allows for the creation of the dichotomy primitive vs. modern, but also for an understanding of history in evolutionary terms, implying that the primitive, given such time and space, might “evolve” while some might even fall for the idealisation of his/her situation as it were.

Andeans have been idealised in this way, essentialising them through a reduction consisting of, as I have tried to expose above, a list of what may be seen as “attributes”, through which the complexities are reduced “to simplistic ethnic markers” where “the essentialist perspective emphasizes the content of culture, independent of the social setting that surrounds the locality” (Löfving 2002, pp. 4, 16). Pierre Bourdieu straightforwardly dismisses this standpoint referring to the “false analyses of essence” which, in his view, are “nothing but the generalisation of the singular experience” (1979, p. 18).

Bernabé Cobo also attempted an explanation in 1653, when he wrote on how the Andes originated in the word Antisuyu, translated into “Andesuyo” by the Spanish Chroniclers, which was part of the eastern region of the Tawantinsuyu or “four-quarters division” of the Inka.
territory. According to Cobo, these names were taken from “the most important provinces included in each one of them” (1983, p. 185); the Antí in this case. Although representing an elucidation on the subject – what is Andean? – the term carries many of the connotations that primordialism, akin to essentialism, has inherited from the primitive thread. When Cobo claimed in 1653 that “the Indians of different provinces were so mixed and thrown together that there is hardly a valley or town throughout Peru where some ayllo and tribal group of mitimaes would not be found” (1983, p. 192, my emphasis), we were already warned of a situation, where the Inka, in this case, took part in the changes that took place before the arrival of the Spaniards. What Cobo mentioned in his descriptions one century after the Spanish invasion proves at least that, by then, the so-called Indians were, to the eyes of the Spaniards, a homogeneous group. Therefore, he wrote that there were three names that the Spaniards had given to all the natives of the New World, and these were “Indians, Natives, and Americos” but, he warned, they were all “modern and artificial, invented since this land was discovered… The word Indians is used when we Spaniards speak to each other, but since its meaning is now derogatory we do not use it when we speak with Indians…” (Cobo [1653] 1983, pp. 8–9). The Indians Cobo spoke about must have also had their views on these Spaniards, but with a very interesting nuance, that had to do with the priests (see below). However, owing to the historical sources, it is also possible to understand that today, the Indians themselves promote this image as a revival, knowing that even though they could not jump in time for the train of changes that the colonial system imposed, they surely have something left to stick to. And this is (unwittingly?) called “ethnicity” by people such as anthropologists, a term that involves both exclusion and inclusion and helps promoting difference as a plus, in a Bolivia where the possibilities for being part of the old elite have paradoxically been narrowed to the extreme.

How do we tell “Indian” from “non-Indian”? Cobo gives yet another hint: colour. This seems to be the feature that made an impression, as he writes that one of “the most surprising things” that the Spaniards found

in the Indies is that although it is such a big land with such a wide variety of climes and weather, inhabited by an infinite number of people of different languages, customs and rites, nevertheless, with regard to their appearance, physical make-up, and natural properties, especially with regard to their colour, the inhabitants of the Indies look as similar to each other as Europeans born in the same province and within the same European clime. The Indians are rather dark in colour; this is commonly described by our writers with words such as the following: dark brown, olive, tawny, yellowish-brown, the colour of cooked quince, light chestnut-colored, and, the one that describes it best of all, mulatto-colored. (Cobo, [1653] 1983, p. 9).

Again, this seems to be another feature of the apparent homogeneity of the natives but, when taken together with what is used to create the differences, it appears as one of those aspects that experimented little change through time and space and are therefore handy for the “Indian” discourse of difference – from more than one perspective. I had the chance to recently hear an archaeologist, who, half-serious half-joking, was claiming that a DNA analysis should be in order if a blue-eyed blonde pretended to be a Bolivian! (see e.g. Jablonski 2004, on the subject of colour).

The “Indian movements” of the eighteenth century (1780 to 1783) were not, as people such as Conde (1992) would like us to believe, “a millenarian effort to displace all things Spanish and return to pre-Columbian forms” (mt). This was no longer possible, because by the 1780s, Hispanic and Catholic institutions and practices, and some Spaniards such as the priests, had become “necessary for ‘indigenous’ societies” (Abercrombie 1991, p. 107). This is evidenced by both the nature of rebel fighting strategies and the importance for rebels of colonial religion and administrative forms. In 1780, in the mining centre of Aullagas, for example, local officials learned that town moieties from adjacent groups Macha and Pocoata were preparing to descend on the town for their traditional (post conquest) ritual battle (tinku) in order “to jointly murder all the town’s Hispanic residents”. However, they were going to do this during the September feast of “the powerful, devil-slaying Saint Michael [San Miguel], which now provided the ritual matrix within which such battles were fought…” (Abercrombie 1991, p. 107). The merging of
both religious and administrative matters into the \textit{fiesta-cargo} system was no doubt already ongoing.

The ideological construction becomes thus unambiguously clear, a construction of identity that, as in the case of \textit{nationalism}, is based on the belief that a people with common characteristics such as language, religion or ethnicity constitutes a separate and distinctive political community (Anderson 1991, Abercrombie 1991, Asher 1995, Boyer & Lomnitz 2005, Diaz Polanco 1985, Hayes 1927, Kohl & Fawcett 1995, Llobera 1989, Meskell 2002, Simpson 1993, Trigger 1995, Urban & Sherzer 1991, Wailes & Zoll 1995). Nationalists, after all, attempt to “preserve this social distinctiveness to protect the social benefits which follow from national identity and membership” (Abercrombie \textit{et al.} 1988, p. 162). The “Indians” who seem to exist within those terms in Bolivia are today portrayed as pursuing a “state”, a “nation” of their own, and according to what they call their traditions. What one suspects, however, is that they are trying to replace those abhorred \textit{q’aras} as they call the “non-Indians” – the \textit{other’s other} – with their allegedly \textit{non q’aras} – the \textit{other’s us}. Their movements and combats for changing the \textit{status quo} hint at, as in the 18th century, that they keep on trying to take on the social organisation and system established by their so-called oppressors, while at the same time, and with the help of some anthropologists, claiming that theirs is a claim based on a better \textit{and} different society. In short, we have come full circle from Indian to “criollo-cholo-mestizo” to Indian again, in its reified version of “ethnic”.

\textit{Archaeology}

Understanding Uru contexts from an archaeological perspective implied surveying the areas surrounding Lake Poopó. This was one of the tasks that I undertook already in 2000. After an initial understanding of the landscape in the Poopó area, early archaeological surveys were carried out in Quillacas as described in the chapter dedicated to the fieldwork experience.

An occupation pattern approach was what the discipline of archaeology offered to my research instead of the more or less traditional material culture, defined as physical traces from human groups of the past and consisting mainly of potsherds (cf. Renfrew & Bahn 2005, 1993). The Uru, described unanimously as people of the water, are seen as people who do not produce their own ceramic. Instead, and as the fieldwork carried out between 2000 and 2003 suggested, they prefer to buy the pottery they need and not to make it themselves. The surveys carried out allowed for collecting some sherds, as described in the chapter on ethno-archaeology (Chapter VI), and the task of classifying them in a sensible way is still in the hands of our Bolivian archaeologists. They have been investigating the area only in the recent years. There is much to learn from this ongoing research, in spite of the many difficulties a country such as Bolivia has to face, not least, funding research programmes.

Occupation patterns, understood as the way humans occupy the landscape in which they live, their dwellings, their arrangement, the nature and disposition of the buildings pertaining to community life (Willey 1953, 1956; Clark 1952; Trigger 1967), was therefore what I had at hand to understand what was connected to Uru and what was not. After I was told that Quillacas was not an Uru settlement, but Aymara, I followed the suggestion to move to Pampa Aullagas where, nonetheless, the same round structures were found, some of them being used as corrals. Two aspects are relevant here: with the help of archaeology, I could realise that, on the one hand, the settlement pattern did not say very much about Uru identity. The population in aylus Choro and Suxtita who, as we have seen, are “too few” to be allowed the annual leadership of the Corregimiento, where the jilaqatas meet to discuss ayllu concerns, claimed that they used putukus as jant’as, i.e. as shelters. The putukus, however, were used as jant’as by both Aymara speakers claiming an Aymara identity and Uru people. Moreover, we could hear how people argued about who was best at building putukus: sometimes it was an Uru, sometimes one of the Aymaras.

On the other hand, Uru houses were not round at all, not even in Calzar Vintu, the Uru-Murato settlement depicted in the maps published by Wachtel (1990) and Molina (1993; 1991). In Calzar Vintu we met Julián Choque, who was the only inhabitant who openly claimed his Uru identity. As described above, his settlement consisted of two rectangular single
room houses with, and this is relevant, the entrance door oriented not only to the east but also to the north. He had built his own putuku close to Lake Poopó and River Laqajawira and had plans to build another behind his houses, i.e. close to the dunes. The large circular structure that we found in front of his settlement was not an Uru house. This was a large corral for llamas built approximately in the 1940s that was used by one of the Aymaras living in Sato, but who had lands in Sakatiri. As an Uru-Murato, he was now settled in Aymara territory, i.e. in Sakatiri, an ayllu where people identify themselves as Aymaras. One would expect that Choro and Suxtita were no longer going to be suspected of Uru descent. Will their jilaqatas now be part of the leadership of the Corregimiento in Pampa Aullagas?

The ayllu of Suxtita contained many circular structures that were identified as both corrals and putukus (see Fig. VII.4), and in Asurcollu, one of its communities, we excavated the remains of what appeared to be an interesting round structure. After the excavation, it was clear that the archaeological contribution combined with anthropology explained the peculiar trace in front of the chapel of the settlement. Until recently, the round structure had been more of a meeting place, where one of the local traditions (Alasita) had been celebrated. The celebration had subsequently moved elsewhere in the ayllu, but the structure excavated revealed not only how it was used before its abandonment, but also the way in which it had previously formed part of the landscape. Finding this round structure in a place and at an altitude that faced the town of Pampa Aullagas, Mount Pedro Santos Willka as well as the two mountains in Quillacas (San Julian Mallku and Santa Barbara), was certainly not what one could expect to be part of an Uru settlement.

Why were the round houses, or for that matter, circular plans so insistently associated with Urus? Dealing with domestic architecture, Gasparini & Margolies (1980) published one of the most complete studies on the subject in the Andes. They mention that although in many areas, the rectangular plan has replaced the circular one, which they claim was used by many ethnic groups before they were conquered by the Incas, it should be noted that the present spread of the rectangular form is due more to the building systems introduced by the Europeans than to Inca influence. The circular plan continues in use among various Aymara-speaking groups and, to a lesser extent, in other regions of the central and north-eastern Peruvian Andes. Similar to in Inca times, the rectangular peasant house of today has a single room with quite limited interior space. When a family has other rooms for additional sleeping quarters, storage, or kitchen use, these are usually separate buildings without internal communication between the rooms. To go from one to the other one must go outside into the open. Even in two-storey houses, the stairway leading to the upper level is always outside (1980, p. 129). This should remind us of what has just been described regarding the fieldwork experience in Pampa Aullagas, particularly the houses described in ayllu Suxtita, but also the ones where Julián Choque has his settlement in Calzar Vintu.

What are these circular plans from the point of view of the architects? To begin with, Gasparini & Margolies mention that it is accepted that the rectangular plan is typical of Inca construction (1980, p. 138) but, most importantly, they claim that this does not mean that the rectangular plan was restricted to the Incas or that they did not use other forms, such as the circle. The circular plan was widespread in the Andes and is still used in several regions, mainly in Bolivian territory (1980, p. 138). They also mention that in various sites in the central and northeastern highlands, and even in Quechua territory such as in the department of Apurímac (Peru), archaeological remains are found with circular house plans, and that such structures probably existed in the Cusco area before the introduction of the Inca architecture. The Incas made use of the circular plan in buildings that were not to be used as dwellings and many storehouses were circular, as were a number of funerary structures or chullpa. The tower called Muyucmarka in the fortress of Saqsaywaman and a building at Runku Raqay on the road to Machu Picchu also have circular plans. Still more numerous are structures with curved walls that do not form a circle, of which there are well-known examples at Písac, Machu Picchu, Cusco, and Cusichaca. There are pre-Inca fortifications, such as Chankillo in the Casma Valley, comprising several concentric circular or oval enclosures. Gasparini & Margolies quote the chronicler García de la Vega recalling a round tower in the plaza of Cuzco opposite Amarukancha known as the sunturwasi, “a most beautiful circular tower” in the words of
Garcilaso (1980, p. 138). Another sunturwasi was noted by Squier in Azángaro and another circular building in Urco near Calca. It was, however, in pre-Inca dwellings that the circular form was most often applied and it was frequently and widely used during the Late Intermediate Period, dated c. 1100–1450 AD by these authors (see Table VI.1) In the course of the Inca territorial expansion, the subjugated ethnic groups who lived in circular houses did not abandon their customs, Gasparini & Margolies state (1980, pp. 138–9).

Examples follow from the central Andes or highlands, but the important thing to do is to emphasise that in the highlands, circular houses were more numerous than rectangular ones in the regions incorporated into the Inca system (1980, p. 139). The circular houses that are still being built in Aymara territory directly relate to traditions established before Inca domination. The fact that there have been no substantial change-producing factors in some isolated regions explains the persistence and continuity of some unaltered customs and, in this group, fall the houses of the Chipaya (see Fig. VII.5 a–c) in the province of Oruro, Bolivia (1980, pp. 139–41).

The corbelled vault of the Chipaya rural sod house (see Figs. 133, 134 in Fig. VII.6) uses a very ancient building system recorded from prehistoric European buildings on the islands of Cyprus and Sardinia. The south Italian peasant houses called trulli have the same type of corbelled vault, and even an important monument such as the Treasure of Atreus in Mycenae has its great interior vault of the corbelled type, that is, horizontal courses of stone, each protruding further than the previous one, that gradually reduce the diameter at the same time as they rise in height until they achieve total closure” (Gasparini & Margolies 1980, p. 147). In addition, all chullpa or funerary structures, whether stone or adobe, rustic or with perfectly finished masonry, have a corbelled vault in their interior (1980, p. 154). Although the chullpa with fine stone masonry are finished on the outside in the shape of a flattened hemisphere, this convex top is purely formal and not at all structural. The corbelled vault ends much lower down, as can be seen in the cross-sectional drawing (see Fig. 142 in Fig. VII.7). Chullpa of well-finished stone, whether rectangular or circular in plan, always have double walls: the outer composed of fine masonry and the inner of fieldstone, the latter being the one that closes to form the corbelled vault. However, it is important to note that in chullpa with a rectangular plan, the inner structure, that which closes the corbelled vault, maintains a circular plan (1980, p. 154).

After the assistance from these scholars (Gasparini & Margolies 1980), we reach the conclusion that circular plans directly relate to traditions established before Inca domination. We do not know whether there have been any substantial factors leading to changes in some isolated regions that would stand for an explanation of the persistence and or continuity of unaltered customs as the authors claim, but we can see that the houses of the Chipaya fall within this group. Moreover, archaeological evidence seems to be proving that the circular plan was widespread in the Andes and is still used in several regions, principally in Bolivian territory (1980, p. 138).

**Linguistics**

Analysing the linguistics contribution on the languages spoken in the Andes, particularly by people like the Urus, led me to scholars such as Vellard (1957, 1967), who claimed having established the difference between two languages spoken by the same group, i.e. Puquina and Uruquilla. Later, it was hypothesised that Urus had adopted Puquina as a general language during the Tiwanaku period. Bouyssse-Cassagne came across a document from 1580, called the *Copia de Curatos*, where *Uruquilla* was identified as the original language of Urus. Therefore, understanding that the language of this ethnic group was Uruquilla and that their members adopted Puquina language when Tiwanaku dominated the area, Bouyssse-Cassagne claimed that ethnic and cultural differences existed between the Urus and the Puquinas (cf. Martín Rubio, 1998, pp. XXXIII–IV; Bouyssse-Cassagne 1992, p. 473). Bouyssse-Cassagne also claims that Uru or Puquina languages from Lake Titicaca, and Chipaya from Poopó were identified as related to the Arawak family languages of the Amazonas (ibid.).

Créqui-Montfort & Rivet made an earlier contribution on the subject in their *La langue Uru ou Pukina*, published between 1925 and 1927, but Alfredo Torero (1992) claims that they
compiled Uruquilla evidence that was available at the time. However, unfortunately they did this with the idea of showing that Uruquilla or Uru and Puquina were one single language exposed at two different moments in time, and that this single language was nothing but a part of the great Amazonian Arawak family. At the same time, Torero is of the opinion that Créqui and Rivet argued that Uruquilla had become an extremely transformed variant of Puquina in only three hundred years, thus making null and void in advance any future comparative research between this material and those of other languages, like Arawak. Such research presupposed that other languages were unconnected to Uruquilla for a long period of time (1992, pp. 176–7).

Torero argues in favour of Uruquilla as the language of Uru population owing to the composition of Puquina and Uruquilla linguistic areas. Puquina was more densely spread in the northern part of Lake Titicaca and the maritime and jungle flanks; Uruquilla was, in turn, spread south of this lake and towards the south of the plateau basin. Therefore, a Pucara culture would have fostered a proto Puquina, and a Chiripa culture was the transmitter of such proto Uruquilla. The cultural strength of these Pucaras would have allowed for later turning Tiwanaku people into Puquina speakers and these people, in turn, would have had the same influence in the southern part of the plateau, to the disadvantage of Uruquilla languages that were active or opponents in the same period (ibid.). The prestige of Chiripa and related places is sufficient for Torero to explain the dissemination of Uruquilla through the southern sector of the plateau, perhaps also through the maritime and jungle flanks, starting south of Lake Titicaca in the first millennium AD. In this way, a great part of “Palaeolithic” or “Uro” population became Uruquilla speakers (Torero 1992, p. 184).

For Torero it is fundamental to understand that, whereas in the 16th century most of the Uruquilla speaking groups were fishers and gatherers, Uruquilla speaking societies that existed by then were not Uros and that they can be compared to, if not considered wealthier than, the so-called Aymara societies because of their possessions in land and cattle. This was the case of Uruquillas from Zepita and Aullagas, significantly located in the neighbourhood of old formative centres such as Chiripa and Wankarani, as Torero claims (ibid.). He compares this situation with socio-linguistic experiences in other places of the world and it becomes clear that for him, the culturally developed and economically powerful centres were those in a position to propagate Uruquilla towards marginal populations of lower cultural level – such as the Uros – in the past, and that the reverse should not be expected (1992, p. 184).

On May 1st, 2005, an article titled Uru Chipayas construyen su propio alfabeto (Uru Chipayas developed an alphabet of their own), appeared in a La Paz magazine (Revista Escape), signed by Cándido Tancara. The author describes the Uru Chipayas as people who “never ceased to speak their original language in more than 4,500 years”. However, he claims, “their children” have made studies in linguistics and thus have been developing their own alphabet during the “last five years”, based on “studies carried out by foreigners in the last century”, probably referring to Vellard and Créqui & Rivet mentioned above. The article mentions how the Uru linguists and school teachers (such as Florencio Mamani Quispe or Germán Lázaro from the village of Chipaya), are struggling not only to study their language on the basis of what was previously written and done, but also to produce an alphabet that is the result of the speakers themselves. They formed, together with other Chipaya teachers, a Consejo de Implementación de la Lengua Nativa Uru Chipaya – CILNUCH (Committee for implementing the Uru Chipaya native language), in charge of paying visits to the different ayllus in search of the “best speakers” who could help to enrich the alphabet to be constructed with the support of video and tape recorders. The press article mentions that the Uru Chipaya language was declared “official in a Supreme Decree [number] 25894” of November 11, 2000 and that a consensus for the proposal to unify the alphabet was proclaimed in a ceremony that took place on April 6, 2005. Members of the Congress, education officers, and Adán Pari, head of the Dirección de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe of the Ministry of Education had been present for the occasion.

The article mentions the details that make the Uru Chipaya language particular, and the discussions that will have to follow in order to come up with an alphabet that is in agreement with all those who hold opinions as the language, it is claimed, is formed by “thirty seven letters and five vowels, though this is not a final figure.” I would like to add that when the Aymara
language was “unified” in the same sense that Uru Chipayas intend to do, the vowels, for example, were reduced to three, namely a-i-o. The rest, that is e-u in the Spanish alphabet that was used as a reference, were derived from the combination of the three official vowels with special consonants (such as q or x). It is expected that in 2006 they will be ready to teach the language to schoolchildren who, according to the article, are “more than six hundred”. Uru Chipayas, the article claims, are some three thousand people.

Have the Urus increased in population? Wachtel stated that they were “no more than two thousand people in total” (1990, p. 13). If so, would it be an indicator that their ethnicity has become apparent or, in other words, “more” Urus claim their “ethnic” belonging? Would it account for the appearance of an “Uru-Chipaya” language? What about linguists as Torero and the discussion presented above, based on years of dedicated research? What about his opinion that what Wachtel asked him to listen to when Chipayas and Iru-Itus met, was Aymara to his ears (1992, p. 181)?

While more questions accumulate regarding the (Uru) “problem”, it should be said that whatever the language, and in this I follow some of Torero’s arguments, linguists can go as far as to try to understand when was it that changes could have resulted into “new” languages, divergent languages. The implication of this is deep, since it refers to isolation, lack of contact and other aspects that do not account for an area that has been populated for thousand of years.

To claim that these were, on the other hand, “cultural possessions” qualifying for one of the “ethnic markers” mentioned above is, all in all, an overstatement.

Sociology

What is the sociological contribution to the understanding of social constructions, social difference and social meaning in the topic of the Urus? There is a particular thread that Sociology has helped to expose, called dichotomy. As soon as the idea of nature was employed as a metaphor for containing what was “discovered” in the new continent, the obvious dichotomy between natural and social, thus cultural, became evident. The chroniclers, the explorers and anthropologists without exception have thence recurred to this dichotomy to portray their representations. Statements on the “culture” category abound that compare it with “nature”, as a reference for constructing the opposed meaning attributed to both (cf. Latour 1999). This allows for an explanation of what, it is claimed, are man-made products of a “civilised” world, another expression for denoting difference between human groups called societies, and those who are not, i.e. the things that belong to nature.

Arthur Posnansky, for example, went out to find a difference that he turned into a dichotomy that he already knew existed in the chronicles. One could make a comparison or reference to Cecil Gosling (see Appendix 1), and find that his approach of 1916 was private, like a tourist writing of the Sami for no specific reason. Posnansky had a reason, but both Gosling and Posnansky take the Urus for granted, and while Gosling does it romantically, Posnansky proceeds most consciously for scientific and paradigmatic reasons. Posnansky found Urus obvious, as opposed to Wachtel, who saw Urus as an “enigma”. On the other hand, when Wachtel, for example, qualifies as acculturation the “Aymara face” of his perception of the Urus, an obvious case of jumping to conclusions, the pervasiveness of the dichotomous approach is confirmed.

Furthermore, this kind of approach shows how mainstream scholars, while encouraging the traditional ethnographical work intended to describe the differences, have unproblematically adhered to these view as an understanding of the world in terms of dichotomy, of opponents, of binary complements from where Lévi-Straussian structuralism is always able to multiply an initial pair of oppositions (Lévi-Strauss 1958 & 1974). This approach, one of the results of positivist reductionism, is part of the intention to explain the whole, understood as a mechanism working its way through history and life, i.e. time and space, while allowing for static views that try to dissect the procedure.

That people became “Uru” was probably the result of social and economic circumstances, as realising how lands and territory were “lost to the Aymaras” seemed to indicate. However, a good example of what happens when the political aspect becomes dominant is that both the
antagonists – such as the Aymaras – and the ones depicted as Urus or, more exactly the other, actively take part in the same construction. This might also prove that Urus are the result of what is generally called “cultural” change, establishing a divide and, eventually, a dichotomy called Aymara/Uru in the Andes.

However, the most important contribution from Sociology to the understanding of the Uru topic comes from the very concepts that have been chosen for the descriptions of Uru people. These concepts, ethnic groups and Urus in particular, are used in the disciplines as a departure, as a starting point and not as an analytical device that would allow for deconstructing its meaning and thus its explanatory power. Pierre Bourdieu has rightly warned us in this respect, claiming that our science, and sociology in particular, seems unable to identify the differences between social classes and, in this case, between “ethnic groups”, unless it introduces them at the outset! (1979, p. 20). Bourdieu’s notion of “point of view” is also a contribution in this respect, when he states that agents are both classified and classifiers, but they classify according to, or depending upon, their position within classifications (Bourdieu 1987, p. 2). The point of view is a perspective, a partial subjective vision he describes as a subjectivist moment; but it is at the same time a view, a perspective, taken from a point, from a determinate position in an objective social space that he calls objectivist moment. These moments, according to Bourdieu, can and must be integrated. Furthermore, a class, be it social, sexual, ethnic, or otherwise, exists when there are agents capable of imposing themselves upon those who recognize themselves as members of the class, and in doing so, confer upon it the only form of existence a group can possess (1987 p. 15). Have we not heard this from the people in Suxtita?

Zygmunt Bauman (2001, 1998) supported these views and enhanced my perspective. For example, it was interesting to notice how this sociologist also perceived that, unlike other varieties of postulated identities, the idea of ethnicity is semantically loaded. This is because it assumes, axiomatically as Bourdieu would have it, a society where everything has been preordained and its order precedes “all bargaining and eventual agreements on rights and obligations” (2001, p. 29). Therefore, any claim for homogeneity that allegedly marks ethnic entities is, in his words, heteronomous, because it does not resemble human artefacts, i.e. bargaining and agreeing. This explains why ethnicity, more than any other kind of postulated identity, is the first choice when it comes to “the withdrawal from the frightening, polyphonic space where no one knows how to talk to anyone else” and to find a “secure niche where everyone is like anyone else and so there is little to talk about and the talking is easy” (ibid.). Also, if it comes to keep such a secure niche – ethnicity – within the society, this is no impediment for still invent their own roots, traditions, shared history and common future – but first and foremost their separate and unique culture as the Urus example has proved.

Aspects of other disciplines

Geography and Cartography were indispensable in trying to understand not only the physical area but also how scientists are capable of reducing the complications of landscape. This is how the complexity of Lake Poopó is seen in the maps as a combination of elevation versus flatness. The various slopes created by the dune landscape, the shallowness of the watercourses in July when the winter season dries up every bit of soil, the salty water that the people is forced to consume and to use for cultivation, the complications of contamination deriving from the mining activities as well as the marks of floods left by the rivers and the lake; these aspects cannot be represented on a map (although textual symbols sometimes help). Aerial photographs are better at this but it is only when you are standing there, at c. 3700 metres of altitude over the flatness that your perspective begins to get a grip on the landscape in Pampa Aullagas. It is also when you walk between or over the dunes, when you climb the mountain (very close to 4000 m) and reach one of its many peaks (breathless and lacking oxygen), hit by the permanent winds of the area that you start to understand why a place like this can and actually has been called Pampa. And you discover yourself having ideas about how one should relate to this landscape (see Figs. VII.8–VII.14).

Reading about the geology of the Andes provided yet another perspective of how the area became what it is today. Understanding the fauna and flora with the help of biology, particularly
the problems created by fish like pejerrey or silverside (Basilichthys bonariensis), or the rainbow trout (Salmo gairdneri) described above, was also important (Bourges et al. 1992; armouze & Aquize 1981;Levieil & Orlove 1992; Roche et al. 1992; Vacher et al. 1992).

Naming disciplines forces me not to realise but to remember how dispersed our knowledge appears to be. I could go on with other names but, having made my point, I would like to discuss the matter of the dispersed knowledge that I have tried to put together.

The standpoints altogether

The artificial way in which disciplines are brought to the fore is now evident, each presenting their contribution as “different”. However, any understanding, in order for it to make sense, would be hopeless were it to rely only on the tools, theories, methods of one single discipline, as it were. This does not happen and it is so obvious today that it has become invisible to the eye. However, the intertwining occurs. Science, the selected disciplines, the way in which they were selected and the parts of each that were selected for the investigation, all have to do with the way the Urus are exposed in the thesis. Summarising the contributions described above, it is as if systematization is the result of the research. It is partly, but it is also some other things else. The standpoints facilitated by the disciplines are both challenging and challengers. They are challenging because they are in search of knowledge and for this, they organise their tools and theories. However, they are also challengers because they respond to the questions instigated by the search of knowledge. So far, the separation into disciplines of the scientific field is deemed as methodologically necessary. It was just too difficult – and it is indeed difficult – to deal with more than one perspective at a time. This is similar to what Stephen Hawking describes as the possibility of visualizing more than three dimensions in physics: he himself found it problematic trying to do so (1988).

However, analysing why it is difficult is also part of the challenge. Naturally, the same applies to the difficulty that Wachtel sees in the Urus as an ethnic group. Reality is characterised by what actually occurs or happens, and is constantly constructed by the actors who participate in what is ongoing (Latour 1999, p. 306); this why it is also multiple. To approach what occurs when a group of people is characterised as Uru from the singularity of a difference, being characterised as ethnicity, equates to ignore the multiplicity of the context where the difference is produced. When I asked Wachtel how could he “see” the identity of an “ethnic group” or, for what matters, how could he identify an “ethnic group”, he told me that it could only be detected “by opposition to another (ethnic group)”. In other words, he meant that you need to have found one “ethnic group” first and this, the “empiric result” as he called it, is the key to “overcome the problems connected to theories” (La Paz, April 11, 2003, pers. comm.). It is understandable that Wachtel sees a problem in the Urus, since the way he understands science, and more precisely his disciplines – history and anthropology – makes him, as Bourdieu (1979:20) has rightly warned, unable to identify the differences between social classes and, in this case, between “ethnic groups”, unless he introduces them at the outset.

Theory is helpful as a starting point as much as observation and “being there”. Nonetheless, the actors themselves also count (Latour 1999, p. 306). These actors, often reduced to the lay people by some scholars, are situational: they are part of whatever is happening, of reality as such. This also means that they, the actors, are fundamental for our understanding of any reality, and authentic as part of whatever makes that reality. As researchers, we are actors as well; thus, research gains nothing in being detached as our sciences have tried to teach us as scientists. The problem, if another one should be named, is the scheme of ideas we put forth to characterize what we call problems. This scheme has a label as well: ideology. What does this boil down to? Into the “impersonal laws” that are brought in to stop controversies from boiling over (cf. Latour 1999, p. 260), an example of which has been the attempt of circumscribing ethnicity into the borders of the ethnic markers.
The ethnic markers, where are they?

It becomes clear that the ethnic markers that our ethnographers, historians and other scholars use for Urus are not of much help: every attempt to fasten them into the Uru ethnicity as an “impersonal law” has proved the futility of the effort. The same applies to the word/concept ethnic, in its current meaning and applications, as recent as the mid-nineteenth century (Tonkin et al. 1989, p. 14).

If ethnicity is claimed because of a dress style, one of the ethnic markers (cf. Barstow 1979 i.a.), it shows how easy it is to fool people who understand the sign and the symbol simply by wearing clothing that imply membership in a specific group. We dress, among others, to be seen, to be accepted, to be considered part of our group. In that respect, these reasons are valid in places of work, in special schools, at masquerade parties, wherever dress is chosen as a sign of “being part of”. I can be taken for whatever I choose to look like just by wearing specific clothing, but that would only prove how deep seated prejudices are and how ignorant we may appear in the many aspects of identity. Would the lack of such attire be a problem for me to be considered as one of the rest? “Yes!”, “no!”, “well, it depends…”, and similar replies to this particular question prove, moreover, the futility point and its complexity.

Language, an ethnic marker cherished by many ethnologists and linguists alike, is even more problematic. Languages not only change constantly, as anyway do the other so-called ethnic markers, but are one of those human abilities that are acquired through learning. In other words, dress can be seen as a convention and as a conventional tradition, whereas language is something that we all are able to acquire in principle and if we want to. There is nothing particular with a language that qualifies for any essential expression of the identity; it does not come tied to identity although, unambiguously, reinforces it in specific contexts.

The same might be asserted for houses and this time from a more general perspective as, for what archaeological research seems to constantly prove, it can be said that the circular plan attributed to the primordial Urus, is as old in the inhabited world as in any early settlement in the Andes. The fact that this settlement pattern was seen more as “Aymara” in that part of the world creates yet another question, that of the need to define Aymara out of the essentialism of the language.

Regarding ritual, cuisine, and “basic moral values and standards of excellence” (Barth 1969), evidence that connects these to any “essential” aspect of the identity will again prove futile since, whatever the situation, they will change not only from place to place but also within a specific place, household, group of individuals and the society within which they interact. Furthermore, we should have already learnt that the attempts to “classify people by genes, like attempts to do so by cultural and linguistic traits, must lead to contradictions”. This was said by Franz Boas in 1938 (The Mind of Primitive Mind, p. 145, in Terrel 2001, p. 20). Nonetheless, anthropologists and archaeologists but also linguists and other (social) scientists, appear always to be yearning for “writing the ultimate guidebook to human beings” (Terrel 2001, p. 16).

The overview of ethnic markers also shows that a redefinition is out of the question, since it is hopeless and no matter how hard we put ourselves to work in such a redefinition, an ethnic marker will always be contextual, conventional and symbolic. Most importantly, it will be connected to other elements playing also a role and having actually very little awareness of their relatedness to the question of identity, let alone the tricky question of defining what in fact makes an ethnic group and why we need to have such a definition. Being an ethnic cannot be demonstrated in this way; being an ethnic is therefore not a scientific category or, put in other words, it is a pseudo-scientific category. That is why it is also ideological and proves the ideology behind it.

Coming full circle

One of the experiences that I have particularly collected, meditated on and then tried to contextualise was the one I had while in Sweden for, paradoxically, it reinforced my view on how anthropologists and ethnologists construct what they call “their objects/subjects of study”, an ubiquitous dilemma. I describe the experience as completely and briefly as possible, from my perspective as the affected individual.
I attended a seminar on Method and Theory in History and Anthropology sponsored by the Department of History at Uppsala University. When the coffee break allowed for mingling, I was approached by a PhD student from the Department of Anthropology who asked about my research. I tried to summarise my aim in combining Anthropology, Archaeology and History as some of the disciplines in the approach to my research. At this point, I was asked about my origin and when I said that I came from Bolivia, the student asked: “Are you also an Uru?” I replied that, asked in that way, I would have more than one way of answering but that a straightforward answer would be “No”. This is when he said to me: “Because, as you know, we, as anthropologists, are not allowed to study ourselves. This is not appropriate within the discipline… for example, I am doing research in [not Sweden] where I am studying an ethnic group there that…” and he continued with details on his own research. Not only a prejudice but also a recurrent anthropological perspective was flying before my eyes. This PhD student was judging me according to his prejudices about the other, and he was passing on judgement about my misconduct (?). If I happened to be Uru. Moreover, he lectured me about what anthropologists are supposed to do or not. It was clear that he saw no problem in going in search for the other out of Sweden, because Swedes were homogeneous in his view, apart from the Sami who were, in his opinion, the kind of ethnic group that ethnologists were entitled to deal with in this country. He was not into ethnology, he added.

This is but one example of people's conceptions of the other and as it happened, I saw myself involved in a situation where I was unproblematically perceived as the other. Although conscious of my observable physical traits expressed in the concept of phenotype, I want to mention that I have been called things such as exotic bird, which I find particularly amusing. All met with my understanding in situations where the experience was fascinating, particularly while staying in Sweden where it seemed so obvious that I was exotic if not typée, as I was also called in France. But in Bolivia, where differences are constructed in similar ways, i.e. with the help of the phenotype, I would never be asked if I was Uru. To begin with, it is a term that few people are familiar with or have ever heard of, and if they have it is in all probability through some anthropologist. If someone knows what the word stands for, they could tell you that it is the same as asking if you are an Indian and this, being a pejorative term, would simply be rude behaviour.

I have often questioned myself about the kind of differences that separate us from the other. Coming from a society where the colonised minds are prepared to tell Indian from non-Indian, I stared at the reactions of those who were accused of being Indians or cholos, while I also noticed that the local papers often contained tiny ads with personal acquittals for insults proffered against someone while, it was alleged, in a state of confusion, thus legally dismissing the possibility of being prosecuted for slander. Such insults consist, as a rule, of calling someone either Indian or cholo or both. The PhD student who took me for an Uru was apparently not aware of any of these details. People like him, however, expose what is in their minds when it comes to define the other.

The distance crossed
Navigare necesse est,
Vivere non est necesse.
(To sail is necessary; to live is not necessary)

To expose how a construction about an ethnic group is produced should not be taken as an attempt to destroy the edifice where the group has found lodge. Deconstruction, in this case, has been used as a way to analyse the parts and not to separate them from where they were taken, or seen as belonging to by proceeding to its destruction. I did not intend to play the iconoclast role of the critic who, in a zealous fit, is after the “real” to separate it from the “invented” (Latour 1999, p. 277).

To avail oneself of only one discipline to understand the complexity of current ethnic movements and revivals would evidently narrow the perspective and the understanding gained. To use only one discipline serves, in other words, to organise part of the understanding.
Furthermore, to avail of an additional discipline, a second or a third, proves yet other levels of difficulty: on the one hand, it shows that they are needed, that their contribution is demanded, required and not just fancied. On the other hand, additional disciplines are also the evidence of the difficulties in understanding any situation and this, paradoxically, teaches us that the approach is not a matter of discipline but a matter of which disciplines and how or when are they going to be used. It is a matter of understanding how and why the connections or disconnections are established by the actors themselves. It is the actors who “create” what appears as complex in our eyes.

How do they do it? Disciplines like history and archaeology as well as psychology, anthropology and the behavioural sciences, enlighten partially the understanding. Indeed, every discipline as we know them is able to make a sensible contribution from the angle of its perspective.

The question is why. Why do we need to consider the actors while recurring to our scientific disciplines? This is because we all need them: we are actors who interact with other actors and our disciplines do not separate us from the others. It is we, it is us who do so and still we pretend that our disciplines are exerting some sort of pressure over us to act in this way. We go so far as to postulate that we need the separation; that we ought to detach ourselves in doing science, creating a peculiar subject – object relationship. This actually is what the critics do: they separate actors calling them subject-object and then, as Latour rightly warns, are at pains trying to put the whole thing back together as it was before the blow of the separation fragmented it (1999, pp. 277–8).

The world would not be such if it is not seen and understood as articulated in its parts and symbols, such as the boundaries between human groups, which are as important as the very material interests that create them. The disciplines into which our science is divided do us little favour when they attempt to break the connections between what they see as real from what they see as invented. This only leads to visions that present the “other” as “paralysed”, the static view of societies that have helped little in our understanding of their dynamics. To explain the topic of the Urus, for example, from such a paradigm creates more problems than those one pretends to solve. To expose the “construction” of their ethnicity is not enough: it is not even plausible: everyone knows of it.

This is why we do not need to think of disciplines that should disappear, for they will. Eventually. In fact, we actually have good enough disciplines to gain a better understanding of our world. What we need is to make them talk to each other, to make connections, links, among themselves, to make them drop their strategic approach and not bring chains for their “fortresses” where they have been trying to protect themselves from each other while using, it seems reluctantly in some cases, each other. It is the whole that sustains and gives sense to the parts, those parts the disciplines so carefully cherish separated from what gives them a reason to exist.

Back to a world where disciplines are Science and Science is part of the world

Our colleagues from the different disciplines – a peculiar part of the actors and, as is characteristic of actors – do not like to hear that their strategies, i.e. their methods and theories, should be exposed; to them this sounds the same as betrayed, if not abandoned. They see strategies in the same way that ethnic groups do in respect of their ethnicities: without them they believe they are nothing. They feel threatened. They feel insecure.

While exposing my ideas, the ones discussed in this thesis, I saw the fear in the eyes of many academics. Some of them even made me hear what their fears were about: “What is it going to happen to History?”, “I think you should go back to learn how to do History!”, “What will become of Anthropology? What will the anthropologists do if they dispense with ethnographies?”, “What will the world become if archaeology disappears?” This is fear and it is real. It is based on uncertainty, i.e. not knowing what would happen if one dares to go one step further. More importantly, it is an indication of ignorance, the mother of all fears (and myths),
and it denotes the realisation of how problematic it is to make the connections, let alone the how. As researchers, I believe that we deserve a better destiny than one plagued with fears. Disciplines appear and disappear: it is we who make them do so, we the actors; they, the disciplines, do not have a life of themselves although, by being there, they transform us into something else, i.e. someone with (better) knowledge and or understanding.

There was once a world when disciplines did not exist as such. Then, they were created. The creators were human beings and as they do with all-important things, they gave a name to it and they called it science. They went through much pain to understand the subjects that were mysterious to them and it was never easy. Thanks to those brave people, we now know a wealth of information. Thanks to all those people, we now should know that fear is meant to be overcome and that little is gained if we pretend to escape from it; worse, that it may control us.

A nice metaphor can now be evoked: by trying to identify the disciplines as different contributions in the understanding of a problem, i.e. the ethnic Urus, it became clear that unless I separated them intentionally, discerning the specificity of their contributions, I might as well have jumped directly to the conclusions that would have explained how a difficult topic could now be seen in an easier way. I have used the correcting eyeglasses of the disciplines; each one with its peculiar “colour” and, while at that, a rainbow of colours became evident together with whatever below the light of our sun is always shining with its stunning difference. This is not all about the metaphor. When science proves the usefulness of separating knowledge into disciplines for (better) understanding the singularities of whatever aspect of life/reality we are confronted to, it, i.e. science, is evoking while at the same time proving that this is the way we deal with difference. Our ideas of different human beings, of the other, of the names we invent for them to create classifications in our categories of knowledge, are all a reflection – a metaphor – for our science and our disciplines. We, as much as the other(s), do it all the time.

Some of us believe that the scientific seriousness should be one of such differences in respect of those for whom this is common knowledge, if not common sense. Although seriousness is required every time the balance that allows difference to be an expression of the beauty of life is broken, every group of human beings in this world, including those labelled as ethnic, are constantly recreating, renegotiating, re-elaborating a discourse for making the others believe, as they do, in their difference. In this way, they share in a common human characteristic.
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GLOSSARY

AGUAYO: (Ay. awayu) A coloured piece of knitted fabric, used to transport things on the back of a person.

ALASITA: (Ay.) Much has been written about this tradition, trying to describe it as a “typical” Bolivian custom. It is argued that the name derives from the Aymara alasiña, meaning “to buy”, thus alasita would be translated as “buy me!” in the imperative form of the verb. It is connected to Iqiku or Ekeko, a deity of good luck and abundance (see below).


ALLQAMARI: (Ay.) Scavenger, similar to a crow (Catartes aura).

ALAX-SAYA: (Ay.) Upper moiety or division of the territory; equivalent to Quechua anansaya. Also alasaa.

AMAUTA: (Ay. Amawt’a) Wise man, sage.

ANANSAYA: (Q.) Upper moiety or division of the territory. Also hanansaya.

ANTISUYU: (Q.) One of the four parts forming the Inca empire, known as Tawantinsuyu. The name comes from the Antis, today known as the Campas, a group of people inhabiting the northern mountainous area of Cusco and from where the Andes took its name.

ASIRU: (Ay.) General term designating snakes, i.e. reptiles with no legs.

AYLLU: (Q. and Ay.) An extended family or lineage believed to have a common ancestor. A weapon made of a long cord with balls at the end, used in the game of the same name. The ayllo was used in hunting as well as in war. This word and the word above meaning “lineage” are homonyms. The Spanish word for the weapon is bola or bolas, also used in English (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:2653). Also ayllo in Spanish colonial chronicles.

AYMARA: (Ay.) Name used for the inhabitants of a large part of the territory of ancient Qullasuyu or Kollasuyo. The language of this group, classified as a member of the Jaqi Aru or Jaqaru linguistic family. Today they are described as an “ethnic group”.

AWAYU: (Ay.) See aguayo. Carrying cloth, shawl; also lliqlla (Abercrombie 1998:516).

BATAN: (Sp., pl. batanes) Common word in the Altiplano to designate grinding or mortar stones.

BOFEDAL: (Sp., pl. bofedales) Bogs or marshy grounds close to rivers or lakes in the Altiplano, appreciated in the husbandry of cameloids.
CABILDO: (Sp.) “Civil offices, town council; altar where tribute is collected; tribute district” (Abercrombie 1998:517). Also kawiltu.

CACAO: (N.) Theobroma cacao. The cocoa tree and its seeds or beans (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:263)

CACIQUE: (T.) A native chief (see CURACA). Used generically in place of local words for chief.

CARGO: (Sp.) Includes a variety of civic responsibilities, from assuming certain posts, such as jilaqata and or Corregidor, to sponsoring religious festivals as preste, etc.

CEDULA: (Sp.) Spanish colonial term to designate a legal disposition.

CEQUE: (Q. siqi ?) Imaginary lines of ceremonial significance, that radiated out from Cusco. Abercrombie describes them as “A sight line or straight path leading from a center point (in Cusco, the Qurikancha temple) outward, connecting sacred sites (wak’as) and serving as a pilgrimage or dance path” (1998:517)

CHACRA: (Q. chakara; Ay. chakra) A piece of ground or field under cultivation (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:264)

CHALALAWA: (?) Traps for flamingos.

CH’ALLA: (Ay.) Sand, or the particles resulting from the weathering of rocks. Most often the term is applied to a ritual or ceremonial libation and the day when it takes place, such as Tuesday in Carnival.

CH’AMPHA: (Ay.) Sod blocks cut directly from the ground and used in building. Also champa (Q.).

CHARQUE: (Ay. ch’arkhi) Sun dried meat preserved with salt. Also charqui.

CHASKI: (Q.) Runner or messenger who carried the Inca’s orders to the governors and caciques of the empire. These runners were stationed at intervals of one-quarter of a Spanish league (a little less than a mile), and they used a relay system (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:264) Also chasqui.

CHICHA: Uncertain origin, but probably from an Indian language of Panama. Any of various alcoholic beverages made by fermenting maize, other seeds, or fruits (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:264). Ay. k’usa; Q. asua.

CH’IIJI: (Ay.) A local grass (Distichlis humilis).

CHINCHAYSUYU: (Q.) One of the four parts forming the Inca empire, or Tawantinsuyu. The name comes from the Chinchas, today extinct, a group of people who inhabited the area of the valley of Marañón in present Peru, along the coasts of the Pacific ocean and up to Quito (Ecuador).

CHIPAYA: (?) Group of people also known as Uru-Chipaya. They live north of Lake Coipasa, Provincia Atahualpa and Carangas in the Department of Oruro, Bolivia. Today they are described as an “ethnic group”.

CHOLO/CHOLA: (Sp.) The Spanish Dictionary Larousse (1996) gives the following meanings: “Mestizo [i.e. person of mixed race] of white man and Indian woman. Indian who
has adopted the customs of the urban and industrial society” (mt). It is the equivalent of the offensive terms “half-caste” or “half-breed”.

CHOZA: (Sp.) Hut located in the outskirts of the community’s rancho.

CHUCLLA: (Q.) One of the huts or small houses built in pairs along the royal highways every quarter of a league (slightly less than a mile). They were large enough for two messengers or chasquis, as they waited to receive messages (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:264). Also Chujilla or Khuya.

CHULLPA: (Ay. and Q.) According to Andean creation myths, autochthonous people of “presolar age”, i.e. the oldest population in the area. In Quechua language it refers to burial structures with circular or quadrangular plans, the interior having a false vault (Cf. Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:342)

CHULLPA-PUCHU: (Ay.) “rejects of the chullpas”, an insult addressed to the Chipayas by the Aymara Indians (Wachtel 1994:145), and also to Uru people in general.

CHUÑU: (Ay. and Q.) Dehydrated black potato obtained by freezing and sun drying. Also chuño.

COCA: (Q. Kuka) Erythroxylon coca. A plant similar to a rosebush or the leaves of this plant, which contain a stimulating narcotic. The Andean Indians chewed these leaves. The word coca is used in both Spanish and English (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:264)

CONDOR: (Q. kuntur) Vultur gryphus, the huge Andean vulture (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:264)

CORREGIDOR: (Sp.) The Royal authority in the Spanish province during the 16th century. Presently, the authority of a canton (one of the Bolivian political divisions).

CORREGIMIENTO: (Sp.) Province of corregidor’s jurisdiction in colonial times. Presently, offices of corregidor.

CUNTISUYU: (Q.) One of the four parts forming the Inca empire, or Tawantinsuyu, extending from Cusco to the Pacific ocean. Also Contisuyu.

CURACA: (Q. Kuraqka) Title given to the higher-ranking officials in the Inca government; they were in charge of one hundred or more taxpayers. The curaca with the highest rank was the superior of ten thousand taxpayers (In: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:265).

DOCTRINA: (Sp.) Colonial Spanish ecclesiastic district with resident priest (Abercrombie 1998:517).

DOÑA (feminine), DON (masculine): (Sp.) Spanish expression to denote courtesy when addressing someone; it usually precedes the first name as in “doña Sebastiana” or “don Julián”.

ENCOMIENDA: (Sp.) Grant of Indian labour and tribute to a Spanish conquistador (Abercrombie 1998:517).

ENCOMENDERO: (Sp.) The Spanish conquistador who was granted Indian labour and tribute in the Indias.

ESTANCIA: (Sp.) Clusters of houses that form hamlets and are distributed among arable portions of the territory (Wachtel, 1994:146)
HUNU: (Q. unu) Ten thousand. Used to mean the superior of thousand taxpayers, the highest-ranking official of the curaca class (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:265)

IQIQU: (Ay.) “Ancient deity of good luck and abundance, represented by a kind hunchbacked dwarf. Representations of this small god are adorned with a large variety of miniature objects (house, truck, kitchen utensils, food, etc.). The person owning the representation hopes to obtain such objects in its real form. Connected to Iqiqu is the celebration of Alasitas.” (In: Van den Berg, p 68, MTFS). Also Ekeko.

ILLA: (Ay.) Stone and stuccoed llamas representation used to favour the multiplication of the herd. Any amulet intended to promote abundance.

IRU-ITU: Or Irohito, the name of a place close to river Desaguadero where Uru people have been detected. According to Posnansky, they called themselves Utschumi or Kjot-suñs, “people of the water”.

JANQ’U: (Ay.) white colour.

JANT’A: (Ay. ?) Temporary accommodation used as a shelter when herding or cultivating far from the permanent house.

JAYU: (Ay.) Salt.

JIK’ILLA: (Ay.) Pieces of broken ceramic or pottery.


JUNTA-MUYU: (Sp. and Ay.) Regular visit paid by ayllu authorities – jilaqatas – to all member communities.

KALLANKA: (Q.) “Large unpartitioned hall with wooden pillars to support the roof. Served as temporary lodging for individuals rather than families” (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:342) in Inka architecture.

KAMAYUQ: (Q.) Literally “the specialist”, thus the quipu kamayuq was “the specialist who knots and interprets khipu”. Also camayu or camayo in Spanish colonial chronicles.

KANCHA: (Q.) “Group of several roofed chambers inside a walled compound; also means enclosure” (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:342)

KARATEA: (?) The area where potato and quinua are cultivated, between the shores of lake Poopó and the sand dunes.

KARIKARI: Also Kharisiri (Ay.), Llik’ichiri (Q.), Pistaco (pishtaq) (Q.), Nakaq (Q.), all are words describing “a figure generally represented as a white man who extracts the fat or the blood of the Indians at dusk or at night, after having plunged his victims into a deep sleep” (Cf. Wachtel 1994:146)

KERUYO: (Ay. q’iruyu ?) Tent formed with poles and a plastic or nylon cover.

KILLPA: (Ay. K’ilphaña) The act of marking the herd by cutting or adorning the ears. In Pampa Aullagas this was done adorning the ears of the llamas with threads of colourful wool.
KULCHA: (?) Grass cover.

LAQAYA: (Ay.) Ruins. Building without a roof or where the roof has been dismantled.

LLAMA: (Q.) *Lama glama*. Domestic animal of South America, used as a beast of burden and a source of meat and wool; it was also used as a sacrifice to the gods (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:265)

LLAPITA: (?) A local grass in the Andes.

LUKI: (Ay. *luk’i*) A variety of bitter potato, adapted to harsh conditions such as those in the Altiplano.

MAIZE: (T.) *Zea mays*, the native corn of America. The Spanish equivalent is *maiz* (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:266)

MALLKU: (Ay.) At least three meanings: (1) Mountain peak, mountain spirit. (2) Condor. (3) Pre-Columbian hereditary authority. The *mallku* is a male divinity or spirit and, according to Wachtel (1990:57-58), it is always accompanied by his wife, the *t’alla*, both residing in the same monument.

MAMANI: (Ay.) Falcon; Inca province below the level of quarter empire (Abercrombie 1998:518).

MANXA-SAYA: (Ay.) Lower moiety or division; equivalent to Quechua *urinsaya*. Also *masaa*.

MARKA: (Ay.) Town, village.

MASMA: (Q.) One-room building with one of the long sides open (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:342)

MAYORDOMO: (Sp.) Butler. For the Andean meaning of the word: “Post in fiesta-cargo career, in charge of church key (Ay. *mayurthumu*)” (Abercrombie 1998:519)

MESA: (Sp.) Ritual table bearing the offerings to the divinities (Wachtel 1994:146)

MITA: (Q. *mit’a*) literally: time, period, shift. According to Bertonio: “that what takes just only a season” (1956:224). It was a “labour service, performed by taxpayers who came by turns lasting up to several months. This labour service supplied soldiers, laborers for public works, servants for the nobles, and workmen for other official jobs.” (In: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:266). Coerced labour system of colonial period (Abercrombie 1998:519).

MITIMAES: (Q.) Settlers or newcomers who were brought into a recently conquered province to propagate Inca culture. In exchange, an equal number of newly conquered people were sent to take the place of the settlers. The term *mitimaes* was also applied to these new vassals who were moved from their native lands. The word *mitimaes* and its singular *mitima* are Hispanicized forms of the word *mitma* (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:266). The Quechua term is *mitmakuna*.

MOJON: (Sp.) Boundary marker, usually a rock pile, pillar, or notable feature of landscape (Abercrombie 1998:519).

MOROKO: (Ay. *muruq’u*) Round, spherical, circular. Used to describe a hand of stone for the grinding stones.
MOYA: (Q.) Pasture land (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:266)

MULLUCHI: (?) Algae in Lake Poopó.

OCA: (Q.: uqa, Ay.: apilla) Oxalis crenata. Plant from the Andes, yellow flowers and edible root similar in taste to chestnut (familia oxalidáceas).

PADRONES: (Sp., plural) Locally produced census list, particularly in colonial times. The singular form is padrón.

PALI: (?) Variety of potato.

PAMPA: (Ay. and Q.) Flat surface, plain.

PAMPAKU: (?) A local dish prepared with potatoes, oca and llama meat.

PANAQA: (Q.) Ayllu composed of the descendants of an Inca, except for his successor (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

PANTULA: (?) A pink variety of quinua (chenopodium quinoa).


PARCIALIDAD: (Sp.) moiety or division of the territory, e.g. as in anansaya or urinsaya.

PARIWANA: (Ay.) Flamingo of Lake Poopó. Also parihuana (Phoenicoparrus andinus, Phoenicoparrus jamei).

PASADO: (Sp.) “Passed”; one who has completed a fiesta career (Ay. pasaru) (Abercrombie 1998:519).

PASANTE: (Sp.) Person designated each year to sponsor the following year’s celebration of a saint or a mallku (Wachtel 1994:147). Also preste.

PHALA: (Ay.) Cord made with twisted straw.

PHUTU: (Ay.) Niche.

PIÑU ROJO: (?) Variety of potato.

PIRWA: (Ay.) Barn. Square structure built to store potato. Also “male” offering to the deities found in front of the staffs of command of the jilaqatas in ayllu Suxtita, consisting of potato, coca leaves, salt.

PRESTE: (Sp.) Now used to designate the main fiesta sponsors, the name derives in all probability from the Spanish presbítero, or priest. It is also known as pasante (Sp.), i.e. he who “passes” the fiesta being responsible of supplying with drinks, food, coca leaves, and the ritual ingredients needed for the celebration.

PROBANZA: (Sp.) “Service report in form of curriculum vita backed up by sworn witness testimony, presented to Spanish Crown in an effort to gain privilege or position” (Abercrombie 1998:519)
PUKARA: (Q.) Fortress. Also hamlet chapel, according to Abercrombie (1998:519).

PUKINA: Together with Quechua and Aymara, it was one of the “general languages” officially recognised in the Viceroyalty of Peru for preaching purposes, at the beginning of the 16th century (Cf. Wachtel, 1978:1146)

PUNA: (Q.; Ay. suni) The highest lands of the Andes. The word is used in both Spanish and English (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:267)

PUNKU: (Ay.) Door.

PUTUKU: (Ay.) Dome shaped dwelling built on a circular plan. Also: “rural Chipaya house built of sod blocks that rise to form a false vault” (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

QALA: (Ay.) Stone, rock, boulder.

QHAPAQ-ÑAN: (Q.) Royal highway; the road connecting Cusco and Quito (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:342)

Q'ARA: (Ay.) Literally: bare, naked, uncovered. It is used as an insult from Aymara people to the so-called “whites”. It has its respective reaction when those “whites” reply with the term t’ara (see below).

QARWA: (Ay.) Llama (Lama glama).

Q'IPI: (Ay.) Bundle, usually wrapped with the help of awayu or aguayo.

QUECHUA: Actually, the correct word is qhishwa and it names an “ethnogeographic area, valley or ravine, frequently cultivated with maize. The main language in the Andes has received its European name from this area” (Cf. Murra, 1987:26). The speakers call it Runasimi, the language of men, that is.

QUILLA: (Q.) Month. This word also means “moon”; the months were counted by moons in Inca times (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:267)

QUINUA: (Sp.) Andean cereal – Chenopodium quinoa with a characteristic small grain.

QUIPU: (Q.) Literally “accounting with knots”, it was an Andean system of knotted cords used for record keeping. Made of strands of cord or thin wool strings, smaller strings hung like fingers from the main cord. Knots tied in the smaller strings indicated the numbers in a decimal system (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:267). The correct spelling in Quechua language should be khipu, however the colonial Spanish chronicles have recorded it as quipu or quipo.

QULLASUYU: (Q.) One of the four parts forming the Inca empire, or Tawantinsuyu. The name comes from the Qullas, a group of people that inhabited the area of Lake Titikaka extending from the north to the south. Also Kollasuyo.

QULLU: (Ay.) Mountain. Also collu or collo.

QURIKANCHA: (Q.) Literally: “Golden Enclosure”; called the Temple of the Sun since the conquest. It was the highest ranking religious structure. Located in Cusco (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

QURPA: (Ay.) Adobe made with compacted manure of llama and sheep, used for building walls in corrals in Pampa Aullagas.
QUTA: (Ay.) Lagoon. Small lake.

RANCHO: (Sp.) Usually the central part of the territory where the communities build the main residential groups.

REDUCCION: (Sp.) A new town where a scattered population of Indians was to be concentrated (Abercrombie 1998:520)

REPARTIMIENTO: (Sp.) Term replacing encomienda; colonial administrative district (Abercrombie 1998:520)

RUNA: (Q.) Man. This word came to mean “Indian” after the Spaniards arrived (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:267)


SAMIRI: (Ay.) Abercrombie describes it as follows: “Deity form, “one who gives breath”: (1) a high mountain boulder that is an ideal type or ancestor form; (2) miniature stone figurine in animal form that is the repository of the life principle of animals” (1998:520). In Asurcollu we were told that it is “the protector of a community” (Cristina Cayo, 29 July 2003).

SANI: (?) Variety of potato.

SAYJATA: (?) Name of the sacred place at each of the communities in Suxtita.

SULLU: (Ay.) Foetus. Also abortion.

SUNI: (Ay.) High-altitude zone suitable for pasture or bitter-potato production (Abercrombie 1998:520). Also puna.

SUNTURWASI: (Q.) “Circular structure” (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

SUYU: (Q.) A section or division of land assigned to one man and his family for their share of agricultural labor. This same word is also used in the toponym Tawantinsuyu, the “Land of the Four Quarters” (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:267)

TAKIRA: (Ay.) Stone vessel used to shell grains

TAMBO: (Q. tampu) Rest station. There was a tampu on the road at the end of each day’s travel (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

T’ARA: A term used by the so-called “whites” to reply when the insult q’ara (see above) is applied to them. It has no specific meaning but it is used as an insult, as well.

TASA: (Sp.) An assignment of tribute resulting from a census (Abercrombie 1998:520)

TAWANTINSUYU: (Q.) “Land of the Four Quarters”; the Inca empire (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

TAWIÑA: (?) Double bladed oar used to row in a boat.
TINKU: (Q. tinkuy) Described in the literature mainly as a ritual battle that involves a meeting of opposites, it means “place of pleasant encounter in the symbolic sense, where the hurin and hanan divisions meet” (Gasparini & Margolies 1980:343).

TOLA: (Ay. t’ula, often written as thola) Firewood in the Altiplano; it produces bright flames (Several varieties: Parastrephia lucida, Anthobryum triandrum, Baccharis santelices = B. Incarum, Baccharis boliviensis, Stipa ichu). In the roots of this plant develops a parasite called amañuqu or amañoko, an edible sweet tasting plant (Ombrophytum subterraneum). It also refers to any of several species of resinous bushy plants that are used as fuel.

TOTORA: (Ay. t’ut’ura) A local reed that grows in both lake Poopó and Titikaka (Schoenoplectus californicus).

URINSAYA: (Q.) Lower moiety or division of the territory. Also hurinsaya; equivalent to masaa.

URQU: (Ay.) Male; (Q.) mountain.

URU: (Ay.) Literally: day. According to Abercrombie, Urus are an “ethnic group thought of as lake-dwelling fishers and gatherers.” (1998:521)

USNU: (Q.) May be a stepped structure, a platform, base of a throne, place intended for high ranking personages. May also be an altar (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343)

UXU: (Ay.) The sound produced by llama animals.

VARA: (Sp.) Measurement equal to about 85 centimetres (Gasparini & Margolies, 1980:343). Also “Staff of office” (Abercrombie 1998:521)

VECINO: (Sp.) Townsman with fully vested rights (colonial); non-Indian townsman (modern) (Abercrombie 1998:521)

VICUÑA: (Q.) Lama vicugna. An animal found wild in the Andes, related to the llama but smaller (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:268)

VISITA: (Sp.) Spanish census and formal census record in colonial times.

VISITADOR: (Sp.) The official visitor or inspector in charge of the visita.

WAK´A: (Ay, and Q.) A sacred place, a place spirit. It may be a hill, a river, a stone, or any other object. Also uaca or huaca in Spanish colonial chronicles.

WASI: (Q.) House.

WASKA: (?) Threads made of llama wool or skin. Also huasca.

WILANCHA: (Ay. verb: wilanchaña) Ritual involving the spread out of llama blood over possessions or objects such as a house.

WILLKA: (Ay.) The sun. Also Inti (Q.), therefore a title for authority, and also a name.

WIRJIÑA: (Ay.) Shallow water supply for animals. Waterhole.
YANACONA: (Q.) Retainers. As officials of the Inca government, they were exempt from the mita labour service. Yana means “retainer”; the suffix cona (i.e. quna) can indicate either plural or a member of a class (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:268)

YARETA: An endemic plant of the southern part of lake Poopó, it grows in compact padded clusters (Azorella compacta).

YATIRI: (Ay.) From yatirúa: “to learn”; the person who teaches others about different subjects.

YUCA: (T.) Manihot. The many varieties of this manioc root were grouped in use as poisonous and non-poisonous. Cassava bread was made from the poisonous kind after the poison juice was squeezed out (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:268)

YUNCA: (Q. Yunka) Hot, humid lowlands. The term is applied to the lands east of the Andes. It is used as an adjective: temple yunca and provincias yuncas (in: Cobo, 1983 [1653]:268). Also yunga or Yungas.
Appendix 1

An account of a visit to Angwaki, a village of the Uros Indians on the river Desaguadero in Bolivia.

Communication manuscrite of December 1st, 1916, Gothenburg, by Cecil Gosling

'The Uros Indians of Angwaki offer a sharp contrast to the Aymaras who inhabit the high plateau lands of the Cordillera.

The Uros are cheerful and obliging people who appeared pleased to see foreigners and to do what they can to serve them. In appearance though not very tall, they are slim and well built. Their eyes are dark and expressive and without that opaque appearance which I have noticed in the Aymaras. I should be inclined to think that this alone indicates that they come of a different race, and possibly one hailing from a warmer clime.

As I seldom went into the village itself, principally on account of the number of savage dogs there, I saw but little of the women. The houses, if my memory serves me, were constructed with a species of “adobe” or sun dried peat and thatched with totora reeds which grow in abundance in the river. These reeds are also used in the construction of the “balsas” or canoes with which they navigate the rivers in their fishing and egg hunting expeditions. These boats are fashioned by binding rolls of the totora together. The bow and stern are high out of the water giving a very graceful and ornate effect and show a distinct evidence of artistic taste. The “balsas” used by the Peruvians on the other side of lake Titicaca are slightly different design and less ornamental. These craft are more secure than their flimsy appearance would warrant, and on one occasion when caught in a heavy blizzard and snow storm when far from land, I was surprised to observe how seaworthy they are under the capable management of the Indians. Some of them have sails which are also made of the Totora reeds, and these frequently travel long distances bartering eggs and fish at the neighbouring hamlets lake Titicaca and the river Desaguadero.

The poles used for propelling the “balsa” are from 12 to 15 feet long, the wood being very light and strong. They usually have two prongs at the end, these being spliced on with twine made from some local aquatic plant. As no tree of these dimensions is found on the High Plateau or the riverine district in question, it may safely be assumed that they are brought from a lower region, and assumption is further warranted by the fact that although a “balsa” may be purchased for three or four shillings, it is impossible, as I know from personal experience, to buy the poles. On one occasion I tried to purchase a pole at half a dozen Uro hamlets, offering a good price, but meeting everywhere with a refusal.

As these Indians practically live on the water there must be a large demand for these poles which are used for a variety of purposes, namely: as a means of propelling the canoes, as a mast when sailing, as a fish spear, and also for the purpose of killing wild fowl when sitting on their nests or within reach. I have never seen the Uro boys, or men, carrying slings as do the Aymara Indians.

Their food consists almost entirely of fish and eggs, and they told me that of all waterfowl they preferred the flamingo or Pariguana as they call it. This is presumably on account of the fat this bird contains.
The Uros consume a considerable amount of coca especially when pushing their canoes through the reeds, which is hard work; they also frequently eat the white shoots of the totora reed growing under water, the taste of which though insipid, is not disagreeable. Tobacco does not seem to be a habit among them, probably through lack of money to buy it, but when offered cigarettes they accepted with apparent pleasure, puffing the smoke through their nostrils as if it were an enjoyment of which they had long been deprived.

Their willingness to go into very cold water often up to their waists in search of a wounded bird, and voluntarily to remain in it for some time, without apparent discomfort, attracted my attention as being so opposed to the habits of the Aymara Indians.

I have already mentioned the evidence of artistic taste on the part of the Uros in the construction of their “balsas”. It should be added that pottery that I have seen when with them, differs to the shape and design of that of the Aymaras and Quichuas. I bought two earthen jars at Angwaki very slightly baked. There was no colouring matter or design on these jars which were about a foot tall and the shape which was pleasing to the eyes resembled in a very striking manner the alcarraza of Southern Spain.

On one occasion I found one of these Indians in my tent studying a Canadian guide book which I had brought with me, and which contained illustrations of the various fish found in the rivers and lakes of that country. He told me in broken Spanish, at least such I understood to be his meaning, that he recognised both the salmon and the trout, fish, which however are of course not found in the Desaguadero river or in the lake Titicaca. The Dorado and Doradillo which are similar in appearance to these fish, are found in nearly all the tropical rivers of South America and it is possible that he might have heard of their existence through other Indians who had descended into the warm country in search of punt poles, and I thought that perhaps this was what he was trying to tell me’.
Arthur Posnansky and his ‘evolutionary views’, as well as the way he makes use of the word ‘race’, are exemplified in what follows, summarised and translated by myself from the original in Spanish from his text Antropología y Sociología de las Razas Interandinas y de las Regiones Adyacentes, pp 113–9, published in 1938 in La Paz, Bolivia.

Isla de Panza is located in the middle of Lake Poopó and, for Posnansky, this fact accords him the right to assert that whoever lived there should be classified as Uru.

The Urus of the island of Panza, in Lake Poopó

‘It is only through references that we knew something about the island of Panza in Lake Poopó and that it was inhabited by Urus that had not yet been assimilated. However, in 1903 the French doctor M. Neveu Lemaire, member of the G. de Créqui Montfort and E. Senechal de la Grange mission, explored the Poopó lake and in a report titled “The lakes of the Highlands of South America”…, they claim having visited the island and present furthermore data related to the inhabitants.

I seriously doubt Monsieur Neveu Lemaire and his team did actually visit the island. My doubts are based in the reasons I present next.

On page 5 of the mentioned report, Dr. Lemaire states that “due to the frail condition of our boat, I leave Mr. Guillaume to embark together with Orellana and one Indian so that they reach the island of Panza, taking pictures and measuring the Indians over there.”

Up to now, no publication has shown the pictures nor measurements obtained by Mr. Guillaume and this leads me to strongly believe, that this person has not been in the island as the short time lapse indicated by Neveu Lemaire in the mentioned paper, made it humanly impossible to go to the island, to take photographs, obtain anthropological measurements from the Indians and then go back to the starting point. Having said this, we dismiss the possibility of the visit of this person to the island of Panza.

As far as Mr. Neveu Lemaire himself, we believe that he was not either in Isla de Panza and if he was, it was for a few minutes at best. However, we are inclined to believe that he did not put foot on it, based on the following: on page 9 of the paper, and referring to Isla Panza and its inhabitants, he says the following: “This island has low elevation over the water level. Its fringes steep gradually in a soft slope and are covered largely by salt depositions. It was believed that this island was inhabited by Uru Indians, but this tribe is totally unknown there. The island is inhabited by some forty Aymara Indians who belong to the same race of those of Oruro and La Paz. The inhabitants of Isla Panza live almost incommunicado to firm land…”, etc. etc.

Finally, the reader himself will judge the credibility of the information that I transcribe as follows: on page 6 of the same text, referring to the arrival to Isla Panza, he tells the following: “we arrived at the sunset, anchored some 50 meters from the island (stations 4 to 8). On the 9th, when I woke up, a light cover of ice surrounded us. Two of us went to firm land to refresh our water provisions; after that we turned to the south east corner of the island by paddling and we sailed then for a couple of hours, but soon we were forced to paddle to reach the San Epifanía gulf, where we arrived at ten o’clock by night, we anchored close to the coast (stations 8 to 12)”.

These transcriptions and particularly the phase “two of us go to firm land to refresh our water provisions”, prove that neither Neveu nor his team ever made contact with the inhabitants of Panza, who live quite far from the place reached by them…
We therefore believe that Mr. Neveu Lemaire’s report on Urus from Panza is scientifically useless and deserves no consideration at all…

I will hence report on the island and its inhabitants on the basis of my own stay of only three days “in situ”, a period of time I was unable to make the best of due to my swollen and injured legs as a consequence of the water and the bright sunshine [that affected me] during the long trip of 36 days.

The island of Panza, called “Puna-sara” by the inhabitants, is comparatively close to the western shore of lake Poopó and quite distant from the eastern shore; for that reason, the inhabitants would use only the short tract to firm land on the western side. A beach, covered by sand, mollusc and “Potamogeton” algae, surrounds the island and wild straw and thola grow farther inland. It gradually rises and abruptly gets higher towards the centre up to ca. fifty-two metres over the lake surface, forming an undulated plain over which prehistoric dwellings of Uru people can be found.

These dwellings and other buildings found before reaching the platform of the island, are made out of calcareous tufa blocks [Sp. ‘bloques de toba calcárea’], exception made of the roofs made out of other kind of stone. The special technique employed is the same as for the palace of Pillkokaina in the Island of the Sun, the Temple of the Moon on Island Koati, and the prehispanic dwellings found east of Titicaca (Kewaya, etc.). The curious technique for the construction of roofs consists of placing flat stones in a ‘prepositional’ way so as to reach the arch form. These roofs are covered with long thatch of the island and fastened with stones to prevent the wind from taking them away. The doors, both in modern and prehistoric houses, are always oriented towards the sunrise and made out of cactus planks. The prehistoric dwellings have no roof but the same walls – made out of calcareous tufa – are erected reducing upwards and closing the arch of the construction. The ruins are placed over the plain (some 52 meters above the lake level) and belonged to the prehistoric inhabitants. There are two groups still preserving their old names. All the dwellings I have observed in the island are square shaped, both modern and old ones.

Because of the gentle climate there is abundant vegetation, particularly the gigantic cacti (Cereus) with big and white flowers. Upon arrival in the island on board of the special two-bodied boat, and when we were preparing our tent in the middle of the tall straw, the first human being we saw was a robust female Indian who was grazing some bulls. She, as we learnt afterwards, would understand Keshua and Aymara languages. After recovering from the surprise caused by the arrival of foreigners, the shepherdess was extremely astonished to hear that we could get into the island through the eastern side, the spooky, gloomy side, without suffering shipwreck. She was an affable, smiling person, not “surly” as Aymara people. She helped us with the tent and went immediately for water, returning with companion. They both lighted the fire and came to our help.

A cup of tea, bread and gifts, mainly some mirrors, necklaces and sweets, made them even more affable and talkative. They told us that most of the men of the island were out working at the mines, extracting boron and saltpetre in the coasts of Chile. Afterwards, and upon our request, they went to their hamlets and came back with some relatives, European style clad Indians who would perfectly speak Spanish and could read. They joined us in the tent and we had a nice chat in Castilian language. They also understood perfectly Aymara and Keshua languages but rejected the possibility of having a language of their own. We also offered some gifts such as cigarettes, bread, illustrated leaflets, newspapers, and pocket knives. After these introductions, essential when one deals with Indians, we asked them to sell us a lamb for next day’s meal and gave them some money. Immediately, one of them turned to a female Indian, the one we met upon our arrival, and he uttered some words in a language that was neither Keshua nor Aymara. These words warned me in a fruitful way for my research by means of the chat.

I invited these Indian “gentlemen” with some cognac I carried in my medicine chest, and after a couple of minutes we became the best of all friends.

My new acquaintances became extremely talkative and then lapsed into the room of confidences. I was eloquently telling about my long stay and studies among Uru and Chipaya people and, finally, I showed two of my leaflets with photographs and a vocabulary on both languages. I told them I was a writer and that, through my books, I made it public everywhere
the existence of these people, the oldest of the continent. I added that they were the last remains of an ancient and noble race that occupied the whole region and that, long ago, were deprived of it by the ferocious and warrior Kollas. Finally, I told my friends that they themselves were members of that race and that, therefore, should know that language. Up to that moment, I was thinking of them as Chipayas and with that vocabulary at hand I asked some questions, articulating some main words such as water, fire, rain, man, woman, children, parts of the body, and so on. I do not know whether the heavy dose of cognac or the desire I had to tell something about them in the papers and the pictured book on the island I promised to write, turned down any wariness and so they keenly proceeded with the translation of those words into their native language. I immediately noticed it was a very ancient language, more similar to Uru than to Chipaya. Later on, in other conversations we held, they told me that they would never tell anybody they belonged to another race, because of the contempt Aymara people showed to those who would speak another native language, but that from times immemorial they did inhabit the island and that they only recurred to their old language when they wanted to communicate between themselves out of the comprehension of foreigners. It is then that I suggested they could help in my research on the island, by excavating some skulls from the ‘Chullperios’\(^1\). They categorically refused to do so without giving any explanation, but I, based on my multiple experiences from other travels, understood the reasons for the refusal (as Altiplano Indians believe superstitiously that when an ancestor’s tomb is excavated, they catch the “chaka-chullpa”, i.e. bone of the deceased, and that they get ill and die afterwards.) [\textit{Text in footnote}]

I thought it wise to stop insisting and, taking chance of the familiarity already established, I chose some types of different somatic features and started by measuring their heads. After this I told them that in order to prove that “they were truly descent of the ancient and noble race that lived in the island and built the houses with stone roofs before them”, it was necessary to obtain some skulls to compare the measurements with those obtained. Urged by self-esteem feelings and the desire of confirming that they really were the descent of the old sovereigns of the beautiful island, they accepted to excavate in Puka-Chullpa the next day. As a result, I was able to obtain, apart from some coarse ceramics, two perfectly preserved skulls belonging to male and female people. The male presented a magnificent healed trephine close to the left mastoid, 5 cm long and 3 cm width… We took these trophies to the tent where the good and intelligent natives anxiously and in agitation observed my work. I opened the calipers box of Martín and started to measure the skulls. I immediately measured again my easy going collaborators and compared the indexes that resulted identical to those of the pure race. I noticed when measuring not a uniformity of race in the Island Panza, but the intrusion of Kolla elements, same as in Titicaca islands.

I explained, the best I could, what “indexes” were and its value for a comparative study on races; I ignore whether they understood my rough lesson on physical anthropology, but I found that in the end they were convinced and felt proud of belonging to the same race of those who gave life to the excavated skulls in PUKA CHULLPA. I saw in their blessed faces the intimate satisfaction they experienced and I noticed the great respect and fondness with which they then packed in bales those skulls.

From all verifications I carried out, I obtained evidence that families residing in the island of Panza are partly “pure Urus” and partly “Urus mixed with Kollas”, as well as Kollas apparently pure on the grounds of their conspicuous anthropological “habitus”; all of them in the first level of assimilation, intelligent people, able to understand concepts and free from any moral flaw. Men have clearly received fair instruction, most of them working already since very young age in the Pacific coasts.

With the money these sober workers earn in the saltpetre refiners, they buy fabrics and clothing for their women. They raise considerable amounts of cattle and in short they enjoy economic prosperity. As far as women are concerned, they remain in the same situation as in the

\(^{1}\) Burial places where ancestors were buried in times immemorial. The ancestors themselves are called \textit{Chullpa} in Aymara language, that is, mummy, well preserved body from ancient tombs (my clarification).
old days in respect of language, culture, and attire. Their nose is wider than that of men, which is also evident from the excavated female skull…

The body of the inhabitant of Panza is slender and brawny; the stature is taller than that of the Altiplano inhabitants but the thoracic capacity is smaller. The skull is dolichocephalous in the case of pure types, and the nose is wide, slightly curved. The individuals with Kolla blood relationship are leptosomic, hyper brachicephalous and have very aquiline nose. I have selected one from each type for the superficial metric investigation, having measured only four men and two women in total because of my poor physical condition…

The Uru person clearly loves his island and even when he might have the advantageous chance of getting married in the Pacific coast, he would not take it and prefer to come back to his piece of ground, scoured by salt water from the Poopó, where he would marry one of his relatives.

I repeat I have been only three days in Panza, and my notes are rather deficient. It would be interesting to carry on wider research in the field and excavate the sites where the ancient strata of the culture lie.'
Appendix 3

The following is an account of what life was like, ‘before time’ came to exist within the context of Andean population. It was collected by Thomas Abercrombie (1998) and draws from storytelling of layra timpu, time before time that is. Although he has collected it as layra = the past, and translates it as ‘an earlier age, a time long past; lit.[erally] “eye space-time”’ among the K’ultas of the eastern Andes (1998, p. 518), the Aymara word for ‘eye’ is nayra and timpu, in the lips of K’ultas (and Abercrombie), it is the Spanish word for time = tiempo.

The title of the story that I quote below is translated as ‘Tatala-Jesucristo and the Supay-Chullpas’. Tatala, also known as ‘Jesucristo’ or Jesus Christ, is associated with the sun because, Abercrombie explains, the ‘pidginized intercultural discourse of missionary Christianity… facilitated the equation of Christ (whose radiance and enlightened teachings Spaniards portrayed in straightforwardly solar terms, such as Christ’s radiant halo and the sun-shaped monstrance in which the consecrated host was displayed) and the sun (in whose golden brilliance and glittering rays pre-Columbian Andeans had envisaged their redemption from a disorderly and watery past).’ (1998 p. 326, my emphasis). Therefore Jesucristo is the sun and, as ‘a philosophy of conquest and the identity transformation it entails’, Jesucristo takes on the world-transforming role once granted to local deities (such as Tunupa and Viracocha), and this Solar-Christ and Supay-Chullpas story ‘makes no room for today’s K’ulta people to claim pre-Christian ancestors’ (1998, p. 325, my emphasis).

For a better understanding of the title of the story, I provide the following further clarifications:

Tatala: Aymara (Ay.) term to designate Jesus Christ. Suffix ntix in the title approximately denotes belonging.

Supay: (Ay.) Devil or evil spirit. This new meaning of a word that originally was intended to designate spirit beings or forces (Harrington 1989, pp. 45, 137), was forged during the colonial period.

Chullpas: (Ay.) Aboriginal people who would have existed in a presolar age; by the same token, preconquest tombs are known under this name.

Jesucristo-Tatalantix Supaytinsi-Chullpantix

Tatala and the Supay-Chullpas were enemies, they say. The Chullpas chased Tatala, a foreign, old man, and finally were able to kill him because they were many and he only one. They buried him in the earth and put thorns (chh’api) on top. They waited, then went away. Later they discovered that he had escaped. They caught him and buried him again, this time putting a large stone on top. They waited and waited, but when they left, again he escaped. They went after him. While following his trail, the Chullpas asked some other people if they had seen the fleeing old man. These people pointed out the ashes of his cooking fire, and from the ashes’ appearance the Chullpas believed that he was long gone. (Here don Bartolomé [the storyteller], explains that this refers to a deceit in which the ashes, from a bush called sak’a sunchu, only appear to be
old.) Exactly at this point the Chullpas became frightened. They learned (or remembered) that it had been foretold that the old man would conquer them if he got away.

Frantically, they built strong houses; and since Tatala had gone off to the West, they built all with doors facing east, to protect themselves from the heat and light of Tatala’s fire. Tatala rose into the sky as the sun from the east, and the Chullpas died in their houses, burned and dried up by the heat. To this day, one can see their remains, and the sun, Tata Awatiri, continues to travel across the sky. Some of the Chullpas, however, managed to escape by diving under the water of Lake Poopó. That is why there are still some Chullpa people alive [Uru people, that is]. (In Abercrombie 1998, pp. 323–4).

§

I would add that the Spaniards, rhetorically speaking, came from the east.
The text that follows has been translated by myself from the paper De los Señoríos a las Comunidades: el caso de Quillacas (From Lordships to Communities: the case of Quillacas), presented by Rossana Barragán and Ramiro Molina Rivero, at the Annual Meeting of Ethnology held at the National Museum for Ethnography and Folklore – MUSEF, La Paz, Bolivia (25–27 August 1987).

Asanaques, Tunupa and other names appearing in the text are the current names for prominent mountains in the landscape surrounding the research area and have, therefore, been assimilated as part of the sacred wak'as, or places and place spirits that may be represented by hills, rivers, stones, or any other object in the Andes. As such, they were and are still seen as founding spirits or protector spirits that the Spaniards associated with Lucifer or evil beings (Harrington 1989, pp. 45–7) in colonial times.

The Legend of Tunupa

One day Asanaques married Tunupa and they had many children. Asanaques was an old white bearded man and the main Mallku1 in the region, and Tunupa was a young and beautiful woman who wore ten skirts and ten underskirts.

The old Asanaques was a jealous husband of the beautiful Tunupa, causing the young woman a lot of pain. So, one day, after too much suffering, the young Tunupa decided to leave towards the coast leaving behind a small child at a place called Huari, and another son near to Sevaruyo, known currently by the name of ‘fat hill’ (Cerro Gordo).

While striding out for the coast, Tunupa stayed one night at a place in Quillacas where she made a small fire to cook some food, giving origin in this way to two hills: Santa Barbara and San Juan Mallku, where the present town of Quillacas was founded.

On the next day, still striding out for the west, Tunupa took off her small shoes so that she could cross the river at a place known today as the small hill of Sato. Once she reached the other side of the river she decided to take a rest, leaving her faeces in that place, then to be known as a hill named Pedro Santos Willka where the present village of Pampa Aullagas is located.

Headed towards the south, near Tambillo, Tunupa dug the field to build her Tiwaraña so as to obtain some quinua, this food she kept for the rest of her journey. Following her way southwards and at a place called Jayu Cota, she dug again and then poured in her milk which she left for her smaller son who was following her. This place is presently a small reddish salt pan because it originated in the mother's milk that had not yet been used for breast feeding. Farther, Tunupa left behind her sick son who was affected by smallpox and who was called Salviani, the name of a hill with many holes.

She went and followed her way until she arrived to the salt pans of Uyuni, where she met two young and handsome men, Cora Cora and Achacollo or big hill; she made their acquaintance and they persuaded her to stay in that place.

Soon enough, the two young men started to court her, the beautiful Tunupa. The fame of her beauty had reached distant places and attracted the attention of well known Mallku [men/mountain] such as Sabaya and Aconcagua. It was said that even Mallku Sabaya sent his army to conquer Tunupa and that he failed to succeed.

1 See Glossary.
Meanwhile, the two courting young men started to fight against each other trying to obtain Tunupa’s attention, and this lead to a war. Cora Cora hurt Achacollo by means of a stone thrown to his heart, and he bled copiously. For that reason the hill we see today looks completely dry. On the other hand, the hill Achacollo threw also a stone to Cora Cora, hurting his bladder and opening many holes in it. Still today this hill has many springs of water originating in the interior of it. In this way, and ever since, the beautiful Tunupa belonged to the region (see Fig. A4.1).

Interpretation

The two most important characters of the legend, Tunupa and Asanaques, are two conspicuous volcanoes in the region, associated with the powers of fire coming from the interior of the earth, also known as the Ukupacha. These characters become anthropomorphic by means of analogies that try to orderly place things in this world and represent the origin of culture for the region. Both are represented as the human dual entities Mallku and T’alla, involved in an oppositional and conflictive relationship giving place to Tunupa's story. The legend therefore describes the actions carried out by Tunupa, who re-appears in the region where the chronicler Ramos Gavilán (1621) had precisely registered her disappearance.

The etymology of the word Tunupa refers to the term tunu which, according to Bertonio (1612) means "the stock of trees and plants"; and tunu achachi which means "man or woman that are some family’s stock"; and tunu lari which means "the stock from where women originated".

As a consequence Tunupa clearly represents in this case the mythical origin of the region. In this respect it is important to note that if the Tunupa of the North is represented by the male gender, in this case it is the female gender that plays the role thus uncovering a direct association between tunu and Tunupa.

The journey of Tunupa, while creating new settlements for population that will become later on a confederation of various ethnic groups, suggests a beginning for a civilisation process: the making of a fire at Quillacas, the shoe forgotten at the hill Sato, the process of preparing quinua fields, as well as the pouring of milk that will become the Jayu Cota salt region, thus submitting us to the origins of civilisation.

Finally, Tunupa is the T’alla of the old Asanaques who, because of his excessive jealousy, abandons him and starts a journey headed to the coast, leaving behind a son in Huari and another one in Sevaruyo. Furthermore Tunupa, because of her relationship with different hills such as Cora-Cora, Achocallo, Sabaya and even Aconcagua, personified as men, marks a geographic space as well.

Tunupa is clearly structuring a space for a territory that, surprisingly, coincides in great part with the space occupied by the so-called Federation of Quillacas. Furthermore, being the legend a civilising narrative of a female heroin in a space inhabited mostly by Uru people, it has possibly been used as an ideological mechanism to consolidate Aymara socio-economic and cultural hegemony and, finally, the legend is preserved fresh in the oral memory of the descent of the great Federation.

---

2 My translation and summary, after Barragán and Molina's account of the text. The authors make it clear that a symbolic analysis is not contemplated at this stage, rather the intention of defining and marking a territory evoking the space occupied by the old ethnic confederation of the Quillacas.

3 See Glossary.
Appendix 5

Dress Style in the Andes

Figure A5.1 Cholitas in a contest for “Cholita Paceña” in 2005 – Cholitas en concurso para “Cholita Paceña” en 2005 (La Prensa, La Paz)
Figure A5.2 Cholita dressed to dance in Gran Poder celebration in May 2006 – Cholita vestida para bailar en la fiesta del Gran Poder en mayo 2006 (La Prensa, La Paz)

Figure A5.3 Cholita from La Paz – Cholita from La Paz
Figure A5.4 Melchor Maria Mercado drawings of 19th century: *Indios, Mestisos. Republica Boliviana.* La Paz – Dibujos del siglo XIX de Melchor Maria Mercado: *Indios, Mestisos. Republica Boliviana.* La Paz (Google Images taken from: http://www.payer.de/bolivien2/bolivien0210.htm)

Figure A5.5 Melchor Maria Mercado drawings of 19th century: *Urus, Amita* – Dibujos del siglo XIX de Melchor Maria Mercado: *Urus, Amita.*
Figure A5.6 Melchor Maria Mercado drawings of 19th century: *India de Puna, Alcalde, Cholita de Segunda* – Dibujos del siglo XIX de Melchor Maria Mercado: *India de Puna, Alcalde, Cholita de Segunda* (Google Images taken from: http://www.payer.de/bolivien2/bolivien0210.htm)

Figure A5.7 BBC: *Urus – Old Culture* (2005) - BBC: *Urus – Antigua Cultura* (imagen de 2005)
Figure A5.8 BBC: *Urus* (2005) – BBC: *Urus* (imagen de 2005)

Figure A5.9 BBC: *Urus* (2005) – BBC: *Urus* (imagen de 2005)
Appendix 6

La Razón is one of the largest daily newspapers in La Paz and the following is an editorial note published on August 2, 2006. I present the original digital version and then my translation of the text into English. The reader should by now be able to evaluate by her/himself, not only the contents but also the approach that media, written in this case, usually presents to the readers to be informed about the so-called Bolivian ethnic groups.

§

LA RAZÓN Edición Digital – Miercoles, Agosto 2 de 2006

Editorial / Nota del Día

La cultura Chipaya

En la Cámara de Diputados se halla en trámite un proyecto de ley para declarar a la cultura Chipaya como Patrimonio Cultural e Intangible de Bolivia. Se trata de una excelente iniciativa, pero el homenaje no tendría que reducirse a un gesto simbólico, sino a la puesta en marcha de un programa dirigido a rescatar de la extinción a aquella histórica etnia.

Según las investigaciones antropológicas, la cultura Chipaya tiene una antigüedad de más de 2.500 años antes de Cristo, con lo que se convertiría en la más antigua del continente. Pertenece a la llamada cultura Wankarani, que es anterior a Tiwanaku, que sólo cuenta con 1.500 años de existencia.

Estos antecedentes justifican plenamente que el Congreso Nacional se apreste a proclamar como patrimonio nacional lo que queda de la cultura Chipaya, de esta manera se espera que se haga todo lo necesario para reponer sus antiguas particularidades, así como para conservarla como la mayor reliquia antropológica del país.

La población de Chipaya se encuentra a 188 kilómetros de la ciudad de Oruro. Sus 1.500 habitantes son celosos en conservar su estirpe y sus costumbres, por lo que hablan el puquina, para evitar la influencia del aymara, el quechua o el castellano.

Una de las características más singulares que tienen es que habitan viviendas circulares, muy parecidas a los iglú de los esquimales. Se considera que esta es una sabia manera de combatir el frío. Los chipayas llaman a sus viviendas putukus. Es lamentable, empero, que al presente existan también viviendas con techos de calamina y estructuras rectangulares, lo que está desnaturalizando la identidad de un gran vestigio cultural. Esto tendría que ser corregido, de forma de mantener intacta la identidad de los chipayas.

§

My translation:

The Chipaya culture

A project of law is currently in the hands of the Chamber of Deputies for proclaiming the Chipaya culture Cultural and Intangible Patrimony of Bolivia. It is a remarkable initiative but
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the homage should not be restricted to a symbolic gesture. Rather, it should aim at the setting into motion a programme directed to rescue from extinction such a historical ethnic group.

According to anthropological investigations, the Chipaya culture is as old as 2500 years before Christ, which would make it the most ancient of the continent. It belongs to the so called Wankarani culture and it precedes Tiwanaku which is only 1500 years old.

This background validates in full the National Congress decision to proclaim as national patrimony what is left of the Chipaya culture, and it is expected that no effort will be spared to reinstate their ancient particulars as well as to preserve it as the highest anthropological relic of the country.

The Chipaya village is located 188 kilometres far from the city of Oruro. Its 1500 inhabitants are zealous in preserving their lineage and customs, a reason why they speak Puquina so as to avoid the influence of the Aymara, the Quechua or the Castellano language.

One of their most striking characteristics is that they live in circular houses, very similar to the Eskimo igloos. It is believed that this is a wise way of coping with the cold clime. The Chipayas call their houses putukus. However, it is regrettable that there are also houses with corrugated tin roofs and rectangular structures nowadays. This is denaturing the identity of a great cultural vestige. This should be corrected, so as to keep intact the identity of the Chipayas.
Figure 1 a–c. (a) Map of South America, (b) Map of Bolivia, (c) Map of Lake Poopó – (a) Mapa de Sud América, (b) Mapa de Bolivia, (c) Mapa del Lago Poopó (prepared by Markku Pyykönen)
Figure III.1 Map of the Territory occupied by the Urus in ancient times - Mapa del Territorio antiguamente ocupado por los Urus (In: Créqui-Montfort & Rivet, 1925-1927)

Figure III.2 Repartition of Urus in the southern Andes and the “aquatic axis” in the 16th century – Repartición de los Urus en los Andes meridionales y el “eje acuático” (After Wachtel 1978, pp. 1128-29)

Figure III.3 The Chipaya Territory – El territorio Chipaya (In Wachtel 1990, p. 15 fig. 1)
Figure IV.1 Abercrombie’s rendering for the layout of reducciones after Matienzo’s 1567 recommendation, Fig. 6.3 – Interpretación de Abercrombie sobre la disposición de las reducciones, según las recomendaciones de Matienzo en 1567, Fig. 6.3 (In: Abercrombie 1998, p. 240. New York Public Library, MS Rich 74, fol.38r)

Figure IV.2 Approximate depiction of Pampa Aullagas town, following Abercrombie’s 1998, p. 240 – Representación aproximada del pueblo de Pampa Aullagas, según Abercrombie 1998, p. 240
Figure IV.19 Pairumani: occupation pattern – Pairumani: dibujo del patron de asentamiento (elaboración: Denis Rodas)

Figure IV.20 Map of the estancias of Moratos depicting Calzar Vintu – Mapa de las estancias de los Moratos del Lago Poopó donde se muestra Calzar Vintu (Wachtel 1990, p. 234 Figure 44)
Figure IV.22 Calzar Vintu: drawing of llama wool strings and details – Dibujo de tesado de *waskas* de lana de llama con detalles (dibujo: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.24 Calzar Vintu: drawing detail of traps for *pariwanas* – Dibujo de detalle de las trampas para *pariwanas* (dibujo: Aida Ferreyra)
Kinship Diagram Nr 1: The Calle family, Asurcollu, Ayllu Suxtita – Esquema de Parentesco No. 1: Familia Calle, Asurcollu, Ayllu Suxtita (prepared with the help of Markku Pyykönen)
**Figure V.3** Asurcollu: occupation pattern - patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

**Figure V.4** Asurcollu: occupation pattern at the *choza* – patrón de asentamiento en la *choza* (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

**Figure V.5** Asurcollu: stone utensils: batán or grinder, mill, batea or stone container, *takira* – utensilios de piedra: batán, molino, batea de piedra, *takira* (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)
Figure V.8 Challa: occupation pattern – Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.10 Challapuju: occupation pattern – Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)
Figure V.11 Challapujo: kitchen with stove and detail of stone batán – Cocina con fogón y detalle del batán de piedra (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.12 Challapujo: corral with tola walls; choza of Teodoro Lázaro; detail of the batán or grinder – Corral con paredes de tola, choza de Teodoro Lázaro, detalle del batán (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)
Figure V.14 Tola Collu: occupation pattern – Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.15 Tola Collu drawings: occupation pattern at the choza – Patrón de asentamiento en la choza (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.16 Tola Collu drawings: kitchen, oven for pampaku and metal and adobe covers or lids – Cocina, horno para pampaku y tapas de lata y de adobe (elaboración: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.17 Tola Collu drawings: *pirwa* for storing potatoes – *Pirwa* para almacenar papas (elaboración: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.18 Tola Collu drawings: cultivation tools – Herramientas de cultivo (elaboración: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.19 Tola Collu drawings: details of rope (*phala*) for tying up the sticks for the roof; animal representations (*illas*) at the chapel – Detalle de la soga (*phala*) para amarrar el techo; representaciones de animales (*illas*) en la capilla (elaboración: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.21 Añawani: occupation pattern—Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.22 Añawani: henpen—Gallinero (elaboración: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.25 Jaransirka: occupation pattern—Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)
Figure V.27 Nueva Florida: occupation pattern - Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.29 Kalpata: occupation pattern – Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)
Figure V.31 Bella Vista or Ukatujo: occupation pattern – Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Mónica Sullka)

Figure V.38 Lupikpa: occupation pattern – Patrón de asentamiento (elaboración: Denis Rodas)
Figure V.41: Occupation Patterns on Mount Pedro Santos Wilka

Distribution of Ayllus

Ayllu Guillama
Ayllu Choro
Ayllu Sakatiri
Ayllu Quillana
Ayllu Chupa
Ayllu Suktita
Ayllu Sakatiri

Distriubution of Ayllus

Ayllu Willka
Ayllu Taxa
Ayllu Jivapacha

Figure V.41
FIGURE V.42
Occupation Patterns on Lake Poopó shores
Territory of Ayllu Suxtita
Figure V.43 Occupation patterns on Lake Poopó shores: Diagram of Janta in Chullpa – Diagrama de la jant’a de Chullpa (elaboración: F. Herschend)
Kinship Diagram Nr 2: Uru-Murato families, Calzar Vintu, Ayllu Sakatiri – Esquema de Parentesco No. 2: Familias Uru-Murato, Calzar Vintu, Ayllu Sakatiri (prepared with the help of Markku Pyykönen)
Figure VI.1 The three settlement areas selected between Pampa Aullagas and Asurcollu, close to River Lakajawira and Lake Poopó – Las tres áreas de asentamiento seleccionadas entre Pampa Aullagas y Asurcollu, en las cercanías del río Lakajawira y el lago Poopó (elaboración: F. Herschend)
Figure VI.7 Schematic drawing of the ruins of Calzar Vintu – Dibujo esquemático de las ruinas de Calzar Vintu (elaboración: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.17 a-b. Calzar Vintu: diagram (a): profile of round structure, diagram (b): diameter of round structure - Diagrama (a): perfil de la estructura redonda, diagrama (b): diámetro de la estructura redonda (elaboración: F. Herschend)
**Figure VI.32** The principle of the Asurcollu circular structure – El principio que rige la estructura circular de Asurcollu (elaboración: F. Herschend)

**Figure VII.5** a-c. Figs. 129-130-131 in Gasparini & Margolies (1980:145): (a) Fig. 129. Department of Oruro. The two types of Chipaya house: the *putuku*, which is closed with corbelled vault, and the type with a thatched dome, (b) Fig. 130. Plan of a dwelling in the Yacha settlement of Wakan. Rooms arranged around a courtyard. The structures close their corbelled vaults with long slabs. Roofs are flat and accessible, (c) Fig. 131. Cross-section of one of the Wakan rooms – (a) Fig. 129. Departamento de Oruro. Los dos tipos de casas Chipaya: el *putuku*, cerrado con cúpula redondeada, y el tipo con techo de paja (b) Fig. 130. Plano de una vivienda en el asentamiento Yacha de Wakan. Habitaciones dispuestas alrededor de un patio. Las estructuras cierran sus cúpulas redondeadas con losas largas. Encima tienen techos planos accesibles, (c) Fig. 131. Corte de sección de una de las habitaciones de Wakan.
Figure VI.33 The circular structure in Asurcollu with the alignment of chapel and altars – La estructura circular en Asurcollu con el alineamiento de la capilla y los altares (elaboración: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.34 Map of the survey and sampling areas, and the alignment between the chapel in Asurcollu and Pampa Aullagas – Mapa de la prospección y muestreo, y el alineamiento entre la capilla de Asurcollu y Pampa Aullagas (elaboración: F. Herschend)
**Figure VII.6** a-b. Figures 133-134 in Gasparini & Margolies (1980:148): (a) Fig. 133. A group of Chipaya *putuku* type houses built of sod blocks laid in horizontal courses, covered by corbelling, (b) Fig. 134. Cross-section of a Chipaya *putuku* - (a) Fig. 133. Un grupo de *putukus* Chipaya construidos con *champas* colocadas horizontalmente y logrando el cierre completo mediante la cúpula, (b) Fig. 134. Corte de sección de un *putuku* Chipaya.

**Figure VII.7** Figure 142 in Gasparini & Margolies (1980, p. 155): Sillustani. Cross-section of the “lizard” chullpa. The corbelled vault ends much lower down the convex hemisphere; it is a formal solution with no structural purpose – Sillustani: corte de sección de la chullpa “lagarto”. La cúpula redondeada termina mucho más abajo del hemisferio convexo; se trata de una solución formal sin ningún propósito estructural.
Figure A4.1 The route of Tunupa, according to Ramiro Molina – La ruta de Tunupa, según Ramiro Molina (1989, p. 47)
Figure II.1 Lake Poopó – El lago Poopó (prepared by Markku Pyykönen)
Figure II.2 Waldseemüller’s map of America in 1507 – Mapa de América según Waldseemüller en 1507
(Courtesy of http://www.1421.tv/assets/images/maps/waldseemuller.jpg)
Figure III.4 A Chipaya girl with plaited hairdo – Joven Chipaya, Oruro, Bolivia (Bolivian Photo Agency)
**Figure IV.3** Pampa Aullagas from the upper altar of the calvario on Mount Pedro Santos Willka. River Lakajawira to the front, and the road to Orinoca on the right – Fotografía de Pampa Aullagas desde el altar superior del calvario sobre el cerro Pedro Santos Willka. Río Lakajawira en frente y camino a Orinoca hacia la derecha (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

**Figure IV.4** Angel Copa, Municipality Intendant of Pampa Aullagas (left). Alfonso Choque, Jilaqata of ayllu Choro (right), both born in Choro. They stand in front of the “Three Wise Men”, i.e. the staffs representing their authority – Izquierda: Angel Copa, Intendente Municipal de Pampa Aullagas. Derecha: Alfonso Choque, Jilaqata del ayllu Choro. Ambos son de Choro y están parados frente a los “Tres Reyes Magos”, como denominan a los bastones de mando que representan su autoridad (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure IV.5 Pampa Aullagas: a ruined chapel in the graveyard – Pampa Aullagas: capilla en ruinas en el cementerio (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.6 Pampa Aullagas: skull and offerings at the altar of the graveyard chapel - Pampa Aullagas: calavera y ofrendas en el altar de la capilla en ruinas (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.7 Pampa Aullagas: offerings in All Saints day at one of the tombs at the graveyard – Pampa Aullagas: mesa en Todos Santos para una de las tumbas (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.8 Pampa Aullagas: preste of the fiesta San Miguel, September 2002 - Pampa Aullagas: preste de la fiesta de San Miguel en septiembre 2002 (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure IV.9  Pampa Aullagas: people participating in the fiesta San Miguel, September 2002 – Pampa Aullagas: participantes en la fiesta de San Miguel en septiembre 2002 (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.10  Pampa Aullagas: girls dancing Tinku in the fiesta San Miguel, September 2002 – Jóvenes del pueblo bailando tinku en la fiesta de San Miguel en septiembre 2002 (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.11  Niches in the interior walls of the circular enclosure in San Miguel de Uruquilla – Los nichos en el interior de la estructura circular en San Miguel de Uruquilla (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure IV.12  Two square chullpas in San Miguel de Uruquilla – Dos chullpas cuadradas en San Miguel de Uruquilla (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
**Figure IV.13** Pairumani: general view of the ruins on the slope of Mount Santos Willka with Lakajawira River in the distance – Pairumani: vista general de las ruinas sobre las faldas del cerro Santos Willka con el río Lakajawira en el fondo (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

**Figure IV.14** Pairumani: house with stone walls but without roof – Pairumani: casa con muros de piedra y sin techo (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

**Figure IV.15** Pairumani: stoves – Pairumani: fogones (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure IV.16 Pairumani: *batán* and *morokos* or *morocos* (Sp.), *muruq’u* (Ay.) - Pairumani: batanes y morocos (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.17 Pairumani: *takira* or grinder - *Takira* o meledor (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.18 Pairumani: only house with roof and door – Pairumani: única vivienda con techo y puerta (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure IV.21 Calzar Vintu: llama wool strings or *waskas*, prepared for Julián Choque’s traps – Tesado de *waskas* de lana de llama para las trampas de Julián Choque (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.23 Calzar Vintu: Julián Choque showing a *chalalawa* trap for *pariwanas* (flamingos) – Julián Choque mostrando una trampa *chalalawa* para *pariwanas* (flamencos) – (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.25 Julián Choque at his house in Calzar Vintu, next to his boat or *warco* – Julián Choque en su casa de Calzar Vintu, junto a su bote o *warco* (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure IV.26 Calzar Vintu: one of Julián Choque’s houses facing River Lakajawira – Una de las casas de Julián Choque frente al río Lakajawira (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.27 Calzar Vintu: the other house next to a pile of champas with a stick or kero to thrust the boat, and chalalawa sticks – La otra casa de Julián Choque junto a champas donde se ven el kero o vara para impulsar el barco y varas para chalalawa (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure IV.28 Calzar Vintu: close-up of the implements close to the two houses with the oar or tawiña on the upper right – Primer plano de los implementos ubicados entre las dos casas. Al fondo se ve una tawiña o remo (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure IV.29 Calzar Vintu: Julián Choque’s tawiña or two-end oar – Remo de dos paletas o tawiña de Julián Choque (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.1 Máxima Chaparro, Jilaqata of Suxtita with staff and portable stove for burning offerings, in the back: *aguayo* with three other staffs or “Reyes Magos” (the three Wise Men) – Máxima Chaparro, Jilaqata de Suxtita con bastón de mando e incensario para quemar ofrendas. Al fondo: *aguayo* con otros “Reyes Magos” (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.2 Asurcollu: the corral next to the choza – Corral junto a la choza (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.6 Asurcorllu: the larger altar with the image of Santa Veracruz Tata – El altar mayor con la imagen de Santa Veracruz Tata (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure V.7 Asurcorllu: the aluminium candle holders with “butterfly” wings – Los candelabros de aluminio con “alas de mariposa” (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure V.9 Challla: stove – Fogón (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.13 Challapujo: adobe corral – Corral de adobes (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.20 Tola Collu: llama and sheep illas at the chapel – Illas de llama y oveja en la capilla (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.23 Añawani: henpen - Gallinero (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.24 Añawani: llama phoetus or sullu – Feto de llama o sullu (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.26 Jaransirka: the houses and the quinua field with a scarecrow in the front – Las casas y el área de cultivo de quinua con espantapájaros (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.28 Nueva Florida: view of the houses – Vista de las viviendas (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.30 Kalpata: henpen/oven – Gallinero/horno (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.32 Bella Vista: the well – El pozo (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.33 Kaqasa: one of the houses with stone basement, corral and cultivation areas on Mount Pedro Santos Willka – Una de las casas con cimientos de piedra; al fondo: corral y áreas de cultivo en el cerro Pedro Santos Willka (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.34 Kaqasa: kitchen with oven – Cocina con fogón (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.35 Kaqasa: sheep corral; back: Ayllu Sakatiri – Corral de ovejas. Al fondo: Ayllu Sakatiri (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure V.36 Kaqasa: well covered with a heap of white and reddish stones – Pozo de agua cubierto con piedras blancas y rojizas (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.37 Kaqasa: wirjiña with totora reeds – Wirjiña con totoras (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)

Figure V.39 Lupikipa: henpen and chicken – Gallinero y gallina (fotografía: Aida Ferreyra)
Figure VI.2 River Lakajawira and the dunes in Pampa Aullagas – El río Lakajawira y las dunas en Pampa Aullagas (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.3 The dunes on the road to Orinoca from Pampa Aullagas – Las dunas en el camino a Orinoca desde Pampa Aullagas (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.4 River Lakajawira and Lake Poopó from Mount Santos Willka in Pampa Aullagas – El río Lakajawira y el lago Poopó desde el cerro Santos Willka en Pampa Aullagas (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.5 The fields on the slopes of Mount Santos Willka covered with snow in July 2002 – Los campos en las laderas del cerro Santos Willka cubiertas de nieve en julio 2002 (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.6 The dunes between Calzar Vintu, Pairumani and Sakatiri – Las dunas entre Calzar Vintu, Pairumani y Sakatiri (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.8 The landscape in the second settlement area – El paisaje en la segunda área de asentamiento (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.9 The fore and aft of the small boat in the second settlement area – La parte delantera y trasera de un bote en la segunda área de asentamiento (fotografía: F. Herschend)
**Figure VI.10** The so-called champas in the second settlement area – Las denominadas champas en la segunda área de asentamiento (fotografía: F. Herschend)

**Figure VI.11** Burnt-off tola shrubs close to the corrals in the second settlement area – Arbustos quemados de tola cerca de los corrales en la segunda área de asentamiento (fotografía: F. Herschend)
Figure VI.12 A sheep corral on the slope of mount Santos Willka - Un corral de ovejas en la ladera del cerro Santos Willka (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.13 Preparing a llama for the slaughter in a corral in Asurcollu – Preparando una llama para sacrificarla en un corral de Asurcollu (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.14 Llama dung next to the corrals in the second settlement area – Guano de llama cerca de los corrales en la segunda área de asentamiento (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.15 Warming up next to a burnt-off tola shrub – Calentándose junto a un arbusto de tola ardiendo (fotografía: F. Herschend)
Figure VI.16 The circular structure in Calzar Vintu in July 2002 – La estructura circular en Calzar Vintu fotografiada en julio 2002 (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.18 Inka Crossing settlement – El asentamiento de Inca Crucero (fotografía: F. Herschend)
Figure VI.19 a-b Potato destined to be converted into *chuño* in July 2002 – Papas listas para la helada que las convertirá en *chuño* en Julio 2002 (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.20 The large corral at Inka Crossing – El enorme corral en Inca Crucero (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.21 The chapel in Asurcollu with the llamas grazing in front – La capilla de Asurcollu con las llamas pastando (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.22 The chapel in Asurcollu seen from the back, facing the outer altar - La capilla de Asurcollu vista desde el lado posterior y frente al altar externo (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.23 The outer altar in front of the chapel of Asurcollu surrounded by a circular structure - El altar externo frente a la capilla de Asurcollu rodeado de una estructura circular (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.24 The debris forming the circular structure next to the outer altar in Asurcollu – Los fragmentos que conforman la estructura circular junto al altar externo en Asurcollu (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.25 The distance between the chapel and the outer altar in Asurcollu – La distancia entre la capilla y el altar externo en Asurcollu (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.26 The excavation of one of the segments in the debris next to the outer altar in Asurcollu – La excavación de uno de los segmentos junto al altar externo en Asurcollu (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.27 The stone lined excavated segment divided into two sections – El segmento excavado con piedras alineadas y dividido en dos secciones (fotografía: F. Herschend)
Figure VI.28 The pair of segments excavated – El par de segmentos excavados (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VI.29 The reproduction of the way the segments were occupied and the miniature representation of a house according to Doña Cristina – Reproducción de la forma de ocupación de los segmentos y la representación de una casa en miniatura según Doña Cristina (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VI.30 The Alasita celebration explained by Doña Cristina – Alasita explicada por Doña Cristina (fotografía: V. Sáenz)

Figure VI.31 Collecting salt in Jayu Quta – Recolectando sal en Jayu Quta (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VII.1 Sebastiana Kespi: interviewed by the media – Sebastiana Kespi entrevistada por la prensa
(¡Oh! November 13, 2005, p. 4)

Figure VII.2 Jorge Ruiz’s son and Sebastiana with her grandchildren – El hijo de Jorge Ruiz y Sebastiana con sus nietos
(¡Oh! November 13, 2005, p. 5)
Figure VII.3a Chipaya houses: (a) view of Chipaya – Casas Chipaya: (a) vista de Chipaya
(In Wachtel 1989, pp. 52-3)

Figure VII.3b Chipaya houses: (b) view of ayllu Aran-Saya – Casas Chipaya: (b) vista del ayllu Aran-Saya (In Wachtel 1989, pp. 52-3)
Figure VII.3c Chipaya houses: (c) sacrifice of llamas – Casas Chipaya: (c) sacrificio de llamas (In Wachtel 1989, pp. 52-3)

Figure VII.4 One putuku in Pampa Aullagas – Un putuku en Pampa Aullagas (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Figure VII.8 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: the houses on the slopes of mount Santos Willka – El paisaje en Pampa Aullagas: las casas en las faldas del cerro Santos Willka (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VII.9 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: traces of occupation – Huellas de ocupación (fotografía: F. Herschend)
Figure VII.10 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: stone walls close to the slopes of mount Santos Willka – Muros de piedra en las faldas del cerro Santos Willka (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VII.11 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: Llamas, dunes and sand – Llamas, dunas y arena (fotografía: F. Herschend)
Figure VII.12 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: Sheep herding – Pastoreo de ovejas (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VII.13 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: Sheep herding with company – Pastoreo de ovejas en compañía (fotografía: F. Herschend)

Figure VII.14 The landscape in Pampa Aullagas: Which is Uru and why? – ¿Cuál es el Uru y por qué? (fotografía: V. Sáenz)
Uru-Chipaya houses in a book-marker

Pariwanas, i.e. flamingos of Lake Poopó

Frands, Aida, Silvia: THANK YOU!
(El Vagón, La Paz, 3 August 2003)