HISTORY, POWER, AND IDENTITY:
AMAZONIAN PERSPECTIVES

Jonathan D. Hill

ABSTRACT
The concept of ethnogenesis offers a theoretical approach to hybridity and syncretism that finessesthe tensions between “New Amazonian Ethnography” and “New Amazonian History” by simultaneously encompassing the study of indigenous ontologies and alternative constructions of history (i.e., “mytho-historical narratives”) as well as the reconstruction of history from all available sources. Ethnogenesis can be defined as a process of authentically re-making new social identities through creatively rediscovering and re-fashioning components of ‘tradition,’ such as oral narratives, written texts, and material artefacts. Understood in these terms, ethnogenesis allows us to explore the cultural creativity of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples alike in the making of new interpretive and political spaces that allow people to construct enduring social identities while moving forward in the globalizing nation-states of Latin America.
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Introduction
Defined as ‘a concept encompassing peoples’ simultaneously cultural and political struggles to create enduring identities in general contexts of radical change and discontinuity’¹, ethnogenesis provides a useful analytical approach to understanding collective identity construction as a historical contestation over a people’s existence and their positioning within and against a general history of political and economic inequality. Among South Americanists, the concept of ethnogenesis has taken its place over the past 10-to-15 years along side other conceptual tools, such as “interethnic friction”².

“tribal zone”3, “regional system of interdependence”4, “mythic history”5, “ethno-ethnohistory”6, and “shamanic history”7, as part of a broader “temporal revolution”8 in the anthropology of indigenous South America that seeks to re-historicize indigenous peoples of the region.

In an essay introducing a recent volume on *Time and Memory in Indigenous Amazonia: Anthropological Perspectives*9, Carlos Fausto and Michael Heckenberger have discussed the simultaneous shift to a “New Amazonian History” and a “New Amazonian Ethnography”. The tension between these two new trends, the former emphasizing the power relations inherent in centuries of colonial and national state expansions across the Americas and the latter privileging indigenous ontologies and alternative histories, underlies much anthropological research in recent decades. It is gratifying to read Fausto and Heckenberger’s conclusion that we can, indeed must, continue to explore this dynamic tension in ways that “recognize that the indigenous systems of representation, still embodied today in the shamanic practices and the poetic evocations of a mythic and historical past, constitute a parallel and very sophisticated approach to the contradictions between nationalism and indigenous identities”10.

But if there is general agreement that the goal of “relating incompossible worlds remains possible, and politically necessary”11, the question of how to pursue this goal continues to generate differences of interpretation, controversy, and some misunderstandings among South Americans. For one thing, their argument that the efficacy of indigenous historical narratives “lies in their very merging of myth and history, and not in any separation of the two”12 and their conclusion that “we must be prepared to explore conceptual equivalences rather than objective identities”13 are gratuitous if not anachronistic, since more than twenty years have elapsed since a group of us Amazonianists and Andeanists documented and interpreted numerous examples of mythic-historical narratives from across South America14. In the wake of this collective effort, it has become common wisdom in anthropology that such mytho-historical narratives must be given serious attention in any theoretical approach to the study of hybridity, syncretic social formations, ethnogenesis, or long-term historical processes of change.

---

12 Ibid, p. 15.
13 Ibid.
By writing about mytho-historical narratives in 2007 as if they were somehow a newly discovered topic, Fausto and Heckenberger weaken what seems like a promising effort to develop a two-pronged theoretical approach based on a synthesis of the “New Amazonian History” and the “New Amazonian Ethnography”. However, reinventing the wheel of mytho-historical narratives is only the first of two serious problems with Fausto and Heckenberger’s theoretical approach. After first asserting that the efficacy of these narratives “lies in their very merging of myth and history, and not in any separation of the two”\(^{15}\), the authors go on to contradict themselves by defining the mythic and historical in polarized, ‘either/or’ terms as exclusive alternatives to one another rather than as a pair of cognitive modes that work together in a variety of creative ways. They reach the bizarre conclusion that “the work of anthropology, as often as not, is not about writing or reconstructing history but about relating alternative histories, each with a unique perspective and voice”\(^{16}\). As much as I agree that relating alternative histories is an important part of our work as South Americanists, I also strongly disagree with the assertion that “anthropology (…) is not about writing or reconstructing history,”\(^{17}\) as I believe that we must make every effort to demonstrate how alternative indigenous histories are relevant to and significant for the broader project of recovering historical knowledge through archaeology, linguistics, ethnomusicology, ecology, botany, history, and other disciplines\(^{18}\).

The concept of ethnogenesis offers a theoretical approach to hybridity and syncretism that fineses the tensions between “New Amazonian Ethnography” and “New Amazonian History” by simultaneously encompassing the study of indigenous ontologies and alternative constructions of history (i.e., “mytho-historical narratives”) as well as the reconstruction of history from all available sources. This approach is rooted in Fredrik Barth’s pioneering approach\(^{19}\) to social differentiation as a process of ethnic boundary-marking and builds upon Edward Spicer’s concept of “persistent identity systems”\(^{20}\) that have endured across centuries of colonial domination. More recently, James Clifford has drawn upon ethnogenesis and related concepts to argue that emerging indigenous American identities are better understood as a creative process of “authentically remaking” rather than “a wholly new genesis, a made-up identity, a postmodernist ‘simulacrum’, or the rather narrowly political ‘invention of tradition’ analyzed by Hobsbawm and Ranger\(^{21}\), with its contrast of lived custom and artificial tradition’”\(^{22}\). Clifford’s elaboration of the assumptions underlying this theoretical approach are worth listing in their entirety, since they encompass a broad range of cultural, social, economic, political, and historical dimensions. Ethnogenesis assumes that:

- “(…) selective, creative cultural memory, border policing, and transgression are fundamental aspects of collective agency.”
- “Culture is articulated, performed, and translated, with varying degrees of power, in specific relational situations.”

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
\(^{17}\) Ibid.
\(^{18}\) I could agree with their conclusion if it were to undergo a simple rewording to read “the work of anthropology, as often as not, is not only about writing or reconstructing history but also about relating alternative histories, each with a unique perspective and voice”.
“Economic pressures and changing governmental policies are very much part of the process, and so are changing ideological contexts.”
“Components of “tradition” oral sources, written texts, and material artefacts are rediscov-ered and rewoven.”
“Attachments to place, to changing subsistence practices, to circuits of migration and family visiting are affirmed”.

Building upon Clifford’s characterization of ethnogenesis as a process of “authentically re-making” new social identities through creatively rediscovering and refashioning components of “tradition”, such as oral narratives, written texts, and material artefacts, this paper will explore how ethnogenesis, hybridity, persistent identities, and related concepts are currently being developed in Amazonianist anthropology. An overview of the “Comparative Arawakan Histories” project will serve as a way of establishing the immediate intellectual context for the much more rigorous integration of research across sub-disciplines that is currently emerging. The concept of ethnogenesis has emerged as an important means for stimulating research that cuts across sub-disciplinary boundaries.

Later sections of the paper will explore some of the research resulting from a series of workshops and meetings that brought together specialists on Amazonian ethnology, archaeology, linguistics, and ethnohistory from Latin America, Europe, and the U.S. These scholars were selected specifically on the basis of their ability to bring their own research specialties to bear on historical issues of ethnogenesis and identity-construction at an initial workshop on “Mapping Cultures” at Lund University in Sweden (2006), a double session on “Long-term Patterns of Ethnogenesis in Indigenous Amazonia” at the American Anthropological Association meetings in Washington, D.C. (2007), and a concluding workshop on “Amazonian Ethno-Linguistics” at Lund University (2008). Specific case studies to be examined will include Eduardo Neves’ study of ethnogenesis in the Central Amazon floodplain and Kay and Franz Scaramell’s work on ethnogenesis and the emergence of “generic indios” in the middle Orinoco region.

Comparative Arawakan Histories Revisited

How and why the project developed

Research on Arawakan languages and cultures of South America and the Caribbean basin confronts a fundamental historical problem: how do we account for the vast geographic distribution of a single language family, and how can we understand similarities and differences among such widely dispersed language groups? The problem is all the more challenging when we look at this vast geographic distribution from a long-term historical perspective. Linguistic reconstruction shows that regions as far apart as the Taino of Cuba, Chané and Terena of southern Brazil, Yanesha and Asháninka of eastern Peru, Pa’ikwene (Palikur) of coastal Brazil were formerly connected by a vast network of Arawak-speaking peoples living in the central Amazon floodplain and its main tributaries. Contemporary Arawak-speaking peoples are found in discrete pockets and clusters at the headwaters of major rivers, including the Orinoco, Negro, Purus, Ucayali, Madeira, and Xingu.

23 Ibid.
The main purpose of the comparative Arawakan histories project was to assemble groups of researchers – primarily ethnologists and historians but also linguists and archaeologists – who had carried out intensive studies of Arawakan histories in specific locales and regions to see how well we could map out the long-term historical changes that had unfolded in various regions during the colonial period, the Rubber Boom, and the recent past. Like the Arawakan peoples themselves, specialists in studies of Arawakan histories find themselves dispersed into separate regions and countries. Bringing a number of them together around a single conference table at Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama City, Panama, was thus a microcosmic reconstruction of the vast Arawakan diaspora that had spanned most of the Caribbean, Orinoco, and Amazon basins before the arrival of European colonizers.

In setting up the conference, we asked participants to give extra attention to interethnic processes of change, such as patterns of alliance with colonial powers, the emergence and long-term commemoration of new religious movements, and constructions of interethnic confederations. We chose these topics because they appeared to offer the greatest probability for stimulating new comparative understandings of how diverse Arawak-speaking peoples navigated traumatic changes set in motion by the expansion of colonial and national states across lowland South America and the Caribbean basin (epidemics, missionization, forced relocations, slavery, and ethnic soldiering). In the course of writing and discussing the papers, other historical themes took on increasing significance, including gender relations, cultural landscapes, ritual and political hierarchies, and linguistic hybridizations.

The two areas where the greatest cultural and linguistic diversity is found among contemporary Arawak-speaking peoples are the Northwest Amazon and the lowlands of eastern Peru. Not surprisingly, these two areas have also received the most attention from anthropological and historical researchers in recent decades. For the Northwest Amazon, we now have in-depth ethnographic studies of the Wakuénai (also known as Curripaco, Kurripako, or Baniwa of Brazil) phratries living in the Isana-Guainía drainage area on all three sides of the Brazil/Colombia/Venezuela border; long-term ethnohistorical analyses of the Piapoco, Baré, and other groups of the Brazilian and Venezue-

---

26 Travel funds for the Conference on “Comparative Arawakan Histories: Rethinking Language Family and Culture Area in Lowland South America” was provided by a Conference Grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) generously provided hotel accommodations, food, and use of the Tucker Conference Center for the gathering of scholars. In addition, STRI paid for my second trip to Panama City to enable me to co-author the introductory essay of the Comparative Arawakan Histories [See: HILL, J. & SANTOS-GRANERO, F. Comparative (…) 2002] volume with Fernando Santos-Granero and covered the costs of translating one of the book’s chapters.

elán Río Negro basin; a collection of Warekena mythic narratives; a complete ethnographic documentation of the Kurripako language; and a series of articles and papers on the archaeology of northern (Maipuran) Arawak-speaking peoples’ expansions through the Negro-Casiquiare-Orinoco region. For the eastern lowlands of Peru and adjacent areas of western Brazil, recent ethnographic and historical studies include important works on the Yaneshas (or Amuesha), Matsiguenga.


Piro\textsuperscript{34}, Asháninka\textsuperscript{35}, and regional ethnohistory\textsuperscript{36}. By the mid-1990s, the Northwest Amazon and eastern Peruvian lowlands provided the two areas where researchers had developed the strongest intraregional comparative knowledge of the long-term historical processes of change that have produced contemporary ethnolinguistic geographies of Arawak-speaking peoples. Comparison across the two regions was the next logical step but would have to confront major differences as well as broadly similar patterns.

The Northwest Amazon and sub-Andean lowlands served as the main points for anchoring the comparative Arawakan histories project. Broadening the scope of comparison to include Arawak-speaking peoples in other key areas – Orinoco basin, circum-Caribbean region, eastern Bolivia, upper Xingu, and north-eastern Brazil – was designed to fill in some of the massive spatial and temporal discontinuities that have developed over centuries of western state expansion in Lowland South America.

**Sacred Landscapes as Environmental Histories**

The catalyst or spark that set cross-regional comparisons in motion was an article published in *American Ethnologist* on the toponymic ‘writing’ of history among the Yanesha of Peru\textsuperscript{37}. The author discerned strong Andean influences in the multiple ways in which Yanesha inscribed their mountainous, riverine landscape with ritual power and mythic knowledge, thereby transforming the natural environment into a historical ‘text’. Walking across this landscape spontaneously evokes specific historical events and movements through special place-names. Even more striking than the Andean influences were the similarities between Yanesha toponymy, or historical ‘writing’, and the spirit-naming of places in Wakuénai sacred songs and chants from the Northwest Amazon region. In both cases, these indigenous (Arawakan) processes of historical writing through toponymy are dynamic, open-ended modes of remembering and interpreting the historical past through creatively linking the “what really happened” to indigenous forms of ritual power and mythic being.

A brief overview of toponymy in Wakuénai sacred singing and chanting serves to illustrate the ways in which historical memory, mythic creation, and geographic knowledge come together in ritual performances during male and female initiations. Wakuénai mythic narratives describe the creation of humanity as a process in which the trickster-creator, \textit{Made-From-Bone}, raised the mythic ancestors of Wakuénai phratries and patrisibs from a hole beneath the rapids at Hípana, a village on the Aiarí River in Brazil. In this myth, \textit{Made-From-Bone} brought these ancestors to life by blowing tobacco smoke and giving each of them powerful spirit-names. The narratives about mythic past times outline a process in which \textit{Made-From-Bone} gradually shapes a world of primordial beginnings in which there is only one place into an expanding world of named, culturally and


geographically distinct peoples and places. The contemporary world of fully human social groups and history unfolded as an opening up of the world through a series of movements away from and back to the mythic center, or place of emergence, at Hipana, during the cycle of mythic narratives about the birth, life, and “death” (or fiery transformation) of the primordial human being (Kuwai).

Wakuénai social relations and historical memories are grounded in this understanding of mythic creation as a series of outward expansions from and inward returns to the regional center at Hipana. The most dramatic social expressions of this process of mythic creation through opening up the world are the long series of malikái singing and chanting in male and female initiation rituals. These performances begin and end with singing that invokes First-Woman (Ámaru), her son (Kuwái), and their attachment to the world of living human beings via a celestial umbilical cord at Hipana, the place of ancestral emergence and ‘navel’ of the world. Between the opening and closing songs, a series of chants lasting for several hours names all the places where Made-From-Bone travelled as he chased after First-Woman and tried to take back the sacred flutes and trumpets. In both male and female initiation rituals, sacred malikái singing and chanting aims to purify the sacred food, called káridzámáí, that becomes the initiates’ first meal as adult persons.

Place-naming in female initiation rituals moves down the Isana and Negro rivers and across the Casiquiare, Guainia, and Cuyari rivers, musically mapping out the Isana-Guainia headwater region that forms the ancestral homeland of the Wakuénai. In male initiation rituals, the chanting of place-names encompasses a much larger area of riverine territories extending from the Upper Rio Negro downstream to the lower Rio Negro where it joins the Amazon River at Manaus and beyond, all the way to the mouth of the Amazon on the Atlantic Coast. Returning back upstream to the Upper Rio Negro region, the chanting of place-names continues north and east through the Atabapo and middle Orinoco rivers until reaching the mouth of the Orinoco in the Caribbean Sea. This enormous expanse of riverine territories is roughly equivalent to the geographic distribution of the northern branch of the Arawakan language family prior to the European colonization of South America in the 16th century. The chanting of place-names in initiation rituals is an episodic re-opening of the world, an enchantment of the historical connections between the Wakuénai and their homeland in the Isana-Guainia headwater region, and a dynamic reconstruction of social networks that once extended across the two largest river systems in South America.

In female and male initiation rituals, geographic knowledge and historical memory converge in the making of specific ethnic identities that are defined in relation to mythic places and episodes as well as to historical events. Although this process of ethnogenesis unfolds primarily through such non-material resources as mythic narratives, specialized knowledge, and restricted musico-linguistic forms, it is also directly connected to material ways of interacting with natural habitats and exploiting natural resources.

One of the most dominant features of Wakuénai socio-ecology is the degree to which their everyday lives are oriented to rivers, streams, flooded forests, and other bodies of water. At the height of the annual long wet season in June, 65% of the region’s forests are flooded with several feet of water. Villages are always located on major rivers or tributaries, and social visiting or ceremonies requires people to travel by canoe along rivers and streams. Going to manioc gardens and hunting grounds also requires travel by canoe. Settlement patterns are set up in ways that allow people to efficiently exploit the interfacing of rivers and forests, especially during the first weeks of the long wet season (late March through early May) when the rivers are rising most rapidly and begin to overflow their banks. At these times, people use weirs and traps to capture large quantities
of migrating Leporinus fish as they move into newly flooded forests and return to the main river channels after spawning. Leporinus spawning grounds are highly site-specific and are a major determinant of human settlement patterns.

Wakuénai cosmology is every bit as ‘hydro-centric’ as their everyday subsistence and social activities. The trickster-creator, Made-From-Bone, created the ancestor spirits by lifting them from a hole beneath the rapids along the Aiari River (a tributary of the Isana River in Brazil) at Hipana, the mythic center of the world and place of emergence. Living people who are descended from these mythic ancestors live in ‘this world’ (hekuapiriko) along with fish and aquatic animal species, but they do not reside in the forests, which are home to game animals and bird species that are strongly associated with spirits of the dead. And as we have seen, chanting in both female and male initiation rituals follows major rivers, with the exception of a few key passages across forested lands. The migrating of fish species up rivers and from one river to another serves as a basic metaphor for the ‘mixing’ of peoples from different river basins in the long series of place-naming that unfolds during the chanting for female and male initiation\(^\text{38}\). In short, Wakuénai cosmology, mythic narratives, and major rituals symbolically overdetermine the ‘hydrocentricity’ of everyday social and economic practices.

Wakuénai socioecology outlines a strategy of “Let the fish and game come to us”. Fish traps or weirs (cacuri) are built along the banks of the river in areas of forest that become flooded during the long wet season, taking advantage of the natural feeding and spawning behaviours of fish species as they move into the flooded forests during the wet season. This settlement pattern is highly sedentary and promotes strong, enduring attachments between specific groups of people and specific places. The ‘ecological footprint’ of Wakuénai ways of interacting with the environment and exploiting natural resources is one in which there is relatively high-intensity landscape management\(^\text{39}\) in areas situated along major rivers and streams, especially in areas where there are significant seasonal migrations of Leporinus and other fish species to specific sites but also along entire river margins (see Figure 1). Low-intensity landscape management is found in areas away from major rivers and streams, except for heavily used portages between river systems (e.g., Cuyari-Naquen, Guainía-Temi, and Xié-Tomo/Aki pathways). These overland trails are relatively short distances through forests at the headwaters of tributaries that feed into major rivers and serve as shortcuts connecting the river systems across the entire region. Such trails are very important as routes for trade between affinally linked sibs of different phratries and as escape routes in survival migrations during periods of traumatic changes, such as the Rubber Boom. In addition to these areas of high- and low-intensity landscape management, the Wakuénéai and other Arawak-speaking groups of the Upper Rio Negro region make regular annual, or semi-annual, use of remote fishing and hunting lands (e.g., Caño San Miguel and Pasimoni River). In some cases, people make small manioc gardens in these remote areas allowing them to reside there for an entire season. Also, some of these areas were formerly occupied by large, sedentary Arawak-speaking peoples, and one can still see evidence of their villages and gardens. These regularly used areas of fishing and hunting grounds are usually located at considerable distance from the main villages along major rivers and can be seen as areas of ‘medium-intensity’ landscape management.

\(^\text{38}\) See: HILL, J. (…) 1993.

Methods and major findings of the comparative Arawakan histories project

The wide geographic distribution of Arawakan language groups provides researchers with both challenges and opportunities for comparative analysis. Because the Arawakan diaspora consists today of widely scattered clusters of language groups, it is nearly impossible to establish a probable ancestral homeland by using comparative linguistic methods alone. Such studies have allowed specialists working on other South American language families to make convincing arguments for the most likely homeland (e.g., Durbin on Carib; Constenla on Chibcha). In other cases, the geographic circumscription of entire language families obviates the need for such studies (e.g., Gê of central Brazil, Pano of eastern Peru/western Brazil, or Jivaro of lowland Ecuador/ north-eastern Peru).

Conversely, the far-flung distribution of contemporary Arawakan language groups can be seen as an ideal situation for hypothesizing about relationships between linguistic affiliations and cultural practices. As we noted in the introduction to Comparative Arawakan Histories, “Arawak-speaking peoples entered into historical relationships with groups belonging to most of the major language families of Lowland South America: Carib, Tukano, Pano, and Tupí.” The Arawakan language family is also unique in the extent to which it follows major rivers across Lowland South America. Viewed abstractly and on a macro-spatial scale, the pattern of geographic distribution appears like a gigantic ‘hand’ with ‘fingers’ extending or radiating south, southwest, west, northwest, and northeast from the central Amazon basin. The sheer size and complexity of the historical and cultural processes that have marked and been marked by the Arawakan diaspora demands a broadly comparative perspective. In attempting to develop this comparative approach, we posed two general questions: 1) how did the continuous, flowing diasporic pattern of Arawak-speaking peoples of the early colonial period transform into the contemporary pattern of dispersed clusters of peoples? And 2) what can we learn about complex language-culture relationships through comparing specific histories and sociocultural variation over long periods of time and large spatial distances within a single language family?

In terms of methodology, comparison across widely dispersed geographic areas was informed by a rigorously historical approach to ethnogenesis and cultural differentiation. The centrality of history in comparative studies meant that in the first place we were interested in establishing specific local and regional histories through all available means. The concern for integrating these histories into broader processes of colonial and national state expansion in Latin America and the Caribbean was of paramount importance rather than merely one theme among several others. Situations of contact may draw upon cultural traditions and social institutions of conquering and conquered peoples from earlier (i.e., ‘precontact’) times, but the resulting arrangements of power relations and ideologies are new social formations. Rather than “a ship of history” landing on the shores of distant “cultural structures,” the situation of contact is better understood as an intertwining of two or more formerly distinct histories into a single history characterized by processes of domination, resistance, and accommodation. As Terence Turner has noted, the essential, defining feature of individual and collec-


34
tive behaviours within situations of contact is not the adherence to uniform standards or social norms but conflicted interactions, negotiations over power and meaning, inconsistency of status values, and unresolved social contradictions. Once a situation of contact has developed beyond the initial stages of conquest by superior military force and extirpation of conquered peoples’ overt sources and symbols of power, it becomes a colonial situation in which colonized peoples must struggle within and against overwhelming forces of domination and hegemony in order to survive.

The comparative methodology developed in the Arawakan histories project was based in sceptical, critical approaches to the complex interrelations between language and culture. The comparative linguistic method continues to play an important role as a tool for reconstructing historical relationships among peoples, both living and extinct. However, linguistic reconstructions are not seen as isolated from, or privileged over, other methods for historical reconstruction or comparison, such as comparative mythology, archaeology, or ethnohistory. From the outset, the project’s participants argued against any simple, direct (or “one-to-one”) linkage between language and culture in favour of complex, historically dynamic relationships that often included transculturation, language shift, and the emergence of new linguistic forms. Colonial essentializations of language-based social identities, such as the widespread use of the term “Spanish Arawaks” to denote stereotypically “friendly, peaceful Indians” must be critically understood in terms of shifting power relations during the colonial period and their political impact on shaping the course of history. Arguing against a static, direct relationship between language and culture is not the same as negating the importance of any kind of enduring historical relationship between language and culture. Indeed, one of the major findings of the Arawakan histories project was precisely that linguistic affiliation can remain connected with a set of particular sociocultural practices over long periods of time and across wide spatial distances.

Perhaps the broadest and clearest general finding to emerge from the comparative Arawakan histories project is a distinctive pattern of socio-geographic flow, connectedness, openness, and expansiveness of Arawak-speaking peoples along the major rivers of Lowland South America. This feature is most directly perceivable from ethnohistorical maps aiming to reconstruct the distribution of Arawak-speaking peoples prior to the colonial period. A pattern of continuous expansion is also evident in comparative linguistics, ethnographic accounts of indigenous myths and rituals, and in the archaeological record. The expansiveness of Arawak-speaking peoples may have responded to demographic and ecological conditions but our comparative project indicated


that there are internal social and political dynamics, which are equally important\textsuperscript{48}. Continuous, flowing diasporic movement is not in itself exclusively or distinctively Arawakan but can be seen as characteristically Arawakan when taken together with the other practices outlined below.

A second major finding of the comparative Arawakan histories project is the widespread occurrence of regional and even inter- or macro-regional social formations organized in relation to common sacred places. Although this feature is superficially similar to central plazas and ritual centers found among other indigenous peoples of Lowland South America, many Arawak-speaking groups have a more strongly developed sense of intercommunity linkage and the organization of numerous local communities in relation to a shared central place. In tandem with a clear orientation towards organization around regional centers we find a variety of practices of landscape appropriation. These include elaborate ritual performances of naming places and movements across large areas, imbuing natural landmarks with historical significance, and imprinting landscapes with cultural designs\textsuperscript{49}. These processes of landscape construction, including the regional orientation to a shared central place, are not fixed in time and place but are often replicated in newly settled areas whether as a result of internal sociopolitical dynamics or colonial processes of displacement\textsuperscript{50}. Iterative toponymies, sacred cartographies and enchanted landscapes are found among widely dispersed Arawakan peoples. Once they are established, these ethnoscapes become central to processes of appropriation of new territories, social reproduction and indigenous historical consciousness.

A third feature of Arawakan sociopolitical formations is their open and inclusive character, which often expresses itself in the establishment of broad alliances between local and regional groups at both intra- and interethnic levels\textsuperscript{51}. This feature contrasts with other indigenous peoples of Lowland South America, among whom social and political relations tend towards fragmentation and community-based political orderings that dampen the ability to form broader regional social formations. An important social mechanism underlying these alliances is the existence of widespread networks of ceremonial exchange linked to sacred sites, temple-like structures and hierarchies of ritual specialists. These exchange networks promoted processes of political aggregation of like peoples and alliance with peoples across ethnolinguistic boundaries. This propensity to form cross-ethnic alliances was (and is) also manifested in the ability of Arawak-speaking peoples to rapidly create new regional confederacies in the context of colonial and national state expansion\textsuperscript{52}.


\textsuperscript{50} See: PASSES, A. (…) 2002.


\textsuperscript{52} See: VIDAL, S. M. (…) 2002.
Related to this openness and inclusivity of Arawakan social and political formations is the frequency and intensity of multilingualism, cross-linguistic ties, and the development of transethnic identities. In eastern Peru we find “Panoization” of Arawakan peoples and “Arawakized” Pano-speakers. Similar processes of “Tukanoization” and “Arawakization” are at work in north-western Amazonia. In the Caribbean basin during the early colonial period we find the so-called Island Caribs speaking an Arawakan language but displaying Carib-derived forms of social and political organization. The fact that these linguistic processes have taken place in such diverse situations of interethnic contact strongly suggests that they are intrinsic to Arawakan constructions of social identity.

The comparative study of Arawakan histories demonstrates with striking clarity the suppression of warfare within ethnolinguistic groups and the larger regional formations in which they are embedded. Although exo-warfare between Arawakan groups and other, non-Arawakan groups is quite common in the historical and ethnographic record, there is overwhelming evidence of the suppression of endo-warfare. Organized raiding and slaving, institutionalized cycles of vendettas, and forms of collective violence linked to ritual practices within Arawakan societies are almost entirely absent from the historical and ethnographic records. The relative absence of endo-warfare does not mean that Arawak-speaking peoples did not wage warfare against other non-Arawakan peoples or that they were more peaceful than their neighbours. There is plenty of evidence that Arawakan peoples practiced raiding and enslaving of others, had powerful war leaders, and in some cases were known to engage in cannibalism. Having said this, warfare and its ritualization are not constitutive of Arawakan social identities as is the case among the Jivaran, Cariban, Panoan and Tupian. This striking contrast suggests the existence of a deeply seated Arawakan ontology in which ritual power and relations of trade and ceremonial exchange predominate over predation and conflict as basic principles for ordering social life and the construction of sociality. The relative absence of endo-warfare may well be linked to the ability of Arawakan groups to form regional macro-polities in Northwest Amazonia, the Llanos, Southern Amazon Periphery, and other areas where hierarchy is most clearly expressed. Alternatively, suppression of endo-warfare in eastern Peru and Bolivia may respond to the threat posed by expanding imperialistic pre-Incan, Incan, and Spanish states in the neighbouring Andean highlands for nearly a thousand years.

Ethnographic accounts tend to characterize Arawakan region-centrism as primarily egalitarian, with intercommunal exchange patterns emphasizing balanced reciprocity between local groups of relatively equal strength and status. We know, however, from the historical and archaeological data that in the past Arawak-speaking regional formations developed into larger, more hierarchical polities. In both contemporary and historical contexts we find clearly articulated ideologies of social and ritual hierarchy, based on notions of descent, ancestry and consanguinity. In some areas these ideologies took the form of ranked social and political organization where inherited status was joi-

ned together with marriage practices that ensured the reproduction of hierarchies. Awareness and enactment of genealogical knowledge, social histories, and mythic ancestries were much more acute among individuals of higher status than among lower-ranked or “commoner” individuals.

Common expressions of hierarchy are heightened reckoning of genealogies, primogeniture, patri-virilocal residence, polygyny, rank endogamy, and other social practices resulting in the overdetermination of descent relations among individuals of high status. Elaborate male and female initiation rituals involving sacred musical instruments, specialized ritual speech genres, and chiefly elite languages frequently accompany these social practices. At one end of the spectrum were groups such as the Taino and Lokono, where according to early colonial sources there were chiefly elite lineages, rituals supporting hierarchical orderings, and ideas of divine ancestry. Hierarchy is also strongly present in Arawakan groups of North-western Amazonia (Baniwa, Wakuénai/Curripaco, Guarequena, Baré, Piapoco), the Llanos (Achagua, Caquetio), Lower Rio Negro (Açutuba), Southern Amazon Periphery (Bauré, Paresi, Terena, Upper Xingu), and eastern Peru (Yanesha). Hierarchy is less clearly expressed among the Palikur of Northeast Brazil and in the cluster of Arawakan groups in eastern Peru and Southwest Brazil [Asháninka, Piro (Yine), Apurinã, Mojos]. At the other end of the spectrum, we find groups such as the Machiguenga among whom social and ritual hierarchy is at most weakly present.

These variations among Arawak-speaking peoples living in different areas of Lowland South America are better understood as a matter of differences in the degree to which ideologies of hierarchy are enacted in specific historical and ecological conditions than as a simple dichotomy between the presence and absence of hierarchy. The same variability has been well documented within specific Arawakan-speaking societies where hierarchy is often constructed situationally and hierarchical structures can alternate with, or give way to, more egalitarian modes of organization. Expressions of social hierarchy are almost invariably tied directly to ritual power, frequently manifested in exclusive rights to ritual performances, languages, chants and paraphernalia. Moreover, secular political leadership is generally associated with the power of ritual specialists and sometimes even subsumed by the latter.

Steps toward an Archaeology of Ethnogenesis in Amazonia

In an article on “Ethnogenesis, Regional Integration, and Ecology in Prehistoric Amazonia” Alf Hornborg used the concept of ethnogenesis to develop a broadly synthetic approach to understand the emergence of Arawakan chiefdoms and ethnic identities during the first millennium BC. Hornborg argued for the “primacy of regional and interregional exchange in generating complex
distributions of ethno-linguistic identities traced by linguists and archaeologists in Amazonia”65. Rather than a demic model of long-distance migrations of entire communities of people, expansion of the Arawak-speaking diaspora is understood as a historical process of creating and reproducing networks of trade following the riverine pathways of the Orinoco and Upper Amazon basins. Indigenous expressions of ‘cartographic consciousness,’ whether embodied in petroglyphs and other physical signs or in complex performances of ritual and verbal art, provide important insights into how regional and interregional networks of trade are constructed and the specific ways in which they are imprinted on riverine floodplains, upland forest, and wet savannahs. Rejecting the twin extremes of environmental and cultural determinism, Hornborg follows Barth’s66 view of ethnicity as “closely interwoven with traditional modes of subsistence and the specific kinds of landscapes within which they are conducted”67. He concludes that the constellation of sociocultural practices associated with Arawak-speaking peoples of Amazonia is quite well-suited to the building of regional exchange systems connecting peoples across vast spatial distances68.

Hornborg’s 2005 article called for broadening studies of ethnogenesis to encompass historical patterns of trade and exchange throughout Lowland South America and to more fully engage with archaeological research in the region. “Recent applications of this concept to Amazonia69 have usefully reconceptualized historical processes in the area, but its ramifications for archaeology have yet to be consistently worked out”70. The workshop on ‘Mapping Cultures’ at Lund University in Sweden (2006), a double session on ‘Long-Term Patterns of Ethnogenesis in Indigenous Amazonia’ at the American Anthropological Association meetings in Washington, D.C. (2007), and a concluding workshop on ‘Amazonian Ethno-Linguistics’ at Lund University (2008), were a sustained effort to stimulate this process of working through some of the ways of developing ethnogenetic approaches in linguistics, archaeology, and ethnohistory. An edited volume on Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia: Reconstructing Past Identities from Archaeology, Linguistics, and Ethnohistory (Hornborg and Hill, forthcoming) is currently in the formative stage. Rather than attempting to summarize this entire set of essays here, I will focus on two studies that provide clear examples of the new archaeology of ethnogenesis that is beginning to emerge in Amazonian anthropology.

The first of these studies is Eduardo Neves’ interpretation of ring-shaped villages in the Central Amazon floodplains, tentatively titled “The Power of History: Ethnogenesis, Regional Systems and Cultural Ruptures in the Central Amazon.”71 Archaeological data from these Central Amazon sites indicates a shift from low-intensity landscape management based on small-scale human interventions (e.g., household-based swidden horticulture) to high-intensity landscape management. The latter result in “permanent and still visible transformations of the landscape”72, such as the creation of large areas of anthropogenic black soils (called “Amazonian Dark Earth,” or ADE), funerary and other ceremonial mounds, defensive ditches, and decorated ceramic artefacts. The

71 Because this essay is still being prepared for submission later this year, I rely here on Eduardo’s earlier essay, “Political Economy and Pre-Columbian Landscape Transformations in Central Amazonia,” which he co-authored with the late Jim Petersen [See: NEVES, E. & PETERSEN, J. (…) 2005].
ceramic chronology encompasses three general phases: 1) Manacapuru (BC 400 – AD 900, Amazonian Barrancoid tradition), 2) Paredão (AD 700 – 1.000, local tradition), and 3) Guarita (AD 1.000 – 1.600, Amazonian Polychrome tradition). Despite the longevity of these ceramic phases and evidence of relatively long-term occupation at Lago Grande and other large sites, the study of ADE formation in surrounding upland forest sites demonstrates that there were frequent interruptions and site abandonments:

“The CAP data on site formation and abandonment suggest that the inferred chiefdoms in the central Amazon basin were cyclical or centrifugal social formations, characterized by alternate processes of political centralization and decentralization. ...Decentralization and political desegregation is demonstrable, however, by the sudden abandonment of some of these sites, both large and small.”

The authors conclude that these Central Amazonian political economies were characterized by a constant interplay between opposing tendencies toward “centralizing centripetal hierarchical ideologies” and “centrifugal, fragmentary, and decentralized household-based productive units.”

Neves and Petersen look for archaeological evidence of these opposing tendencies in the spatial distribution between large sites based on high-intensity landscape management and smaller contemporaneous sites. To put this spatial distribution into more dynamic, historical terms will require studies of changing patterns of trade and exchange among sites in the region and with sites in other regions. What socio-political conditions would have favoured the formation versus fragmentation of larger, more hierarchical and centralized political communities? As a working hypothesis, I suggest that ethogenesis favoured the development of centripetal, hierarchical political economies in periods of contracting relations of interethnic trade and alliance. The shift to high-intensity landscape management over relatively long periods of continuous occupation was recursively related to the creation of large areas of ADE, since mounds at the CAP sites were made almost entirely of ADE soils mixed with contemporaneous and earlier ceramics. Once established, the expansion of interethnic and interregional relations of trade and alliance would have set in motion new ethnogenic process of ‘creolization’ and formation of trans-ethnic identities.

Silvia Vidal’s ethnohistoric studies of the rise and fall of Arawak-speaking confederations during the colonial period sheds light on these ethnogenetic processes of centralization and fragmentation, albeit on a much shorter time scale and in conditions of demographic collapse and rapid political change rather than long-term continuous site occupations. This map is a snap-shot of indigenous societies struggling to survive between the vise grip of Dutch-Carib slave traders penetrating from the north and east and Portuguese Brazilian colonialism expanding from the south and east. The confederations can be interpreted as a series of desperate attempts to form more centralized, hierarchical political economies followed by periods of dispersal into remnant groups and the emergence of new hierarchies. This series of confederations ultimately resulted in the ethnocide of

---
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76 Ibid, p. 296–297. These ceremonial and burial mounds were built with large amounts of ADE mixed with “sherds from all three ceramic complexes of the site” and display “horizontal, parallel placement” of many large sherds within several mounds (ibid, p. 296). The mounds are thus not only concrete manifestations of the recursivity between environmental history, high-intensity landscape management, and hierarchical political economies but also illustrative of ethnogenesis as a process of authentically re-making new social identities through creatively rediscovering and refashioning components of ‘tradition’, such as oral narratives, written texts, and material artifacts.
many larger Arawak-speaking peoples living in downstream regions (e.g., the Manao of the Lower Rio Negro and the Maipure of the Middle Orinoco). Other groups, such as the Baré, Wakuénai, Baniwa, Piapoco, and Guarequena survived or came into being in headwater areas, where their descendants are still living today.

Franz and Kay Scaramelli’s study of changing ceramic styles in the Middle Orinoco region during the colonial and early Republic periods provides another way of working through the archaeological ramifications of ethnogenesis. Detailed analysis of specific post-contact sites, “such as missions, indigenous settlements, and military outposts provide excellent opportunities for the analysis of the interplay between the different sectors involved: Europeans, mestizos, indigenous and afro-descendents”78. Such studies allow archaeologists “to explore the incorporation of new technology, foodstuffs, items of dress, etc., across ethnic lines, and how these contribute to the creative construction of new identities”79. During the early Colonial Period (1680-1767), Jesuit missionaries created mission sites along the Middle Orinoco River by relocating indigenous peoples from other regions (e.g., the Sáliva from areas of the llanos west of the Orinoco) and attempting to impose a strict new order of religious indoctrination, economic production, and exchange relations. Indigenous recruits vastly outnumbered Europeans during this period, and this demographic reality is directly reflected in the fact that “ceramic remains associated with Early Colonial sites in our study area included a variety of local ceramic production styles that overwhelmingly outnumbered the imported wares”80. These ceramics can be grouped into three distinct styles based on differences in tempering material, vessel form, and decorative motifs: 1) a spicule-tempered San Isidro style associated with the Sáliva speakers brought from the western llanos, 2) a Valloid style with strong pre-contact presence in the area associated with local Carib-speaking groups (e.g., Mapoyo), and 3) an Early Caraipé style of trade wares (not locally produced) associated with the Maipure and other Arawak-speaking groups from the Upper Orinoco.

The diversity of indigenous ceramic styles underwent significant change after the expulsion of Jesuit missionaries in 1767 and during the remainder of the late Colonial period (1768-1829). Locally manufactured pottery continues to predominate in the area, reflecting the lack of success at creating stable agricultural towns with large European or criollo populations. Although these locally made ceramics continued to display the same diversity of vessel forms and tempering materials, decoration largely ceased to exist. A new style of low fired, undecorated utility wares “characterized by distinctive vessel forms (small to medium sized deep cooking pots)”81 emerges as the dominant type of ceramics in the Late Colonial Period. The Scaramellis refer to this new style as Paraguaza and believe that it represents a local Criollo ware, “possibly made and used by a mestizo population made up of the descendents of free blacks, slaves, and Indians, in a context in which imported goods, including metal cooking pots, were infrequent”82.

In the Republican Period (1830-1920), the Middle Orinoco was an area of trade and commerce with the expanding cattle-ranching frontier of the llanos. Towns and mission settlements in the region were largely abandoned, allowing indigenous groups like the Panare, Piaroa, and Mapoyo

79 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
to resettle by moving from more protected upland forests into areas closer to the Orinoco River. Across the river, “a unique non-indigenous llanero identity was evolving out of the combination of escaped slaves, former mission Indians, and poor mestizos and whites who joined forces to exploit the abundant feral cattle in the savannahs”83, a process of ethnogenesis resulting in a racialized class distinction between Racional and Indio. Imported ceramic wares became prevalent during the Republican Period, and locally made pottery loses its former stylistic diversity in favour of a uniform Caripito style made with “caraipé temper in a limited range of undecorated, utilitarian vessel forms such as griddles, bowls, and jugs”84. The Scaramellis conclude that the juxtaposition of imported and locally made ceramic wares during the Republican Period indicates that ceramic production and style were no longer markers of ethnic distinctions but signified the emergence of a ‘trans-ethnic consumption style’ in which locally made ceramics served as water storage and cooking vessels whereas imported whitewares were used for serving and consumption.

Conclusions

The shift in sociocultural anthropology to a concern for long-term historical processes of change and macro-scale relations of exchange within and across regions of South America opens the way for constructive collaborative work with archaeology and historical linguistics. At the same time, the shift from environmental determinism to an interest in landscape as “historically constructed, reflecting changing management practices that leave visible imprints of past human agency”85 provides important common ground for collaboration between archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. And within both fields, the concern for studying power relations within and among indigenous communities and the resulting alternations between centralization and fragmentation allow for exploration of pre- and post-contact transformations of social identities and human landscapes. While acknowledging the profound changes brought about by European colonization and the rise of independent nation-states, we can also avoid essentializing approaches that categorize pre-contact indigenous Americans as “Peoples Without History” or post-contact indigenous identities as merely artificial ‘reinventions’ of past cultures. Instead, ethnogenesis can be defined as a process of authentically re-making new social identities through creatively rediscovering and refashioning components of ‘tradition,’ such as oral narratives, written texts, and material artefacts. Understood in these terms, ethnogenesis allows us to explore the cultural creativity of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples alike in the making of new interpretive and political spaces that allow people to construct enduring social identities while moving forward in the globalizing nation-states of Latin America.
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ISTORIJA, GALIA IR IDENTITETAS: AMAZONĖS REGIONO ASPEKTAI
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Santrauka

1996 m. autorius suformulavo savokos etnogenezė sampratą, kur teigiama, kad tai yra „koncepcija, tikslinai nukreipianti žmonių kultūrinio ir politinio gyvenimo aspiracijas susikurti pastovias ir ilgalaikes savo tapatybės nuostatas bendrame radikalių gyvensenos pasikeitimų bei netolygumų kontekste“. Taigi etnogenezė sudaro realias ir perspektyvias analitinio pobūdžio sąlygas suvokti bendruomenės identiteto nuostatų formavimosi procesus, skirtinaui ir nevienareikšmiškai traktuojamus visoje žmonijos egzistavimo istorijoje, kupinoje įvairiausių politinių ir ekonominių konfliktų bei kaitų.

Straipsnyje šie teiginiai plėtomi toliau. Teigiama, kad etnogenezės sampratai patenka ir tenykščių gyventojų ontologijos, alternatyviųjų istorijos nuostatų (mitologizuotų istorinių atpasakojimų) tyrimui, ir istorijos rekonstrukcijos dalykai, argumentuotai paremti visais įmanomais šaltiniais.

Tai selektyvi ir kūrybinga kultūrinė atmintis, apibrėžianti ir reguliuojanti esminių kolektyvinės minties raidos aspektus.

Kultūra čia yra aiškiai išreikšta, interpretuota ir suformuluota bendruomenės nariams visuotiniai supranta kalba. Nulemta specifinių situacijų ji gali būti įvairių įtaigos lygmenų.

Kritinės ekonominės sąlygos ar besikeičiančios valdžios institucijų nuostatos gali turėti įtakos kultūros procesualumui kintamo ideologinio konteksto ribose.

Tradicijos sudėtinių dalys (žodinė kūryba, rašytiniai tekstai, materialūs kūriniai) gali būti naujai suvokiami ir interpretuojami.

Būdingi specifiniai [tradicijos] bruožai, žinomi konkrečiose vietovėse ir priklausomi nuo besikeičiančių pragyvenimo šaltinių, migracijos procesų ir šeimos santykių, yra galimi ir priimtini (Clifford 2004, p. 20).

Identity and Perspective. Most people are other people. Their thoughts are someone else’s opinions, their lives a mimicry, their passions a quotation. While some posts focus on certain parts of one’s identity—like the importance of embracing one’s sexuality in order to fully accept oneself—other aspects of one’s identity seem less concrete. Your identity doesn’t simply evolve around your physique, your identity transcends to your thoughts and beliefs. Furthermore, your identity is also defined by how you feel about other religions, about science, about education, and about yourself. I try to project these ideas in my creative responses by emphasizing the importance of self-discovery and identity through the differing mediums, subjects, and perspectives on International Relations: Power, Institutions, and Ideas shows students new to the field how theories (perspectives) of international affairs—realism, liberalism, constructivism (identity), and critical theory—play a decisive role in explaining every-day debates about world affairs. Why, for example, do politicians and political scientists disagree about the causes of the ongoing conflict in Syria, even though they all have the same facts? The concept of ethnogenesis offers a theoretical approach to hybridity and syncretism that finesses the tensions between “New Amazonian Ethnography” and “New Amazonian History” by simultaneously encompassing the study of indigenous ontologies and alternative constructions of history (i.e., “mytho-historical narratives”) as well as the reconstruction of history from all available sources. Ethnogenesis can be defined as a process of authentically re-making new social identities through creatively rediscovering and refashioning components of ‘tradition,’ su