

Enemies Within

Enemies Within:

Cultural Hierarchies and Liberal Political Models in the Hispanic World

Edited by

María Sierra

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Enemies Within:
Cultural Hierarchies and Liberal Political Models in the Hispanic World

Edited by María Sierra

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by María Sierra and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8365-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8365-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
Enemies Within: Beware of the Neighbour María Sierra-Alonso	
Chapter One.....	7
The Peruvian Native and the Conception of Liberal Citizenship in the Latin American Context María Antonia Peña and Rafael Zurita	
Chapter Two.....	41
What Should Be Done with the Foreigner in Argentina?: From “Object of Desire” to “Enemy Within” Marta Bonaudo and Diego Mauro	
Chapter Three.....	71
Central American Female Writers: Women Occupying Liberal Public Space Cristina Ramos Cobano	
Chapter Four.....	109
Body to Body with the Liberals: The Association Movement of the <i>Coloured Race</i> in Cuba Pilar Pérez-Fuentes Hernández	
Chapter Five.....	147
A Stranger in the House: The Latino Worker in the United States in the Transition from the Nineteenth to the Twentieth Centuries Susana Sueiro Seoane	

Chapter Six	187
Cannibals Devoured: <i>Gypsies</i> in Romantic Discourse on the Spanish Nation María Sierra-Alonso	
List of Contributors	223

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Figure 6-1 188
Charles Clifford, *La Alhambra. Jitanos bailando*, (The Alhambra: Gypsies Dancing) 1862. Photograph, 600 x 440 mm. Archivo del Patronato de la Alhambra y Generalife, Granada, Spain. From the photograph collection, available from:
<http://hdl.handle.net/10514/9969> (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Figure 6-2 194
Gustave Doré, *Baile en un patio de Sevilla* (Dancing in a Patio in Sevilla), 1847. From: Baron Charles D'Avillier, *L'Espagne*. Paris: Hachette, 1874.
- Figure 6-3 201
John Tenniel, *The Happy Family in Hyde Park*. *Punch*, July 19th 1851. Available from:
<https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/handle/10472/103> (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Figure 6-4 203
Manuel Cabral Aguado Bejarano, *El puesto de buñuelos* (The Fritter Stall) fragment, c. 1854. Oil on canvas, 65.5 x 50 cm. Carmen Thyssen Museum, Malaga. Available from: Public domain,
<http://www.carmenthysssenmalaga.org/es>) (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Figure 6-5 207
José Villegas Cordero, *Baile andaluz con emparrado* (Andalusian Dance with Vine Arbour), 1890. Available from: Public domain,
<http://www.papelesflamencos.com> (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Figure 6-6 212
Rafael Garzón, *Chorrojumo. El Príncipe de los Jitanos* (The Prince of the Gypsies), n.d. Photograph. 390 x 280 mm. Archivo del Patronato de la Alhambra y Generalife. From the photograph collection, available from:
<http://hdl.handle.net/10514/10044> (accessed July 19, 2015).

- Figure 6-7 214
 Rafael Garzón, *Granada. Grupo de jitanos bailadores* (Granada: Group of Dancing Gypsies). Alonso Robisco collection, courtesy of the owner. Available from: <http://photocollection.alonsorobisco.es> (accessed July 19, 2015).
- Figure 6-8 215
 “Helios Gómez en su estudio de Barcelona” (Helios Gómez in his Barcelona Studio). From: *Revista Crónica*. Madrid, 1929.
- Figure 6-9 215
Once sacramentos juntos: Dos soldados que recibieron el sacramento (Eleven Sacraments Together: Two Soldiers Who Received the Sacrament), fragment, 1976. From: Archivo General de la Administración (Spain, Ministerio de Cultura), Sección Cultura, Caja F/1336.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book has been made possible thanks to the financial support received for the project “La construcción histórica de la inclusión y la exclusión políticas: España entre Europa y América Latina (1780–1910) [HAR2012-32637] within the framework of the National Research and Development Plan of the Government of Spain, and to FEDER support.

The authors wish to express their gratitude to colleagues for their comments, constructive criticism and collaboration during the various scientific meetings held to discuss the results of the research in the last few years. We especially wish to thank Janet and Anthony Dawson, who translated the original Spanish texts and the quotations taken from original documents into English, and for their invaluable help in the preparation of this edition.

INTRODUCTION

ENEMIES WITHIN: BEWARE OF THE NEIGHBOUR

MARÍA SIERRA-ALONSO

“Era el *otro*, el que por diferente siempre nos es ajeno, y nos es atractivo aunque sea gracias a la repulsión” (*La fugitiva*, Sergio Ramírez)
[He was the *Other*, the one who, because he is different, is always alien to us, and is attractive to us, if only because of his repulsion.]

In his story about the Costa Rican writer, Yolanda Oreamuno, the novelist Sergio Ramírez has recourse to the myth of the “wild child” to summarize the fate of a woman who lived outside the cultural norms of the various communities she passed through and so was treated as stateless. His words sum up very well the paradox of identity, with its diverse and overlapping interplay of alterity, strangeness and hybridity.¹ This book is concerned with political readings of this paradox, and even though its general historical framework is that of Hispanic liberalism during the greater part of the nineteenth century, its basic premise is that the civic imaginaries that were constructed at that time can be found even today in political conceptions in the Western world, especially in majority views of what is normal and desirable and in the ways of thinking of those who occupy positions of responsibility in the public sphere.

Our interest, therefore, lies in the intersectionality between figures of citizenship and the historical concepts of gender, class, race and territory,

This study forms part of the HAR2012-32637 project: “La construcción histórica de la inclusión y la exclusión políticas: España entre Europa y América Latina (1780–1910) financed by the Plan Nacional de I+D del Gobierno de España and FEDER.

¹ Sergio Ramírez, *La fugitiva* (Madrid: Alfaguara, 2011). The concepts of identity and alterity employed here are taken from Joep Leersen, “Identity / Alterity / Hybridity,” in *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 335–342.

as they were expressed and re-signified following the liberal revolutions that formally brought the Ancien Regime to an end in Europe and marked the independence of the new Latin American republics. Modern national identities on both sides of the Atlantic were based on a set of actions designed to shape the model figures of the “good citizen” and the “good ruler,” which were largely defined by holding up a mirror to “the Other,” who ontologically speaking could not be either. This book is the fruit of a research project that has examined the inner workings of these virtuous figures in relation to their opposites, with the aim of revealing the cultural complexity of these enduring political images. It provides a mosaic of figures of civic alterity that will be both recognizable and surprising to the reader; recognizable to the extent that they refer to model representations that have seeped into the common sense of our Western societies, and surprising, in so far as the various authors put forward interpretations that understand and explain the interconnectedness and performativity of these identities.

We address the Euro-American Atlantic world in its Hispanic dimension, which, in the nineteenth century, was a major space of political invention, a place that constructed and legitimized a new system of government—representative government—which, even as it promised a future of citizen inclusion, also harboured within it multiple processes of exclusion. By reformulating the notions of “rationality” and “effectiveness,” the liberal concept of “political capacity” was defined in negative terms and became the focus for a set of ideas, values and prejudices about citizenship. It was a precarious balancing act that carried forward many deep-seated problems from earlier times; indeed, modern politics in the liberal mould generated models of inclusion/exclusion that were more resilient and more difficult to challenge than the old ones, due to their apparent moderation, their promise of openness, rationalist utilitarian language and ultimately their scientific line of reasoning.

This book is a study of the political and cultural frameworks of the discourse that succeeded in presenting the paradox of exclusionary inclusion so persuasively. The study will carefully examine some of the various intertwining pathways that led to the construction of political inclusion and exclusion, since the categories of gender, race, class and territory, as they were understood then, all reinforced each other in their explanatory power when it came to shaping a “naturally” qualified citizenry. In order to penetrate the liberal matrix formed by these various civic vectors in different parts of the Hispanic world, we have singled out six cases for detailed analysis that focus specifically on the way in which cultural representations were articulated for political purposes: the native

Indian in liberal Peru; the immigrant in turn-of-the-century Argentina; the woman writer in Central America; the “coloured race” in independent Cuba; the Latino worker arriving in the United States; and the Gypsy who became a national symbol of Spain. As will be seen, these figures are neither exceptional nor typical in the traditional sense, but provide points of entry to social problems that go well beyond the case analysis.

As its title indicates, the book is organized around the notion of the “enemy within.” The most complete intellectual expression of this figure—which became dramatically familiar to many through its political and military resonance in the American arena during the second half of the twentieth century—came in fact from European criminology at the end of the nineteenth century, with its conception of the criminal as a pathogen inherent in the social body, attacking it from within and requiring an organized response to combat it.² The research project that led to this book started from the hypothesis that, in spite of the qualitative leap implied by the appearance of this new discipline when it came to explaining internal threats to the social order, political liberalism had already contributed cultural materials and resources to make solid figures of those “Others,” those social subjects who were internal threats to the survival of the community and its system of rights. The discourse of criminal anthropology on social defence was so resoundingly successful in the decades that followed, partly because it fell on such fertile cultural ground.³

Retracing the steps on this road is a worthwhile endeavour and one that eight researchers embarked upon to produce the six chapters that comprise this book. In the first of these, María Antonia Peña and Rafael Zurita study the different forms of exclusion encountered by the native Peruvian communities during the nineteenth century, taking into account the purview of the bills proposed and the laws passed that precluded these groups from becoming citizens in the name of “civilizing” progress. The arguments made in the course of political debate demonstrate that, before the impact of Social Darwinism and biological racism, nineteenth century liberalism equated racial and cultural diversity with underdevelopment and

² For a synthesis of the different versions of the discourse of social defence, see Frédéric Gros: “Punir, c’est défendre la société,” in *Et ce sera justice. Punir en démocratie*, Antoine Garapon, Frédéric Gros and Thierry Puech (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2001), 63–89.

³ A more detailed version of this proposal can be found in María Sierra, “Enemigos internos: Inclusión y exclusión en la cultura política liberal,” in *Desde la Historia. Homenaje a Marta Bonauo*, ed. María Sierra, Juan Pro and Diego Mauro (Buenos Aires: Imago Mundi, 2014), 73–90.

consequently proposed various reforms to promote ethnic homogeneity along with national cohesion. The chapter ends with a reflection on early indigenism and the political use made of the figure of the native. In the second chapter, Marta Bonaudo and Diego Mauro examine changes in perceptions of the foreigner promoted by the Argentinian ruling class in the period between 1850 and 1910. The authors show that there is a thread that runs through the entire process, namely the gradual erosion of the civilizing myth originally associated with the immigrant from Europe. This same immigrant, initially projected as having a “civilizing” influence on Argentina and guaranteeing progress, was converted, in the context of the growing social unrest that characterized the country at the turn of the century and then under the “social defence” paradigm, into the “enemy within” who could not be assimilated into the body of the nation.

In the third chapter, Cristina Ramos focuses on the figure of the woman who dares to break into liberal public space, which is defined as exclusively male for reasons of political logic and physical nature. The author sets out to recover the voices of various nineteenth-century Central American female writers, whose works have often been studied by literary critics although rarely using a historical approach, in order to work out how they managed to make their mark in the public sphere. In most cases, without openly going against the social conventions of their time, these women writers gave impetus to new weak forms of resistance that can be traced in the way they were received critically and through their own writings. In the fourth chapter, Pilar Pérez-Fuentes considers the association movement of the “coloured race” in late nineteenth-century Cuba, examining both the notion and its progressive integration into Cuban nationalism. The response of the Creole ruling class as well as the leaders of the associations was racial whitening, although based on cultural and moral criteria, rather than mixed marriages. Given this framework, her chapter shows that citizenship was deeply rooted in naturalized identities of masculinity and whiteness.

Susana Sueiro, in the fifth chapter, deals with the Latino worker forced to seek economic or political refuge in North America, analysing the different forms of discrimination (racial, cultural, linguistic) that Spanish (and Italian) immigrants in the United States experienced during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Adopting a transnational approach, the chapter reconstructs the migratory flows, as well as the perceptions that the Latino immigrant and the ruling classes had of each other, the latter influenced by the twin paradigms of Social Darwinism and biological racism and increasingly fearful of the spread of anarchism. Finally, in chapter six, María Sierra explores the figure of the Gypsy.

Taking as her starting point the fact that many of the vectors of civic exclusion that characterize modern politics are concentrated particularly densely on the Gypsy, the chapter examines how Spanish Gypsies came to be a symbol of national identity, even while they were disregarded as real citizens or subjects with rights. In this case, the colonizing effect of Romantic discourse is seen in relation to the need to revise the social and historical categories used by history specialists and so avoid passing on stereotypes and naturalizing the judgements of others.

Along the way, we grapple with a discourse that was (and still is) powerful and persuasive; this discourse, because it presented its categories as rational and even scientific, favoured the social and political success of the conflicting stereotypes of the responsible citizen versus the socially dangerous maladjusted subject. With this as its foundation, the new post-revolutionary order drew a clear dividing line between the citizen with full rights and his "Others": women, natives, labourers, immigrants, the poor and so on, all inhabitants of the country who had to be taken into account, but without the political capacity or independence to represent themselves. According to the most optimistic (progressive) liberal views, some of these groups would be incorporated into citizenship at some future date when "civilization" reached them; others, however, would be disqualified as potential citizens on anthropological grounds.

The obvious intention of demonstrating the artificiality of these constructs that were held to be natural is to seek to know more about the genealogies of conflicts that started in the past but continue to be obstacles to peaceful coexistence even today; we also however wish to make a contribution, through our work as historians, to the urgent debate on forms of government and political legitimacy in societies that claim to be democratic. Reinventing democracies involves understanding the contingency—the historicity—of inherited formulae of governance and considering them, in consequence, as amenable to improvement. The readiness to do so is not a threat to democracy but a commitment to go in search of it.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PERUVIAN NATIVE AND THE CONCEPTION OF LIBERAL CITIZENSHIP IN THE LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT

MARÍA ANTONIA PEÑA AND RAFAEL ZURITA

Concerning inclusion and exclusion in liberalism

Of all the dimensions that the phenomenon of citizenship presents to the historian's gaze, the contradictory yet complementary questions of inclusion and exclusion are among those that arouse the most interest; interest and at the same time, puzzlement. Some of the inclusion policies that liberalism implemented, which historiography has traditionally applauded as mechanisms for broadening political representation and recognizing individual rights, are presented today, with the benefit of hindsight, as evidence of other explicit or latent forms of exclusion that coexisted with them, or even made them possible. Defining who was going to be within the new socio-political system necessarily involved explaining why others were going to be left out. Accordingly, if we want to know how inclusion was articulated, we need to examine in greater depth the arguments and justifications put forward for excluding certain groups—women, the illiterate and the poor—who were considered to lack the capacity and sufficient independence to uphold the order and progress that was aspired to. Many of these justifications were born of conscious convictions inherited from philosophical and cultural paradigms of the Enlightenment; others were expressly developed during the nineteenth century in response to the new circumstances posed by a rapidly changing world and to the fears and anxieties stirred up by the construction of a

This study forms part of the HAR2012-32637 project: "La construcción histórica de la inclusión y la exclusión políticas: España entre Europa y América Latina (1780–1910) financed by the Plan Nacional de I+D del Gobierno de España and FEDER.

political system that, in spite of any possible resistance, was obviously drifting towards democratic formulas. So, the process of inclusion had to be achieved by means of exclusion and carried out by projecting an image of the excluded “Other” as the enemy within, who would then be discreetly removed from the system.¹

In this context, the forms of exclusion multiplied. The excluded subject was increasingly consigned to social invisibility, those features considered to be negative were accentuated or exaggerated, and a model of morality critical of customs or behaviour was circulated; alternatively the subject was removed, interned or eliminated outright. We can analyse all these variables using as a case study the exclusion of the indigenous communities of Latin America on the grounds of race. An in-depth examination of the various forms that racial exclusion took and the discourses that were developed to legitimize it enables us furthermore to penetrate the formidable complexity of these processes, since we not only find the opposition between inclusion and exclusion, but also the reality of self-exclusion, as well as the tense relationship between policies of integration and the preservation of the cultural and anthropological identities of the original peoples. Inevitably, the nineteenth century was the scenario for all these tensions. It was a laboratory used to test launch a liberal system based on the theory of the liberty, fraternity and natural equality of all human beings and in which; at the same time, the native peoples were looked upon as the “enemy within,” a destabilizing element and an obstacle that had to be either eliminated directly or integrated by being subjected to a civilizing process based on biological miscegenation and cultural uprooting.² Because of the sheer numbers of the indigenous populations and the intensity of the political debate that was generated, the case of Peru allows us to analyse the specifics of a theory and praxis that oscillated between granting and not granting citizenship to the Indians, denouncing the fact that they were marginalized and exploited and calling for them to be civilized, all in the spirit of the religious beliefs and Romantic humanitarianism of the nineteenth century.

¹ María Sierra, “Enemigos internos: inclusión y exclusión en la cultura política liberal,” in *Desde la Historia, Homenaje a Marta Bonaudo*, ed., María Sierra, Juan Pro and Diego Mauro (Buenos Aires: Imago Mundi, 2014), 73–90.

² María Antonia Peña Guerrero and Rafael Zurita Aldeguer, “Enemigos consentidos. Visiones contrapuestas sobre la exclusión política en Colombia y Perú durante el siglo XIX,” in *ibid.*, 113–134.

Indigenous citizens in liberal Latin America

After the triumph of the independence movements and the legal and constitutional establishment of the new Latin American republics, the policies of inclusion or exclusion of the pre-existing indigenous communities were basically structured around three action strategies. In quite a few cases, the new liberal states made some indigenous peoples who were considered to be warlike and impossible to subdue—and had remained on the margins of the Spanish occupation retaining economic and political control over their territories—the targets of military policies that were mainly designed to exterminate them. In the Chilean constitution of 1822, for example, the Araucanian territory, which the Spanish had never managed to occupy, was incorporated into the State, and Congress was granted powers to “civilize” the indigenous communities that lived there. Shortly afterwards, in January 1825, the Parliament of Tapihue was convened to agree the border between Chile and Araucania and draw up a format for peaceful coexistence; towards the middle of the century, however, this initial mood mutated into an attitude that was bent on extermination and subjugation, so unleashing a long and bloody offensive war.³ While it serves as a reference, the Chilean case is not unique. Similar attitudes combined with policies of assimilation and territorial integration also appear in Argentina.⁴ The total extermination of the Charrúas in Uruguay, the campaigns against the Guarani in Brazil and the attack on the Nahuas in El Salvador are further notable examples.⁵

In other cases, the chief interest lay in absorbing certain territories occupied by indigenous communities into the nation and this provided the motivation for policies that purported to be inclusive but basically distorted the paradigm of constructing an equal citizenship. In general

³ José Bengoa, *Historia del pueblo mapuche, siglos XIX y XX* (Santiago: Lom, 2000).

⁴ Diana Lenton, comp. and ed., “Genocidio y política indigenista: debates sobre la potencia explicativa de una categoría polémica,” *Corpus: Archivos virtuales de la alteridad americana*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2011), <http://corpusarchivos.revues.org/1148>; Raúl J. Mandrini, “La historiografía argentina, los pueblos originarios y la incomodidad de los historiadores,” *Quinto Sol. Revista de Historia Regional*, no. 11 (2007): 19–38.

⁵ Eduardo F. Acosta y Lara, *La guerra de los charrúas en la Banda oriental* (facsimile edition; Montevideo: Cruz del Sur, 2010); Cláudio Alves de Vasconcelos, *A questão indígena na provincia de Mato Grosso* (Campo Grande: Editora UFMS, 1999); Ricardo Martínez Martínez, *El genocidio cultural de 1932. Narrativas y memorias de la represión* (Master’s thesis UCA El Salvador, 2011).

terms, the indigenous population in these annexed territories would not enjoy the same rights as those that lived in areas with a white or mestizo majority; they would live under differentiated legal and political statutes, and their traditional ways of life would be subject to severe interference from the state authorities. In the case of Mexico, the indigenous territories were annexed from 1824 but never received the same treatment as those with predominantly white populations. While the latter had the possibility of becoming federal states, the former depended directly on other states or on the central powers in order to be subjected to settlement policies that pursued economic modernization and increased agricultural yields, as well as the racial whitening of those spaces. Within the framework of this process of occupation, moreover, ancestral forms of communal ownership of property were replaced by a new model of individual property ownership associated with the idea of progress and economic modernization, in which the native was no longer considered to be the effective owner of the land but became simply the *poseedor* (holder) or rather, the *usufructuador* (usufructuary) of the land.⁶ Over time, as we shall see in the case of Peru, this new legal ownership statute was accompanied by the establishment of new taxes that were justified in public debate as an improvement on the tribute paid by the indigenous population typical of the colonial period, but which in fact marked the natives as members of “another” social class. Tensions and conflict were not long in coming.⁷

Given this background, the closest thing to a policy of inclusion in independent nineteenth-century Latin American republics was the practice of a civilizing paternalism, one that distanced itself from any possible paradigm of tolerance or interracial respect and attached itself to an integrationist mentality behind which it was not difficult to find exclusionary racist conceptions that formed part of a deeply-rooted ideology. Given this perspective, which took precedence over claiming citizenship for the indigenous population, integrating the natives into the nation and into a civil society structured around natural and political rights involved a process of cultural assimilation that required them to renounce their own religious convictions, convert completely to Roman Catholicism, abandon their native languages and discard their indigenous customs and

⁶ Bartolomé Clavero, “Presencias humanas y narrativas constitucionales entre Cádiz indigenista y Ecuador multicultural,” *Historia Contemporánea*, no. 33 (2006): 639–662, 640, esp. 643 and 648.

⁷ Marta Moscoso, “La tierra: espacio de conflicto y relación entre el Estado y la comunidad en el siglo XIX,” in *Los Andes en la encrucijada. Indios, comunidades y Estado en el siglo XIX*, compiled by Heraclio Bonilla (Quito: Libri Mundi, 1991), 367–417.

traditions, which were generally considered to be an expression of savagery and barbarism. Even today, it remains a burning issue in many states to find a balance between processes involving social and political integration and the strengthening of original identities, which run the risk of being lost or diluted precisely as a consequence of integrationist policies not being well understood.

The 1811 political constitution of Venezuela contemplated early on the segregation—and even the dissolution—of the indigenous communities, by removing any possible form of communal or corporative government and offering the natives in exchange equality before the law, as well as individual rights that released them from certain fiscal burdens and obligations to work for landowners.⁸ Furthermore, exchanging self-government for individual rights rested on the basic idea that the natives had to be civilized and that the first step towards gaining entry into that civilization should be their conversion to Roman Catholicism. The enduring nature of these conceptions that placed religion as the central concern of the problem of the Venezuelan natives can be demonstrated by the fact that it was still in the 1858 Constitution and remained there until well into the twentieth century. Using a more moderate tone, also notable for its civilizing paternalism, the Constitution of the Republic of New Granada of the same year set out a very similar model for segregating the natives and justified it by appealing to the need to recover territories in order to attract foreign settlers and to establish and defend the frontiers.⁹

Using these arguments, and in the interests of constructing a nation of a monist character based on the racial, cultural and religious homogenization of the new liberal society, legislation advocated denying the indigenous autochthonous cultures and recommended instead defending a single language, culture and religion. It seems clear that behind these measures lay the conviction that these peoples all represented a threat to white societies. This way of looking at the situation was set out by intellectuals and politicians alike, who regarded the natives as inferior beings and a nuisance. The Venezuelan, Andrés Bello, for example, had stated quite emphatically in the first chapter of part two of his work, *Principios de Derecho Internacional* (Principles of International Law) that “a barbaric people, which does not know the duties of humanity and the laws of war, should be looked upon as an enemy of humankind” (Un pueblo bárbaro,

⁸ Raquel Yrigoyen Fajardo, “Hitos del reconocimiento del pluralismo jurídico y el derecho indígena en las políticas indigenistas y el constitucionalismo andino,” in *Pueblos indígenas y derechos humanos*, comp. Mikel Berraondo (Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 2006), 537–567.

⁹ Clavero, “Presencias humanas,” 645.

que desconoce los deberes de la humanidad y las leyes de la guerra, debe mirarse como enemigo del género humano.). The liberators themselves also lapsed into similar kinds of appraisals, shifting from an attitude of some benevolence towards the natives to a combative stance when they realized that they were violent peoples, resistant to the liberal state. Simón Bolívar illustrates this shift in opinion quite well. In his early writings, he seems to hold a Rousseauesque, anthropological view of the native, putting him on the same level as the noble savage, although when he is later obliged to contain various indigenous rebellions, he comes to conceive of the Indian as an unconquerable enemy who, at best, would only be able to fit into the liberal political system under the supervision of the white classes and by being blatantly deprived of his rights.¹⁰ Even constitutional texts, like the one drawn up in Ecuador in 1830, did not hesitate to make similar observations: “This constituent Congress appoints the venerable parish priests as tutors and natural fathers of the Indians, urging their ministry of charity in favour of this innocent, abject, wretched class” (Este Congreso constituyente nombra a los venerables curas párrocos por tutores y padres naturales de los indios, excitando su ministerio de caridad a favor de esta clase inocente, abyecta y miserable.). The clear obsession with the barbarism of the native and “civilizing” him, frequently entrusted to the care of religious institutions or administrative powers, was a constant in most of the pioneering constitutions of Latin American liberalism, even in some at the end of the century: the 1823 and 1828 Constitutions of Peru, the 1830 Constitution of Ecuador, the 1853 Constitution of Argentina and the 1870 Constitution of Paraguay, among others.

In the long list of such testimonies, and regardless of whether or not they formed part of legal discourse, there was always an underlying cultural contempt that viewed the natives as biologically inferior beings, as well as derogatory references to their “innocence” as a kind of “natural ingenuousness” that excused them from being blamed for their own barbarism. Nonetheless, it is also true that, in those cases where the exclusion policies became increasingly aggressive, so the tone of the discourse similarly hardened. Van Dijk, for example, quotes comments published in the Chilean newspaper, *El Mercurio*, in 1859, as part of the build-up to the outbreak of war against the Mapuches:

¹⁰ Manuel Andrés García, *La construcción del poder: Estado, Nación e Identidades. La construcción del Estado Nacional en Perú y la marginación política indígena (siglo XIX)* (Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico, 2002), 75ff.

Los hombres no nacieron para vivir inútilmente y como los animales selváticos, sin provecho del género humano; y una asociación de bárbaros tan bárbaros como los pampas o como los araucanos no es más que una horda de fieras, que es urgente encadenar o destruir en el interés de la humanidad y en el bien de la civilización.

[Men were not born to live uselessly nor to live like wild animals, without taking advantage of being one of the human species; And an association of barbarians as barbaric as those in the Pampas or the Araucanians is no more than a horde of wild animals gathered together that must be chained or destroyed in the interest of humanity and for the good of all civilization.]¹¹

Generally speaking, the native was considered only in his individual dimension, not as an integral part of a group with its own specific characteristics, culture and rights. The commonest practice right from the beginning of the independence process was to deny him his cultural identity, to such an extent, in fact, that San Martín avoided the term *indio* (Indian) and replaced it with *ciudadano* (citizen), while Juan Velazco Alvarado used the term *campesino* (peasant).¹² In neither case was the adoption of the new politically correct terms an expression of concern for the dramatic plight of the indigenous communities, nor was it in any way a show of respect for the history and culture of those peoples; both terms concealed the dubious idea that equality between human beings could simply be decreed and inequality be attenuated by means of a terminologically egalitarian discourse. Added to this was the difficulty of finding an unambiguous definition of “indigenous,” since some areas made a distinction between the native that had been integrated into the “republic” from the earliest times and the one living on the geographical borders of each state, as well as on the frontiers of lawfulness, who was referred to as “barbarian” (bárbaro), “wild” (bravo) or “savage” (salvaje).¹³ To take one example, as we shall see in the Peruvian case, a distinction was made between the native from the Sierra and the one from Amazonia, demonstrating that, even when it came to exclusion, they used natural and biological taxonomies of their own. When it came to explaining and justifying this hierarchy of the excluded, these descriptions of the customs, clothing and basic habits of each people supplied the theory and pretext for

¹¹ Both Spanish and English versions in Teun A. Van Dijk, *Racism and Discourse in Spain and Latin America* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2005), 125.

¹² Juan M. Ossio, *Los indios del Perú* (Madrid: Mapfre, 1992), 201.

¹³ Mónica Quijada, “La caja de Pandora. El sujeto político indígena en la construcción del orden liberal,” *Historia Contemporánea*, no. 33 (2006): 605–637, esp. 612.

violent intervention. In this respect, the war against the Uruguayan Charrúas and Minuanes in the nineteenth century was preceded by a substantial collection of comments, reports and any number of writings—earlier even than the founding of Montevideo—that emphasized the aggressive, resistant nature of the peoples, the lack of decorum in their dress and their repulsive customs. So, in his “Noticia sobre los minuanes” (“Information on the Minuanes”) of 1764, the Benedictine, Antonio J. Pernetty, mentions the stench of these Indians, who daubed their bodies with a greasy substance to protect themselves from insects, and criticizes their nakedness and tendency to drunkenness.¹⁴ When the war started in the 1830s, this was the image of the Minuanes and Charrúas that prevailed, one that was exacerbated at the time by the fact that the natives openly showed their resistance to the army and became a major obstacle to the process of occupying the land and defining state frontiers. During General Fructuoso Rivera’s relentlessly bloody campaign, most of the adult males were annihilated, while the women, old men and children were distributed among the officers and inhabitants of Montevideo, so that they could have them at their service and “tame” them. It is plain to see in the documentary evidence of these events, gathered by Acosta, that the natives were reduced to a state of virtual slavery and that, even though the obligation to “treat them well, educate them and convert them to Christianity” was established, they were in practice assimilated as if they were animals.¹⁵

In this respect, the use of the term *domesticar* (to tame) to indicate how the Charrúas were to be treated cannot be reduced to a mere terminological anecdote. Indeed, on numerous occasions, individuals from these indigenous communities were also exhibited in Europe as if they were exotic animals, being placed in fake settings that attempted to simulate their natural environment and accentuate their physical characteristics and cultural habits in order to attract an audience that was more morbidly curious than interested in anthropology. Exhibitions of live indigenous “specimens” at fairs and in other public venues appeared in villages and cities alike all over Europe and were frequently reported in the nineteenth-century newspapers, opening up moral and even theological, debates about the appropriateness of such behaviours. One of the best-known cases of the time was precisely the exhibition of the last four representatives of the Charrúa ethnic group in a “human zoo” in Paris in 1833, although the examples do not end there.¹⁶ In 1881, eleven Fuegians were also taken to

¹⁴ Acosta y Lara, *La guerra de los charrúas*, 244–247.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 51–52, and 60.

¹⁶ Annie Houot, *El trágico fin de los últimos charrúas* (Montevideo: Cruz del Sur, 2013).

Paris for the same purpose, and were publicly exhibited later in Berlin, Leipzig and other German and Swiss cities. In 1883, a group of Mapuches was put on show in the Jardin d'Acclimatation in Paris, while, in 1889, the Universal Exposition of the same city was responsible for showing several Selknam Indians from Tierra del Fuego.¹⁷ The appearance in Europe of the concept of the human zoo and the notion of the native as an object for public display—conceived of as halfway between an animal and a thing—is particularly illuminating for understanding the exclusionary mentality of both the Latin American elites and their European counterparts, all imbued with a discriminatory, racist way of thinking that made it very difficult for them to understand the indigenous “Other” as a citizen.

Naturally, nobody consulted the indigenous peoples to find out whether they wanted to be civilized or generously “included” in the prevailing model of liberal citizenship. It was generally not considered necessary to obtain their consent to these changes, because, apart from the fact that the liberal elites were contemptuous of the capacity of natives for rational thought, it was felt that their brand new status as citizens was already a reward in itself. As might be expected, this inclusion by means of exclusion eventually gave rise to the appearance of different types of social and political self-exclusion, namely, disaffection for the new norms that were imposed on them and a certain lack of interest in participating in the political game, so that it was not long before protest revolts took place. In this respect, from a historical standpoint, the study of exclusion is inseparable from the study of resistance to inclusion, or what might be referred to more generally as self-exclusion.

In any event, the different action strategies that the liberal states implemented with regard to the indigenous communities should not be seen as alternative options. In most cases, the policies were the result of a complex balancing act, in which the desire to exterminate them, limited inclusion and civilizing paternalism all coexisted at the same time or were subject to planned modifications that varied to suit the times and the circumstances. Furthermore, in a context in which the central themes of political speeches revolved around the equality, freedom and independence of the oppressed, sustaining these actions placed the liberal elites under the pressure of a permanent contradiction, which could only be withstood by means of a process of constructing the “Other”—in this case, the native—as “the enemy within.” So, the complex but limited conversion of the

¹⁷ Nicolas Bancel et al., *Zoos humains* (Paris: La Découverte, 2002); Christian Baez and Peter Mason, *Zoológicos humanos. Fotografías de fueguinos y mapuches en el Jardín de Acclimatación de París* (Santiago de Chile: Pehuén, 2006).

native into a citizen by stripping him of his cultural identity required his figure to be completely redefined; this oscillated between the image of the inferior Indian, innocent and unprotected, who needed a guardian to protect, educate and guide him, and that of the savage, aggressive Indian who resisted integration. We should not however labour under any misapprehensions; both extremes were based on the conviction that racial and phenotypic heterogeneity among individuals was the result of a biological and social hierarchization, which also included their capacities, and which translated into their being more or less civilized and served to define their unequal relationship with political life. There was no need to wait for the theories of Social Darwinism towards the end of the century in order to propose the natural superiority of some individuals over others; the whole of the nineteenth century was permeated with a series of linked ideas that identified the cultural and racial diversity of the native with backwardness, barbarism and misrule, ideas that were surreptitiously reinforced in parallel with processes that led to the socio-economic impoverishment of the native brought about by the same liberal laws. In contrast to this, many saw ethnic homogeneity as synonymous with political strength, economic progress and national cohesion. Nonetheless, this apparently simplistic reflection on the categories of humanity was capable of placing some societies under great strain, societies which, as we shall see in the case of Peru, were also aware of the sheer quantitative and qualitative weight that the indigenous cultures represented in their demographic, historical and identitarian composition.¹⁸

In addition to this, political legacies weighed heavily and certain conquests could not easily be undone, since the Indian was not just a passive subject. The 1812 Constitution of Cadiz, and all those that took their inspiration from it, had granted the natives rights of citizenship as well as the concomitant political rights, provided that they were settled as residents in a country; according to Quijada, these rights were discursively grasped and effectively exercised by the indigenous communities very rapidly. This could be regarded as a training stage for progressively abandoning age-old practices and becoming familiar with the new ones, attempting to adapt to “a homogenizing system of citizenship that tended increasingly to prioritize the individual principle over the corporative, private property over communal ownership and social inequality over ethnic differentiation.”¹⁹ Hence, according to Quijada, throughout the

¹⁸ Mónica Quijada, Carmen Bernand and Arno Schneider, *Homogeneidad y nación. Con un estudio de caso: Argentina siglos XIX y XX* (Madrid: CSIC, 2000).

¹⁹ Quijada, “La caja de Pandora,” 614–615.

liberal period, the participation of the natives as active political subjects was expressed at the local level, but it also involved them being included in inter-ethnic political factions fighting in battles and civil wars.²⁰ In the case of Peru, for example, when some progressive liberal sectors adopted an indigenist discourse around the middle of the century, it made it easy for some Quechua and Aymara communities to become involved in the defence of certain military caudillos.²¹ Equally, it should be pointed out that the natives soon became aware of the need to defend and enforce their rights, particularly in the sphere of local power, by claiming their right to vote and to be appointed to public office and by refusing to work as personal servants as they had done in the past. Because the indigenous populations were deprived of civil spaces in which to make their demands heard, their claims frequently took a violent turn, which helped amplify the conception of these groups as uncivilized savages who might constitute a serious threat to the well-being of the white elites and the prosperity of the new nation.

The Peruvian case: taxes and votes

The position of the indigenous Peruvians in the historical context after decolonization was the result of the intersection of three basic dimensions. The first was the predominance of rural society in the early development of the republican State and the second was the significant Indian participation in the armies of the caudillos during the foreign and civil conflicts of the 1830s and 1840s, a situation that was not always forced on them, but was expressly negotiated by different communities willing to form part of the guerrilla militias and which, as Cecilia Méndez points out, enabled them, in practice, to exercise a form of citizenship.²² The third dimension was their fiscal contribution via the *contribución de indígenas*, a tax levied on the indigenous population, a republican adaptation of the colonial head tax that was in force between 1826 and 1854.²³

²⁰ Ibid., 631.

²¹ Cecilia Méndez, *The Plebeian Republic: The Huanta Rebellion and the Making of the Peruvian State, 1820–1850* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).

²² Cecilia Méndez, “Tradiciones liberales en los Andes o la ciudadanía por las armas: campesinos y militares en la formación del Estado peruano,” in *La mirada esquiva. Reflexiones históricas sobre la interacción del Estado y la ciudadanía en los Andes (Bolivia, Ecuador y Perú), siglo XIX*, ed. Marta Irurozqui Victoriano (Madrid: CSIC, 2005), 146.

²³ Ibid., 125–153.

In spite of all this, most of the Peruvian elites shared the idea that the Indian was a potentially dangerous inferior being; on the one hand, because they had embraced the message of the Enlightenment that spoke in these terms, and on the other, because of the strong impact that the bloody revolts of Tomás Catari and Tupac Amaru II had made at the end of the eighteenth century. Both these rebellions, which formed part of the context of the struggle by the Quechua leaders of the Cuzco region against the Bourbon reforms imposed by Charles III, took place at the beginning of the 1780s, generating a climate of growing fear of the indigenous communities.²⁴ Equally, and not unconnected to these considerations, was the influence of some revolutionary leaders who—as has been pointed out already—came to see the Indians as potentially dangerous and destabilizing, despite having been initially well disposed towards them.

Given these basic premises, relations between the liberal Peruvian State and the original native peoples were formed from the start in a climate of tension that was determined by two fundamental interconnected areas of conflict that were directly linked to the status of the Indians as citizens. The first was undoubtedly the fiscal situation. The liberal elites were able to present the recuperation of the former colonial indigenous head tax as a way of turning the Indians into political citizens since the Indians had obtained the right to vote on the basis of it; nevertheless figures supplied by Van den Berghe and Primov, as well as by Basadre, demonstrate that the tax's main purpose was to raise revenue and, indeed, in the middle of the nineteenth century it represented 26 per cent of the national budget and 80 per cent of direct taxation. The indigenous head tax was maintained until 1854, the date when it was eliminated by President Ramón Castilla, to be restored in 1867 by Mariano Ignacio Prado.²⁵

The second area of conflict in the relationship between the Peruvian political rulers and the indigenous communities was, precisely, the one that concerned their electoral rights. The 1828 Peruvian Constitution established universal male suffrage; however, against a background of border disputes, internecine wars and the consolidation of the clientelist power of the caudillos, the electoral law of 1834 laid the foundation for a change aimed at limiting the vote to four groups through indirect suffrage: the secular clergy; civil servants; taxpayers (including natives and

²⁴ Ward Stavig and Ella Schmidt, *The Tupac Amaru And Catarista Rebellions: An Anthology of Sources* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2008), 27.

²⁵ Pierre Van den Berghe and George Primov, "Inequality in the Peruvian Andes: Class and Ethnicity in Cuzco," *American Journal of Sociology* 85, no. 2 (1979): 458–460; Jorge Basadre Grohmann, vol. 4 of *Historia de la República del Perú* (Lima: Universidad Ricardo Palma-La República, 1969), 98.

artisans); and those who exercised a “scientific profession.” Given all of this, the 1834 electoral law produced a heterogeneous citizenry that did not attain universal male suffrage but did help give the new republic legitimacy. The law defined the elector as any (male) citizen who satisfied certain census and capacity requirements, with the expectation that being a taxpayer would make the citizen co-responsible for maintaining the public sphere.²⁶

Except for the 1855 electoral law and the 1867 Constitution that established universal male suffrage—each in force for barely a year—other Peruvian regulations, as we mentioned above, made a distinction between active and passive citizenship. So, unmarried men under the age of twenty-five, for example, were excluded from exercising citizenship, although in 1856, the age was reduced to twenty-one. Consequently, since married civil status was given priority, political rights were established as being clearly dependent on being a paterfamilias, and highlighted the fact that the voter who belonged to a family unit was regarded as guaranteeing the attendant features of maturity, economic independence and representing a broad sector of the population, in other words, the family.²⁷ In addition, the illiterate were excluded from exercising active citizenship, although, significantly, an exception was made for those natives who could not read or write (in towns without a primary school), who provisionally retained full citizenship until 1854.²⁸ Finally, an economic exclusion filter was put in place by denying the right to vote to those who did not pay taxes, did not own property or were not heads of workshops.

Except for the period between 1855 and 1860, the established voting system was an indirect one, a vestige of the Constitution of Cadiz that was also explicit in the maintenance of such significant ritual elements as

²⁶ Cristóbal Aljovín de Losada, “Sufragio y participación política: Perú, 1808–1896,” in *Historia de las elecciones en el Perú. Estudios sobre el gobierno representativo*, ed. Cristóbal Aljovín de Losada and Sinesio López (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 2005), 19–74, esp. 50–51.

²⁷ These mechanisms are very similar to the ones applied in Colombia and Mexico, see María Antonia Peña Guerrero, “Sufragio y representación en la Colombia liberal: una mirada comparada a los marcos electorales de Europa y América en el siglo XIX,” *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research* 20, no.1 (2014): 5–18, esp. 8; María Sierra and María Antonia Peña, “La construcción de la representación política liberal: una mirada comparada entre España y México,” in *Emprunts et transferts culturels: Mexique*, ed. Nicole Fourtané and Michèle Guiraud (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 2011), 177–198.

²⁸ See Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, accessed June 30, 2014, <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/bib/portal/constituciones/pais7dbc.html?pais=Peru>.

celebrating mass prior to voting.²⁹ Voting that took place in two stages at parish and province level was introduced as a way of allowing the voters time for reflection and it vested a certain amount of confidence in the ability of the parish elector to select good delegates. At the same time it gave the elites an advantage in controlling the process, since it reproduced the vertical hierarchy of the social pyramid. For nineteenth-century theorists, the function of two-tier elections was to counteract the electoral strength of the poorer sectors of the populace—the “tyranny of numbers”—and, simultaneously, to create a selection mechanism that would favour “government by the best.”³⁰ So much so that, when the direct vote was combined with universal suffrage after the abolition of slavery in 1855, its detractors declared that the Nation had been “debased” (envilecida), which was explained as follows:

Se ha querido igualar al negro esclavo, marcado en el alma y en el cuerpo con una profunda ignorancia, con sus instintos de robo y de asesinato, y con las cicatrices del látigo. Siendo imposible hacerlo subir hasta la altura del gran número de peruanos que conocemos nuestros derechos y podemos ejercerlos y defenderlos.

[They have set out to give equality to the negro slave, marked in body and soul by profound ignorance, with his instincts for stealing and murdering, and with the scars of the lash, it being impossible to raise him to the level of the great number of Peruvians who know our rights and are able to exercise and defend them.]³¹

Political citizenship in Peru, then, was principally defined on the basis of culture, economic independence and social recognition, and was basically equivalent to the constitutionalism that was established in Europe during the same years and in the United States before the 1830s. Furthermore, the regulations adopted the Cadiz model of the resident-voter, above all because control of the requirements and physical

²⁹ Juan Oviedo, vol. 3 of *Colección de leyes, decretos y órdenes publicadas en el Perú desde el año 1821 hasta 31 de diciembre de 1859* (Lima: Felipe Bailly, 1861–1872), 14.

³⁰ Jorge Ragas, “La distorsión de la voluntad. Corrupción y sufragio en Perú (1849–1851),” in *La mirada esquiva*, 215–232; María Sierra, María Antonia Peña and Rafael Zurita, *Elegibles y elegidos. La representación parlamentaria en la cultura del liberalismo* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2010), 138.

³¹ Natalia Sobrevilla, “El proyecto liberal y la Convención de 1855,” in *La experiencia burguesa en el Perú (1840–1940)*, ed. Carmen McEvoy (Madrid-Frankfurt: Iberoamericana, 2004), 223–243, esp. 236ff.