

SHARING THE PAST: REFLECTIONS ON “THE ARCHIVE” AS A SITE OF EXCHANGE AND DIALOGUE OF BODIES OF KNOWLEDGE

DOLORES ESTRUCH

Universidad de Buenos Aires/CONICET (Argentina)
doloestruch@gmail.com

LORENA B. RODRÍGUEZ

Universidad de Buenos Aires/CONICET (Argentina)
rodriguezlo@hotmail.com

Abstract: In recent decades, and on the basis of what is called the “archival turn”, different theoretical and methodological reflections have been made about the archives, their origins, configurations and uses. On the one hand, other types of archives have begun to receive attention. Thus, outside imperial, state or official repositories, the analysis of family or personal records, as well as that of peasant and indigenous communities, have been brought into focus in studies which intensify the oppositions between the public and the private spheres, orality and writing, paper documents and other types of material media. Taking these contributions as the starting point, and within the framework of our own research studies about indigenous peoples, we set forth from the dilemma we face when reflecting upon the dialogues and tensions generated around the construction of the past, when those who engage in dialogue and dispute are actors with dissimilar experiences, interests and power (indigenous people, academicians, state agents). On the basis of the idea put forth by Fabian about a theory – and praxis of – coevalness, understood as a condition for the existence of a dialogic encounter between people and societies, and accepting this author’s invitation to “share our pasts”, the aim of this article is to provide some methodological notes on the place of the “archive” as a possible point of intersection and dialogues. Therefore, our main objective is to rethink/question the “archive”, considering it, as Stoler does, not only as a site of knowledge retrieval, but essentially as a place of knowledge production.

Keywords: archive, indigenous, coloniality of knowledge, intercultural dialogues, Argentina.

ISSN 2283-7949

GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION

2021, 2, DOI: 10.12893/gjcp.2021.2.14

Published online by “Globus et Locus” at <https://glocalismjournal.org>



Some rights reserved

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, and on the basis of what is called the “archival turn”, different theoretical and methodological reflections have been made about the archives, their origins, configurations and uses (Caimari 2017; Cook, Schwartz 2002; Farge 1991; Gorbach, Rufer 2016, and others). Going beyond the borders of History, the archive lies at the centre of research in anthropological studies, literary criticism, feminisms and cultural studies (Rufer 2020). These novel approaches and dialogues among disciplines have fostered the development of new research lines within this field of study. On the one hand, other types of archives have begun to receive attention. Thus, outside imperial, state or official repositories, the analysis of family or personal records (Ramos 2021), as well as that of peasant and indigenous communities (Crespo 2020; Muñoz Morán 2010; Platt 2015; Salomon 2001), have been brought into focus in studies which intensify the oppositions between the public and the private spheres, orality and writing, paper documents and other types of material media. Likewise, close examination of other types of archival logic invites the analysis of tensions and appropriations brought into play in history writing and the construction of memory (Cunill, Estruch, Ramos 2021). These memories do not follow the standard order imposed by the researcher on the work desk; rather, they unfold and are known through disagreements and conflict (Severi 2010). On the other hand, some researchers seek to counteract the fragmentation of histories, typical of how information from state agencies is dispersed and compartmentalised, with the aim of reconstructing “indigenous archives”, for example, and restoring somehow their own rationales (De Jong 2014; Escolar 2013; Vezub 2011).

Taking these contributions as the starting point, and within the framework of our own research studies about indigenous peoples, we set forth from the dilemma we face when reflecting upon the dialogues and tensions generated around the construction of the past, when those who engage in dialogue and dispute are actors



with dissimilar experiences, interests and power (indigenous people, academicians, state agents). On the basis of the idea put forth by Fabian ([1983] 2019) about a theory – and praxis of – coevalness¹ understood as a condition for the existence of a dialogic encounter between people and societies and accepting this author’s invitation to “share our pasts”, the aim of this article is to provide some methodological notes on the place of the “archive” as a possible point of intersection and dialogues. Therefore, our main objective is to rethink/question the “archive”, considering it, as Stoler (2010) does, not only as a site of knowledge retrieval, but essentially as a place of knowledge production.

For that purpose, and following the author’s premise that before reading the archive “against the current” it is necessary to “follow the archival current”², we will organize this text around two main approaches. Firstly, and mainly drawing on our experiences working with archives, we will read “along the grain”, trying to find in the direction of the thread some clues that will allow us to understand the matrix of power which recorded and placed documents therein in the past. As we shall observe, this matrix is in some way still present and affects the present-day context. Far from considering that the colonial/state character of these archives renders them useless for reconstructing the indigenous past, we understand that in order to dismantle the coloniality of knowledge (Lander 2000), it is fundamental to revisit those sources and visualize how they were produced and arranged, with the aim of laying the foundation in which academic and native knowledge can enter into dialogue.

Secondly, we will do a reading “against the grain” as we seek to deconstruct, reread, question and reorganise the archival material which has previously been read following the current. Some indigenous inquiries, made from present times, will lead us to search for other weaves and histories therein, and simultaneously, to observe other archival spaces, forms and practices. In this respect, and to continue consolidating the exchanges and reflect on the bridges



and “noises” that emerge in the dialogue held about the repositories, we consider it necessary that the “reading against the grain” is performed intersubjectively. In our case, we choose to carry out collaborative research, in the terms defined by Rappaport and Ramos (2005) and Rappaport (2007), who proposed that the interactions among ethnographic subjects, intercultural dialogues, should take place in the context of shared theorizing processes; an intellectual endeavour, of constant and ensemble interpretation, which in the process of rereading the archives will enable questioning of what happened in the past, as well as of how that past has been narrated and captured in different repositories.

To sum up, we propose that the challenge of analysing the indigenous past departs from the intersection of three lines we are concerned with: the one that is inviting us to “go across” these archives, while simultaneously leading us to constantly reask ourselves about the adequacy of using the “archive” concept; the one that establishes a dialogue between academic and native knowledge, and the line that connects and reads that past from the point of view of claims and demands made in the present.

THE THREADS OF THE ARCHIVE AND THE THREADS OF POWER

Along the grain

We agree with Foucault (1979) that archives are “the law of what can be said”, which constitute true, although contested, sites of power. Their configuration, organization and functioning entail presences, absences and orders tied to specific historical conjunctures which, in any case, as Añón (2020) observed, set up a narrative machinery which, based on a coloniality matrix, operates beyond the context where it has emerged.



We have learned through our journeys across different archives, in search of data about the colonial period, that approaching them entails coming into contact with an imperial technology which had a key role in the colonization process as an instrument of administration and domination. As Tanodi (2010) points out, various Indian rules and codes defined from early on the production, management and conservation of documents in the colonies³. Having said that, even though it is correct to posit that throughout the colonial period the archive worked as a government tool, this conceptualization places some constraints to consider it from points of view other than those imposed by imperial procedures. In this sense, Cortez (2018) postulates that, instead of speaking about one single archive, we should be aware of the different tendencies or directions that inhabit the colonial repository of the Americas: an imperial, a creole and an indigenous trend which, with differing weight and pre-eminence, coexist, interweave and cause tensions with each other.

In recent decades, a rich assortment of works have analysed the imperial tendency in the colonial archive of the Americas with the aim of reading it “against the grain” or “from below”, in order to destabilise the hegemonic forms of representation shown therein (Stoler 2010). However, as we have mentioned above, we agree with Stoler’s argument about the need of approaching the archive following the original direction of its threads first. Therefore, in this section, before turning the cloth upside down, we will read it following the natural pattern. Accordingly, and taking as a departure point the idea of the archive as technology of power (in terms of Foucault), we consider it of vital importance to approach the modalities for the exercise of power in colonial society by way of what can be said, as stated in the repository. Thus, before reading the silences, the inquiries and the tension, and prior to coming closer to the other side, we are concerned with recovering the threads that the repository stretches from its weave, with exploring the outer side of that power matrix.



Which are, then, the keys to power in colonial society, and how much of them can we recover from the archive? First, Carlos Aguirre and Javier Villa Flores (2009) provide us with an interesting glimpse of them by noticing the self-documentation practices that existed outside the “archives of repression of the Church and the State” (2009: 8). For example, in hospitals, indigenous communities, confraternities, parishes, among other institutions which conceived their archives as an “essential tool to question the State” (Aguirre, Villa Flores 2009: 8).

We believe that a way of reading in the direction of the archive threads is by getting to the heart of these societies of the ancient regime. If we follow the severe criticism made by political and legal historiography to the statist paradigm (Agüero 2006, 2013; Barrera 2010; Garriga 2004; Hespanha 1989, among others), we will witness the substantial change involved in moving the concept of State, and also that of Church⁴ (Di Stefano 2005; Estruch 2017), away from the analyses of phenomena related to institutional languages and forms of power (Agüero 2013). Thus, by removing the gravitational force exerted by the State or the Church as naturalised units of measure, we shall be able not only to approach the study of the exercise of power and the place of the archive from another perspective, but also to visualise other analytical dimensions and actors.

In this fashion, and far from understanding this organization of the colonial power as the assemblage of a centralised system, perfectly articulated “from above”, we will be able to notice the autonomy of these bodies which, as corporate subjects, formed the republic and included the indigenous communities. For this reason, instead of thinking in terms of archives which question the State (Aguirre, Villa Flores 2009), we can regard the “repositories” of hospitals, indigenous communities, town halls, and the like, as lenses which allow us to observe the multiple centres of power marked in a map of overlapping jurisdictions and convergent legal authorities. An example of this is the jurisdictional conflict which strained relations between the town halls of Jujuy and Catamarca



(Gobernación del Tucumán [Governance of Tucumán], present-day Northwestern Argentina), sites of local power, and the authority of the *corregidor* or lieutenant of the mines in the Puna regions of Jujuy and the Yocavil valley, representatives of the royal jurisdiction in these mining regions. These lieutenants served functions of administration of justice by settling conflicts, administering punishment and providing interpretations to the existing legislation, and therefore on many occasions competed with the jurisdiction of the city's chapter house, which had similar prerogatives (Becerra, Estruch 2012; Estruch 2017; Estruch, Rodríguez, Becerra 2012; Rodríguez 2008).

If we adjust the lenses to the sites of local power, we can argue that another tendency should be added to those discriminated by Cortez (2018) in the colonial archive: one which devotes attention to this localised power. In this way, we shall be able to approach the analysis of corporations such as the town hall and notice the complexity of jurisdictional disputes, which should not be necessarily read as questioning the State, but rather as part of a society where power was not centralised and its authorities caused tension within the jurisdictions, while ploughing their way through an intricate network of power.

On this matter, another example is the ecclesiastical power and the parish archives that, in the case of colonial Tucumán, registered vital statistics until the creation of the Register Office in 1884. Even though in certain circumstances this power could compete and create tension with other local powers (for example, *encomenderos* and priests due to indigenous labour and associated economic resources⁵), other times they functioned in a complementary manner. For instance, the *revisitas* [re-inspections] of indigenous inhabitants that took place at the end of the 18th century required that the information collected in situ be checked against the parish records. Indeed, the Instruction⁶ on *revisitas* in Ch. 7.13 established not only that the priests attend the enrolment but that they “demonstrate the Books of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials, which must be kept



in a clear and specific fashion: so that the number of Baptised, Married, and Dead persons shall come to knowledge”.

The religious brotherhoods of San Salvador de Jujuy are an eminent example of how we can use ecclesiastical archives to reconstruct colonial society’s capillary social and political networks. These holy places were truly associational microcosms, inner spaces inside the temples that reflected group identities and solidarity networks. In this paper, we show how, in colonial times, San Salvador de Jujuy’s catholic church brought together, in a single space, two very different segments of society. On the one hand, the members of the local elite who belonged to the brotherhood of the “Blessed Sacrament”. On the other hand, segments of the urban indigenous population who integrated the brotherhood of “San Pedro de Los Naturales” (Estruch 2009, 2017). For the analysis, we rely on the documents that belonged to these two brotherhoods hosted in Ecclesiastical repositories, including the brotherhood’s constitutions, the minute books, and the authority books. We use this corpus to reconstruct a unique historical map of the social networks and the political landscape in Colonial Jujuy.

Postulating this “local” tendency may allow us to approach the bonds of local power with the royalty or with the Pope in Rome, without seeing a State or a Church where there was none or obscuring a matrix of power in which, for example, the negotiation processes between the Crown and the cities/town halls cannot be reduced to a simple hierarchical relationship (Agüero 2013). Hence, we can say that, just as we did not find a State in the colony, we found no centralized archive either. Proof of this is that the General Archive of the Indies was created only in 1785, that is, at the end of the colonial period (Tanodi 2010).

In this fashion, if we return to our question about the keys to power in colonial society and how much of them can be recovered from a reading along the archival grain, we should note that not all these many actors had the same technology of textual production or storage. The archival collections that nowadays allow us to postulate the presence of certain repositories in the past (for example,



the existence of *actas capitulares* [chapter acts] referring us to the bureaucratic tradition of gathering and keeping in the chests with three keys, implemented by the Spanish Crown and transposed to the town halls in the Americas) should be critically reviewed if we want to reconstruct the trajectory of the documents and learn if they have been thought of as archivable.

In our research, and locating the work on the margins of the Hispanic Monarchy, i.e. colonial Tucumán, we often wonder to what extent the notion of “archive” fits in when it comes to thinking about the documentation issued by intermediate authority figures or smaller institutions that we consult today in the provincial state archives. For example, the lieutenants of the mines that we have mentioned earlier had the power to issue certain regulations, to record the memory of their actions; however, we are not able to make use of a framework that allows us to understand what path these documents followed within a society that had no general or centralized archive. In this sense, reconstructing the route of these papers, from their production context to their landing in the current repositories, could be a way of returning not only to the question of how successful, lax or wrong the concept of “archive” may become for the analysis of colonial societies, but also to understand how these documents configured (in a performative sense)⁷ the relations of power and hierarchy in more local settings.

This task then places us in the present and leads us to go along the archival grain to reconstruct, from the current catalogues, the paths and changes the documents have undergone within the repository. Throughout time the papers are located under certain ordering systems, within certain semantic fields. All it takes is going to the catalogues and looking up entries such as “*hacienda*” or “justice”. These categories make up the narrative of the archive itself and condition our research insofar as those domains –which are presented to us under a certain sign – are historical products and, as such, respond to contingent and dynamic ideas.

On many occasions, we find catalogues that retain marks of previous ordering systems and this allows us to reconstruct, in a



various activities of grouping, distribution of papers and formation of folders that, according to a series of criteria including intellectual and physical operations, have taken place from the beginning of the colony to the present day. By analysing its documentary collection from this perspective we have noticed, among other aspects, how the chapter acts of Jujuy are distributed, or rather divided between this archive of justice and the Historical Archive of the province, located in the same city. From there, we were interested in asking ourselves what were the successive notions of justice – and of history – that accompanied the paths of these papers marked by the comings and goings between both repositories and what are the current meanings which justify that these chronicles are being disputed by both archives (Estruch 2021). In a recent interview, the director of the Jujuy Judicial Power Archive, María Eugenia Corte, stated that this repository was born with the founding of the city, the constitution of its town hall and the consequent establishment of the administration of justice. Her words indicated that, far from the existence of an executive power in the colony, what was there was a town hall with its *alcaldes* [mayor]; this was the beginning of an archive activated after the ritual of the founding of the city, when a pillory and stocks were deposited as symbol of the establishment of justice and the starting point of the institutional sphere where this Castilian council would exercise corporate authority through its judges. We thus noticed how the importance of justice within the culture of the ancient regime was not only an aspect that could be analysed from the documents, but also from the catalogue of the two main repositories in the city (Estruch 2021).

From what has been stated so far, we understand then that a reading along the archival grain must make an effort to unravel the ways in which power was built and exercised in each historical context under study. But, additionally, it is necessary to connect the present and the past, exploring the matrices of power that have organised and still organise the archive to this day. In that sense, it is necessary to pay attention to the logic of classification, compart-



mentalisation, dispersion or centralisation that state agencies or local powers impose on the documents, as well as on the archival criteria which classify and distribute into discrete groups the papers reaching our hands.

Against the grain

Now, let us turn the cloth upside down and go against the archival grain, following the other tendencies (indigenous or creole) that Cortez (2018) proposes for the study of the colonial archive of the Americas. In relation to this, we will focus on the silences that the archive perpetuates; certain omissions, concealments and misrepresentations will serve as traffic signals for our analysis against the grain. From this perspective, if the notion of “colonial archive” was proposed to express the asymmetric relationship that prevailed in the production, selection and conservation of documents, it also warns us about the methodological precautions deriving from the silence of actors who left no evident marks in the documentation (Stoler 2010; Burns 2010), but which we have tried to recover with our research. This is why we follow the indigenous tendency, in which an inclusion strategy predominates within the hegemonic data and where non-Western epistemology, practices and knowledge take place. An example in this sense is that offered by Bigelow (2018), who, based on an interdisciplinary methodological practice that emphasizes linguistic translations, sheds light on the indigenous technical skills involved in the development of colonial mining hidden in files. Looking back at our work experience, we may cite other examples by making a small modification to Cortez’s proposal. Instead of following the author’s approach and considering the indigenous voices of the past “trapped” still on the shelves at the repositories, we will review – in order to continue with our methodological notes – some indigenous reports that, from the present, question the archives, the hegemonic narratives and ourselves as researchers.



Until recently, there was a consensus among ethnohistorians that the Calchaquí Valley had been emptied of its original settlers after the so-called Calchaquí Wars⁸ ended in the 1660s. In fact, war reports, government regulations, information on the merits and services of the conqueror, official documents for *encomiendas* – deposited in the current provincial archives (partial inheritors of former colonial jurisdictions papers) – emphasized the complete and final defeat of the rebels, highlighting that the Calchaquí Valley, after 130 years of war, had been emptied as a result of implementing the policy of “denaturalisation” that Governor Mercado y Villacorta had framed⁹. The rhetoric of the extinction of the indigenous population in the valley – which had started at the end of the 17th century – for a long time made it impossible to speak about the indigenous vitality in that place.

It was in the context of ethnic revitalisations that have been developing with increasing force in our country since the 1990s¹⁰ that the discursive possibilities began to change and the colonial archives could be rearranged or read against the grain to find new historical clues. For example, in the framework of an ethnographic fieldwork in which one of us participated and thanks to the exchanges with different members of an indigenous community in the valley (Comunidad India Quilmes), there appeared other versions of the denaturalisation processes that questioned what was stated up to that point in the archives and by the researchers regarding the emptying of the valley and the disappearance of the native peoples. Indeed, in light of the questioning posed by the community members, the “indigenous tendency” of the archives, buried for a long time, began to become more tangible. Despite the fact that the brutality and magnitude of the uprooting continued to be undeniable, new data came into sight in colonial files and documents, clarifying and reversing the image of the Calchaquí Valley as a space emptied of indigenous inhabitants (see Rodríguez 2008).

This case turns out to be interesting in the light of what Añón (2020) points out, i.e. although some narrative machinery is set up in a given conjuncture it may operate even beyond it. In this regard,



it is worth mentioning that the transformation of the colony into a republic and the subsequent period of national consolidation entailed big political changes, which were naturally reflected on the processes of documentary classification, ordering and cataloguing of archives. A reading along the grain of, for example, how provincial archives were reconfigured throughout the 19th century and, especially, towards the end of it will probably show how the “creole tendency”, which was present in the previous period as well, became hegemonic in that context mainly to break down the “colonial order”. In general, in these national or republican archives – increasingly structured according to the will of the state and under the citizenisation discourse – indigenous traces tend to disappear (at least, of those conquered during the colonial period). The case of the Calchaquí Valley is particular given that the imperial-colonial archival tendency and the republican-creole one converge on it and reinforce each other. The image of a deserted valley with no indigenous people depicted in the 17th century is redefined during the 19th and 20th centuries in a process in which different agents, including the academicians, were involved.

Here we provide an illustrative example. In several legal proceedings concerning territorial disputes filed during the 19th century by the Amaicha community (colonial indigenous community from the Calchaquí Valley), their claim for the land was dismissed based on the premise that there were no Amaicha indigenous inhabitants in the region since they had been denaturalised during the colonial period¹¹. Even though the existence of indigenous people is silenced in general and in the Valley in particular, two elements in the archive – in the imperial-creole tendency – allow us to do a reading against the grain and find an indigenous current.

On the one hand, following Derrida (1997), we could say that the archive, in the sense of “the origin” or *arkhè* – the place where things started – and also in the sense of archon or deposit – from where authority is exercised and laws are enacted – constitutes power and legitimises it. However, a paradox is hidden: there are some statements lying on its shelves which threaten the unique



sense that archons and guards of the archive seek to impose and protect. After all, the files of the Historical Archive of Tucumán show that the Amaichas had been claiming for their land in the Calchaquí Valley, at least, since the eighteenth century. Indeed, in 1990 a colonial document known as *Cédula Real* [Royal Decree] helped the community, which could eventually get the title to part of the collective territory (for more information about the *Cédula Real*, see Sosa 2015).

On the other hand, the existence of the Amaicha community in itself not only puts the prior conditions of enunciability under tension and creates others which make the vitality and continuity of the Amaicha community visible throughout time, but also allows us to know/grasp other ways of inhabiting the land and new conceptions of temporality, among others. In this sense, the oral narratives collected show that, in many cases, the way the *amaicheños* periodise time does not correspond to the linear chronology in which an official archive and the documents kept in it are arranged. The succession of dates associated with specific events and characters is replaced with narratives in which time is disrupted and characters fuse together (examples of this can be found in Boullosa-Joly, Rodríguez 2014). Naturally, this allows for readings against the grain and, ultimately, transforms/moulds a reconfiguration of the archives making space for indigenous voices, skills and practices.

We had a similar experience during a collaborative study including the Great Argentine Chaco indigenous communities¹², the photographic and documentary archive of the Ethnographic Museum Juan Bautista Ambrosetti¹³ and the Colectivo Etnografías Chaco, of which we are members. With the aim of highlighting and disseminating the Documentary Collection Enrique Palavecino¹⁴, mainly consisting of the photography production made by this anthropologist during his fieldwork in Chaco between 1927 and 1963, the archive opened its doors to a joint work with these communities and experienced researchers. This photographic corpus, a testimony to the history of the indigenous societies of Chaco as well as



to part of the history of twentieth-century anthropology, was studied in a project developed through a series of stages. After digitising drawings, graphics and more than 1,800 photographs, a meeting was held at the museum with representatives from the communities; photographs were shared and some of them were selected to be exhibited there. This meeting, which was recorded on a camera and thus became archive material, was included in the exhibition “A través de la lente: encuentro con pueblos indígenas en el Chaco” [Through the Lens: An Encounter with Indigenous Peoples in Chaco], inaugurated in June 2010.

In addition, it is also possible to see how these archives, now with the indigenous trace out in the open, in turn, reinforce indigenous memories. Going back to the previous experience, at a subsequent stage, the study continued in Chaco, where a series of community workshops were conducted with indigenous people and specialists. In September 2012, a meeting was held at the indigenous school in the Lapacho II community and at the headquarters of the National University of Salta in Tartagal. Paper photographs were shared and some elements in these images were identified which triggered stories where elder participants had a leading role. Those who knew the Chaco captured by Palavecino with his lens some decades ago were reunited with these portraits of the past and could share them with young people (Carrasco, Costilla, Estruch, Wahren 2014).

We would like to highlight two aspects of this experience. First, the potential of this type of joint activities to “share our pasts”. Throughout the project, spaces were created in which the academic perspective reflected in Palavecino’s photographs and publications was confronted by the knowledge of current inhabitants of Chaco and of researchers who, from the present, revisited those photograph productions belonging to a foundational phase of Argentine Anthropology. Thus, within the framework of a joint work aiming at contextualising these pictures, we recovered an important number of time marks that anchored the past to a series of distinct milestones according to the actor narrating it. For example,





Fig. 2. *Photographs of Palavecino shared in the workshop (Collection Enrique Palavecino. Photographic and documentary archive of the Ethnographic Museum Juan Bautista Ambrosetti).*

in many of the pictures analysed, the distinctive mark which allowed members of indigenous communities to place these visual records in time was the arrival of religious missions, by making the distinction between “before the missions” and “after the missions” in many of their accounts.



Fig. 3. *Photographs of Palavecino shared in the workshop (Credit: Natalia Castelnuovo).*

Second, once the workshops finished, digital copies of Palavecino's photographic corpus were given to the communities so that digital archives could be created at schools and libraries. We believe that a possible way to keep knitting an exchange of knowledge and give space to the dominated is to examine the ordering and classification systems that communities developed for their digital archives beyond the standards of archival practices and Social Sciences. Exploring these classification systems and juxtaposing them with the system adopted by the university museum to arrange the same photographic corpus may be a starting point for making other – generally ignored – languages, views and knowledge visible and making the archive become an area of epistemological and ontological borders, where the academy does not monopolise interpretation and the canonical conception of the archive as a space closed to itself may be questioned by other experiences.

Carolina Crespo (2020) mentions the creation of a “moving”, dynamic and travelling archive in a study about the archival practices of the Mapuche community in the Argentine Patagonia. The author adopts an ethnographic approach to deal with these written and visual record archives paying special attention to the selective searching procedures of documents, readings and ordering systems that imply being objective and reflecting upon them constantly. Within the framework of claims for land and struggles for rights, the strong political consciousness of Mapuche communities made them create mobile and dynamic archives containing heterogeneous materials that would have been discarded following the Western logic; these also include official documents re-orienting the logic behind the organization of a state archive, which has dissected their stories and records.

In connection with this, when reading the archives against the grain, a methodological note to be taken into account focuses precisely on analysing archival practices and creating “peasant archives” (Platt 2015); archives collected, kept and preserved by indigenous communities which, besides comprising documents and photographs, may include records and media that can be archived and considered as “other sources” to reconstruct the history of indigenous communities. These “community” archives allow us to analyse the production and appropriation conditions of official documents, their selection, dissemination and use without losing sight of the meanings previously attributed to the media kept in them.

However, we should consider that these native archival practices are not only contemporary phenomena; producing, selecting and archiving documents to provide evidence that defies authority is a phenomenon which dates back to a long time ago. In their book *Beyond the Lettered City: Indigenous Literacies in the Andes*, Rappaport and Cummins (2016) report how indigenous people’s mastery of alphabetic literacy in the northern Andes originated not only the creation of sources but also of archives that, although influenced by practices of the colonial administration, show how Andean people were actively involved in the construction of legality



and memory. In judicial contexts, indigenous litigants produced, filed and spread documentary evidence where lettered and legal practices were juxtaposed with oral testimonies; the latter were only valid in written form and, therefore, turned out to be an authentic intercultural product as a result of centuries of colonial interaction. The authors record how native voices become audible, for instance, in the assembly of the documentary evidence hoarded by the *caciques* [native chiefs] of Tuza and used in litigations over land. These voices are also recovered in disputes about the line of succession to the *cacique* position in the town of Guachucal, where oral and written evidence develops a narrative about the ethnic lords throughout time.

It is vitally important to bear in mind that the indigenous criteria that made it possible to assemble different types of texts, alphabetic and non-written, in “notebooks” or other formats diverged from the European criteria. Nevertheless, it is essential to keep in mind that the criteria applied by indigenous people to organise their evidence did not always show the sense of otherness; instead, “frequently their criteria asserted the litigant’s intimate insertion into the lettered city and colonial culture in general” (Rapaport, Cummins 2016: 195).

In conclusion, we understand that all of the above constitute key points to approach the historical documents of indigenous authorship, as well as the use and preservation of these documents as papers which indigenous people read and use in the present. Such methodological notes allow us to get closer to the archive against the grain and provide the basis for the analysis of ordering and classification systems which work beyond the logic of the State. These may be crucial when making new, contrastive and “against the current” readings of official archives, which make voices, silences and senses not previously recorded in our analysis visible.



FINAL THOUGHTS

This work recovers and puts into dialogue our research experiences regarding indigenous peoples with a dual purpose. On the one hand, it aims to reflect on the archive as a place of intersections and dialogues in which state, native and academic interests/knowledge converge in the processes of construction of the past. On the other hand, although closely linked to the previous point, it seeks to outline a series of methodological notes arranged in a double direction: those that follow the capillarity of the repository and allow us to explore the authority and power relationships that determine what is “archivable”, of what is “accessible” (Aguirre, Villa Flores 2009) or “unarchivable”, showing us that, more than a piece of information, the archive is a status (Mbembe 2002) whose power matrix continues to have an impact on the Present. As well, it aims to follow the traffic in the opposite direction, seeking to deconstruct, challenge and make visible other plots and stories of the archive, defying us to face problems such as representation, historiographic silences, transwriting and ventriloquism (Guerrero 2000).

Thus, far from thinking that the colonial/state character of certain sources makes them useless for the reconstruction of the indigenous past, we consider that the challenge of dismantling the colonisation of knowledge leads us to explore the archive starting from contexts and anchors that put academic knowledge and native knowledge in dialogue.

We are forced to make a first stop and carry out an introspective examination that studies the subordination processes that our disciplines have carried forward, noting how they have produced knowledge from the archive, establishing power relations based on interpretations, unidirectional cultural translations or certain allochronisms (Fabian [1983] 2019) that we need to review from a collaborative perspective that includes the societies represented there.



For this reason, a second stop leads us to project our role as researchers in the archive, as a space that concentrates epistemological and symbolic borders and makes native, state and academic knowledge to dialogue. If the archive can be thought of as a point of confluence of demands, discomforts and expectations in which various interlocutors intervene, it is a privileged space to question our work in a plot in which re-significance, rejections and negotiations on the cutting and assembly of the past converge. In this sense, we return to the metaphor of the game of billiards proposed by Claudia Briones (2018) to reflect on anthropological expertise, insofar as it allows us to think in trialogues, rather than dialogues. Or rather, in a dialogue or movement that, as in that game, is three-way, and where the main challenge lies in putting different types of discourses and, therefore, truths into perspective and linking, rather than neutralizing or monopolize one of them (Briones 2018).

Thus, more than as researchers, rather than speaking for others about their past, ordering and/or translating them, we can make the archive a meeting point where a series of views on a past in which state agents and academics converge and diverge. Academics have had and are in a strategic position to make visible, blur and discard certain versions of the history of others.

Now, what happens when archives are the result of indigenous archival practices? Does the trialogue dissolve? How to think about the work of the researchers before peasant archives? We understand that the archives produced by indigenous peoples can also be thought of as places for intercultural dialogues where different ways of reading the past converge that include the State as one of the parts of the trialogue. In the first place, because many of the documents archived by indigenous communities have a state origin that are re-signified in this matrix of native archiving practices. As Frank Salomon (2011) states in his analysis of the treatment given by the peasant community of Tupicocha in Peru to the Royal Provision of 1670, all physical attributes have meaning. While academics and state agents fundamentally consider the “content” of these papers, that is, the succession of alphabetic characters, community



members are interested in aspects such as the size of the writing, the forms of parchment binding, the viceregal seals. In these details the “true” content of the original is communicated, treasured as legal proof of collective ownership of the land.

Which leads us to a second question, that there are other ways of approaching and treating the materiality of the archive, that it includes other supports, other mnemonic practices and experiences and representations of time different from those that prevail in official repositories, not it means that these state papers are treasured by the indigenous people for the sole purpose of giving them a ritual treatment and keeping them as fetish documents within the community for time immemorial. On the contrary, we note that these papers document the course of negotiations and agreements established with the state and function in a probationary manner in certain moments of conflict. Thus, we can understand that indigenous self-documentation and archiving practices can also be thought of as forms of counter-power, as ways of challenging the State as they protect the point of view and interests of subaltern groups built over time and activated in certain contexts.

In these instances of conflict, which are usually settled in a judicial framework, the expert role of the researcher, rather than that of an interpreter who works by translating native notions and state notions, can function as a catalyst for conflicts between the different interlocutors, insofar as it makes visible and highlights the distances and misunderstandings that occur in this three-way dialogue. Likewise, proposing a collaborative work where these repositories, far from being data extraction spaces, operate as a place to create co-conceptualizations with those subjects that have shaped them over time, presents us with a series of challenges. On the one hand, it obliges us to respect those basic principles that archival itself raises for dealing with archives: that is, respect for provenance, integrity and the original order. Addressing a community archive then implies safeguarding the order, classification and relationships established between the different media, as they have



been produced and/or assembled by the members of the community. In order to preserve the production contexts in which these supports were created and/or preserved, the work with these materials must ensure that certain elements are not eliminated, in annex or secondary principles, nor that their entirety is fragmented, respecting the complexity and specificity of forms of non-professional or academic filing. In turn, a key aspect to reinforce these dialogues around the archive leads us to pay particular attention to additions. To those elements that enter the repository at present. This makes it possible to jointly record what is selected or produced for the archive, in what contexts, who intervenes in the archiving processes and how these new media are articulated with those that are already part of the repository. In these additions, a key element is the materials produced by the researcher and that the community requests and incorporates into its reservoir.

In this way, photographs, field notes, tax-deductible interviews, or filming produced by the researcher pass through the sieve of native archiving practices, at the same time that they impact on local relationships and on the bond with the researcher himself who has also become active file constructors (Espósito 2021). As Guillermina Espósito relates about the request she received from the Kolla Aboriginal Community of Finca Tumbaya (Jujuy, Argentina) to leave a copy of the material generated throughout the fieldwork, delivering these records to the community archive was an extremely enriching experience. Not only invites to revisit certain aspects shared during the stay, but it also opened new boxes of documentation.

Sharing our repositories of researchers, getting closer to communal communities and making the archive a meeting space where our expert knowledge is also subjected to other interpretations is a way to promote a less hierarchical dialogue, undermining the coloniality of knowledge. We thus move away from that extractive metaphor of the archive (Rufer 2016), typical of a positivist version of work in repositories, to start thinking in terms of aspiration. As Appadurai (2004) proposes, rather than being a tomb of the traces of



the writings, that the archives become the anticipation of collective memory, collective instruments.

NOTES

¹ Fabian ([1983] 2019) argues that the anthropological field of study emerged on the principle of “denial of coevalness”, on the basis of which the non-Western Other was constructed and put under study as distant from Europe, not only in terms of space, but also in terms of time. Thus, the denial of contemporariness to the non-Western Other provided strong ideological justification for European colonial expansion, as well as it cemented worldwide segmentation and the establishment of hierarchies, which was also undoubtedly captured by the way in which (colonial and state) archives were arranged and shaped.

² Stoler (2010: 480) argues that before reading the archives “against the current” (the aspect characteristic of the critical approach to colonial records), it is necessary to “read them in search of their regularities, their remembrance logic, their densities and distributions, the consistencies in the disinformation, omissions and errors”. Only upon recognition of that current will it be possible to rearrange them by seeking other histories in the interior of the grain.

³ Their origin is associated with the colonisation of America, while the term *archivo* is incorporated in the Spanish language in 1490, i.e. some time before Columbus’s arrival to America (Aguirre, Villa-Flores 2009) It was during the reign of the Catholic Kings, in effect, that modern archival practices began (González Echevarría 1998).

⁴ In the same way as Di Stefano, we consider that throughout the colonial period what was understood as “the Church” was in fact a polyarchy inextricably entangled with the multiple jurisdictions which characterised the ancient regime, where there was not a single centre of authority, but multiple decision-making bodies enjoying great autonomy from each other (2005: 51).

⁵ This may be illustrated with the case initiated by priest Pedro Hermsilla against the *encomenderos* of the indigenous towns of Colalao and Tolombón (jurisdiction of Tucumán) denouncing the lack of payment of the corresponding tribute. Faced with the declaration of the *encomenderos* to ignore exactly the amount they had to pay, the priest alleges that “what the law mandates is that the tribute be paid according to the number of Indians that each neighbour *encomendero* has in their register or list of entrusts; thus, said misters have, on a list or register for their administration, those who belong to each of them; hence they know how many Indians are obligated to their satisfaction” (frontpage 2). In the same file there is a letter that the priest writes to the *alcalde ordinario* [first mayor] of Tucumán, Don Miguel Molina, requesting that “as soon as possible he ask [the *encomenderos*] for the titles of their registers and make them pay to me three pesos for each Indian” (frontpage 6). Indeed, and after a decree of the governor of the province, Don Juan de Pestaña, *alcalde* Molina says: “Having brought the registers to my court, it was found that...” (overleaf 7), Historical Archive of Tucumán, Judicial Section, Year 1756, Series A, Box 16.

⁶ Instrucción Metódica para el empadronamiento y revisitas de tributarios en los virreinos del Perú y Río de la Plata, del visitador de la Real Hacienda del Perú Jorge Escobedo [Methodical Instruction for the census and *revisitas* of tributaries in the Viceroyalties

of Peru and Río de la Plata, from the *visitador* of the Royal Treasury System in Peru Jorge Escobedo] (Lima 1784).

⁷ This is why Stoler says that the colonial archives “ordered”, in both the imperative and taxonomic sense, “the criteria of evidence, proof, testimony, and witnessing to construct moral narrations” (2010: 476).

⁸ The Calchaquí Valley (current Northwestern Argentina) remained a “rebel” and autonomous area from the colonial power until 1665; it was the scene of what is known as the “Calchaquí Wars”, the main consequence of which was the denaturalisation process (a policy from the colonial authorities whose aim was the compulsory transfer of local indigenous peoples to different places and under different conditions at the end of said wars). For more information on this topic, see Lorandi 1988.

⁹ For instance, in a letter addressed to His Majesty on 27 January 1666, Mercado y Villacorta reports that, given the “throng” has been denaturalised, “we have achieved the pacification and conquest of the Indians from Calchaquí in that province (...) its valley devoid of the idolatry” (Larrouy 1923: doc. XXXI).

¹⁰ For the past few decades in Argentina, and following a continental tendency, various indigenous peoples have begun to strengthen and make their ethnic identities visible. After many years of silencing, these collectives activated their memories and set out on a journey of organization and struggles, defying all kinds of pejorative representations. There are several studies which discuss these processes in Argentina; see, for example, Briones (1998), Carrasco (2000), Bartolomé (2003), Escolar (2007), Lázzari (2007), Sabio Collado (2013), Rodríguez (2018), among many others.

¹¹ “Well, yes, Indians were expelled from Calchaquí and they were given lands where they settled their communities as compensation. What right is there left for them to claim for essential ground against that distributed as a favour to different owners” (Historical Archive of Tucumán, Civil Judicial Section, Box 82, File 31, page 5 and overleaf). See a more detailed analysis of the case in Rodríguez 2010.

¹² The communities which took part in the experience were the following: Cacique Cambai, Cañaverl (Santa Victoria Este), Cebilar, Cherenta, km 6, La Gracia (Santa Victoria Este), La Loma (Embarcación), Lapacho I, Lapacho II, Lote 75 (Embarcación), Misión Chaqueña (Embarcación), Misión Chorote, Pablo Secretario, Peña Morada, Piquirenda, Tuyaunti, Yacuy, Yariaguarenda, Zanja Onda.

¹³ The photographic and documentary archive where the Documentary Collection Enrique Palavecino is kept is an area of the Ethnographic Museum Juan Bautista Ambrosetti, belonging to the School of Philosophy and Literature, University of Buenos Aires.

¹⁴ Enrique Palavecino (1900-1966) was a distinguished self-taught Argentine anthropologist. He was a researcher and professor at the Museum of the city of La Plata, the National University of Tucumán and the University of Buenos Aires, where he was also the Director of the Ethnographic Museum Juan Bautista Ambrosetti from 1958 until his death.

REFERENCES

A. Agüero (2006), *Las categorías básicas de la cultura jurisdiccional*, in M. Lorente Sarriena (coord.), *De la justicia de jueces a la justicia de leyes: Hacia la España de 1870* (Madrid: Consejo del Poder Judicial), pp. 21-58.

ISSN 2283-7949

GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION

2021, 2, DOI: 10.12893/gjcp.2021.2.14

Published online by “Globus et Locus” at <https://glocalismjournal.org>



Some rights reserved

- A. Agüero (2013), *Ciudad y poder político en el Antiguo Régimen. La tradición castellana*, in T. Anzoátegui, A. Agüero (coord.), *El derecho local en la periferia de la Monarquía Hispánica. Río de la Plata, Tucumán y Cuyo, siglos XVI-XVIII* (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Investigaciones de Historia del Derecho), pp. 121-184.
- C. Aguirre, J. Villa-Flores (2009), *Los archivos y la construcción de la verdad histórica en América Latina*, in "Jahrbuch für Geschichte Lateinamerikas", 4, pp. 5-17.
- V. Añón (2020), *Intervención-Primera Ronda*, in "Corpus", 10, 2, pp. 6-9.
- A. Appadurai (2003), *Archive and Aspiration*, in J. Brouwer, A. Mulder (ed.), *Information is Alive* (Rotterdam: V2_Publishing-NAI Publishers), pp. 14-25.
- D. Barrera, (2010), *Un rostro local de la Monarquía Hispánica: justicia y equipamiento político del territorio al sureste de Charcas, siglos XVI y XVII*, in "Colonial Latin American Historical Review", 15, pp. 377-418.
- M.A. Bartolomé (2003), *Los pobladores del "Desierto" genocidio, etnocidio y etnogénesis en la Argentina*, in "Cuadernos De antropología Social", 17, pp. 162-189.
- M.F. Becerra, D. Estruch, (2012), *La minería colonial en la Puna de Jujuy a través de los documentos: sus prácticas y materialidades*, in E.M. Rodríguez Leirado, D. Schávelzon (eds.), *Actas del V Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Histórica* (Saarbrücken: Editorial Académica Española), vol. 1, pp. 159-186.
- A. Bigelow (2018), *Traduttore, traditore o traduttore, soccorritore: La traducción y la recuperación del saber andino en la época colonial*, in "ISTOR", 73, pp.41-56.
- M. Boullousa-Joly, L. Rodríguez (2014), *Fuentes etnográficas e históricas. Repensando la relación entre pasado y presente. El caso de la comunidad indígena de Amaicha del Valle*, in "Memoria Americana", 22, 2, pp. 43-66.
- K. Burns (2010), *Into the Archive. Writing and Power in Colonial Peru* (Durham, London: Duke University Press).
- C. Briones (1998), *La alteridad del "cuarto mundo". Una reconstrucción antropológica de la diferencia* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones del sol).
- C. Briones (2018), *Verdad Jurídica y verdades sociales: insolencias antropológicas para propiciar el triálogo*, in A. Lombraña, M. Carrasco (ed.), *Experiencias de lectura insolente: abordajes empíricos en el campo jurídico* (Buenos Aires: Antropofagia), pp. 13-25.
- L. Caimari (2017), *La vida en el archivo. Goces, tedios y desvíos en el oficio de la historia* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI).
- M. Carrasco (2000), *Los derechos de los pueblos indígenas en Argentina* (Copenague: IWGIA).
- M. Carrasco, J. Costilla, D. Estruch, C. Wahren (2014), *La construcción de historias y memorias a través de fotografías etnográficas: una lectura interdisciplinaria*, in "Cuadernos de Antropología", 12, pp. 159-174.
- E. Cortez (2018), *Biografía y polémica. El Inca Garcilazo y el archivo colonial andino en el siglo XIX* (Madrid: Iberoamericana).
- C. Crespo (2020), *Prácticas de archivación mapuche en la Patagonia Argentina*, in L. Ojeda Dávila, L. Rodríguez, T. Heredia Pacheco (coord.), *Pueblos indígenas, memorias y archivos. Itinerarios de investigación antropológicos e históricos desde México y Argentina* (Morelia: Editorial de la UMSNH), pp. 177-204.
- C. Cunill, D. Estruch, A. Ramos (2020), *Expectativas, huellas y conversaciones en los archivos*, in C. Cunill, D. Estruch, A. Ramos (eds.), *Actores, redes y prácticas dialógicas en la construcción y uso de los archivos en América Latina (siglos XVI-XXI)* (México: CEPHCIS, Universidad Nacional Autónoma).
- T. Cook, J. Schwartz (2002), *Archives, records, and power: From (postmodern) theory to (archival) performance*, in "Archival Science", 2, pp.171-185.

- I. de Jong, (2014), *El “negocio de la paz”: la trayectoria diplomática de Calfucurá (1860-1873)*, in H. Trinchero, L. Campos Muñoz, S. Valverde (coord.), *Pueblos indígenas, Estados nacionales y fronteras. Tensiones y paradojas de los procesos de transición contemporáneos en América Latina* (Buenos Aires: Editorial de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras), pp. 223-266.
- J. Derrida (1997), *Mal de Archivo. Una impresión freudiana* (Madrid: Trotta).
- R. Di Stefano (2005), *En torno a la Iglesia colonial y del temprano siglo XIX. El caso del Río de la Plata*, in “Takwá Revista de Historia”, 5, 8, pp. 49-65.
- D. Escolar (2007), *Dones étnicos de la Nación. Identidades huarpe y modos de producción de soberanía en Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Prometeo).
- D. Escolar (2013), *Huarpes Archives in the Argentine Desert: Indigenous Claims and State Construction in Nineteenth-Century Mendoza*, in “Hispanic American Historical Review”, 93, 3, pp. 451-486.
- G. Espósito (2021), *Archivos y prácticas escriturarias como objetos de investigación etnográfica. Experiencias y reflexiones*, in C. Cunill, D. Estruch, A. Ramos (eds.), *Actores, redes y prácticas dialógicas en la construcción y uso de los archivos en América Latina (siglos XVI-XXI)* (México: CEPHCIS, Universidad Nacional Autónoma).
- D. Estruch (2017), *El ejercicio del poder en el Jujuy colonial. Enlaces y tensiones entre la jurisdicción civil y eclesiástica* (Buenos Aires: La Bicicleta).
- D. Estruch (2021), *Cruzando temporalidades en el Archivo de Tribunales de Jujuy (ATJ). Experiencias de justicia entre el presente y el pasado*, in C. Cunill, D. Estruch, A. Ramos (eds.), *Actores, redes y prácticas dialógicas en la construcción y uso de los archivos en América Latina (siglos XVI-XXI)* (México: CEPHCIS, Universidad Nacional Autónoma).
- D. Estruch, L. Rodríguez, M.F. Becerra (2011), *Jurisdicciones mineras en tensión: El impacto de la minería en el Valle de Yocavil y la Puna jujeña durante el período colonial (siglos XVII y XVIII)*, in “Revista Histórica”, 35, 2, pp. 69-100.
- J. Fabian ([1983] 2019), *El tiempo y el otro: cómo construye su objeto la antropología* (Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes, Ediciones Uniandes; Popayán: Universidad del Cauca).
- A. Farge (1991), *La atracción del archivo* (Valencia: Edicions Alfons el Magnanim).
- M. Foucault (1979), *La arqueología del saber* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI).
- F. Gorbach, M. Rufer (coord.) (2016), *(In)disciplinar la investigación: Archivo, trabajo de campo y escritura* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI).
- C. Garriga (2004), *Orden jurídico y poder político en el Antiguo Régimen*, in “ISTOR IV”, 16, pp. 13-44.
- R. González Echevarría (1998), *Myth and archive: a theory of Latin American narrative* (Durham: Duke University).
- A. Guerreau (1990), *Política/derecho/economía/religión: ¿Cómo eliminar el obstáculo?*, in R. Pastor (Comp.), *Relaciones de poder, de producción y parentesco en la Edad Media y Moderna* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas), pp. 459-469.
- A. Guerrero (2000), *El proceso de identificación: sentido común ciudadano, ventriloquía y transescritura*, in A. Guerrero (Comp.), *Etnicidades* (Quito: FLACSO), pp. 9-61.
- A. Hespanha (1989), *Vísperas del leviatán. Instituciones y poder político (Portugal, siglo XVII)* (Madrid: Taurus).
- A. Larrouy (1923), *Documentos del Archivo de Indias para la historia de Tucumán (1591-1700)* (Buenos Aires: L.J. Roso y Cía.).
- A. Lazzari (2007), *Identidad y fantasma: situando las nuevas prácticas de libertad del movimiento indígena en La Pampa*, in “Quinto Sol”, 11, pp. 91-122.
- A.M. Lorandi (1988), *La resistencia y rebeliones de los diaguita-calchaquí en los siglos XVI y XVII*, in “Revista de antropología”, 6, pp. 3-17.



- A. Mbembe (2002), *The Power of the Archive and its Limits*, in C. Hamilton et al. (eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (Dordrecht, Boston, Londres : Kluwer Academic Publishers), pp. 19-35.
- O. Muñoz Morán (2010), *Lo que nos dice la forma. Etnografía de los archivos locales indígenas*, in “Revista Colombiana de Antropología”, XLVI, 2, pp. 353-377.
- T. Platt (2015), *Entre la rutina y la ruptura: el archivo como acontecimiento de terreno*, “Diálogo Andino”, 46, pp. 39-54.
- A. Ramos (2021), *Consultando archivos, haciendo archivos*, in C. Cunill, D. Estruch, A. Ramos (eds.), *Actores, redes y prácticas dialógicas en la construcción y uso de los archivos en América Latina (siglos XVI-XXI)* (México: CEPHCIS, Universidad Nacional Autónoma).
- J. Rappaport (2007), *Más allá de la escritura: la epistemología de la etnografía en colaboración*, in “Revista Colombiana de Antropología”, 43, pp. 197-229.
- J. Rappaport, A. Ramos Pacho (2005), *Una historia colaborativa: retos para el diálogo indígena-académico*, in “Historia Crítica”, 29, pp. 39-62.
- J. Rappaport, T. Cummins (2016). *Más allá de la ciudad letrada: letramientos indígenas en los Andes* (Bogotá: Editorial Universidad Nacional de Colombia).
- L. Rodríguez (2008), *Después de las desnaturalizaciones: transformaciones socio-económicas y étnicas al sur del valle Calchaquí, Santa María, fines del siglo XVII - fines del XVIII* (Buenos Aires: Antropofagia).
- L. Rodríguez (2010) “*Informar si el padrón que rige se conocen dos pueblos de amaicha*”. *Re-estructuraciones socio-étnicas y disputas por tierras entre la colonia y la república*, in “Memoria Americana”, 18, 2, pp. 267-292.
- L. Rodríguez (2018), *Los procesos de reemergencia indígena en Argentina*, in G. Soprano, R. Boixadós, S. Smietniansky (eds.), *Una introducción a la antropología. Teorías, conceptos y autores* (Bernal: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes), pp. 314-324.
- M. Rufer (2020), *Presentación: Prácticas de archivo: teorías, materialidades, sensibilidades*, in “Corpus” 10, 2, pp. 1-3.
- M. Rufer (2016), *El archivo: de la metáfora extractiva a la ruptura poscolonial*, in F. Gorbach, M. Rufer (coord.), *(In)disciplinar la investigación: Archivo, trabajo de campo y escritura* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI), pp. 160-186.
- M.V. Sabio Collado (2013), *Revisibilización indígena, memoria e identidad en una comunidad urbana Las marcas de los “ancestros” diaguitas*, in “Claroscuro”, 12.
- F. Salomon (2001), *Una etnohistoria poco étnica: Nociones de lo autóctono en una comunidad campesina peruana*, “Desacatos”, 7, pp.65-84.
- C. Severi (2010), *El sendero y la voz. Una antropología de la memoria* (Buenos Aires: SB).
- J. Sosa (2015), *La “cédula real de los Amaycha”. Contextualización, análisis y transcripción de un documento controversial*, in “Corpus”, 5, 1.
- A. Stoler (2010), *Archivos coloniales y el arte de gobernar*, in “Revista Colombiana de Antropología”, 46, 2, pp. 465-496.
- B. Tanodi (2010), *Acerca de los documentos históricos coloniales, especialmente de Argentina*, in “Revista Códices”, 6, 2, pp. 209-216.
- J. Vezub (2011), *Mapuche-Tebuelche Spanish Writing and the Argentinian-Chilean Expansion during the Nineteenth Century*, in A. Delmas, P. Nigel (eds.), *Written Culture in a Colonial Context. Africa and the Americas, 1500-1900* (Cape Town: Cape Town University Press), pp. 213-241.