

## Series Editor's Foreword

An awareness of the role of the state and the international state system is certainly a central feature of contemporary research on diasporic processes. However, the particular and historical nature of the development of the specific states in question—and indeed the notion of state formation as a historical, multilayered process—often eludes those writers from divergent disciplines who work on modern and postmodern diasporas. And this is the case despite the lessons provided in much of the cutting-edge literature on the state over the past decade, such as the heralded and influential book *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), where the emphasis is on the dialectic between state formation and expansion, and more “cultural” processes—under which could fall (although it is not a concern of the contributors to the Joseph and Nugent book) the development of diasporic identities. This blind spot on state formation leads to other problems when it comes to tracing diasporas. In some work, the state is not only assumed to exist as an apparatus of governance, influencing but ultimately separate from the identities we carry into civil society, but it is also assumed to antedate the dispersal of its subject peoples.

By contrast, in *Andean Diaspora* archaeologist Paul S. Goldstein is avowedly concerned to account for the nature of the state—a preoccupation of North American anthropological theorizing for many years now—and he is further concerned to relate the state formation process to the movement and settlement of people with some sense of a common cultural identity. In this closely argued book, Goldstein marshals extensive and detailed historical and archaeological evidence on the Tiwanaku polity that, from its highland core region in present-day Peru, colonized the lowland agricultural valleys around the years 500–1000 of the Common Era. Rather than conceive of the Tiwanaku state as already formed and consolidated before this colonization occurred, Goldstein places the movement across time and space of more or less loose assemblages of people who considered themselves somehow affiliated as central to the story of Tiwanaku state formation. This movement

emanating from the Tiwanaku core region cannot be seen as being peripheral or as an afterthought, but is indeed exactly what Tiwanaku state formation entailed. At the same time, the complexities of multiple identities and the crosscutting allegiances demanded by membership in different *ayllus*, a kind of corporate group, meant that Tiwanaku colonization was a heterogeneous rather than homogeneous affair. Rather than a top-down, elite-directed, and centralized (and centralizing) process, a rather acephalous, decentralized, and segmented “structure” (if that is the proper word here) emerged. Rather than cultural uniformity, Tiwanaku colonists carried complex and often conflictive identities with them into diaspora. In developing his diasporic model of state formation and expansion, Goldstein, following ethnohistorian John V. Murra, refers to the result as “archipelagos” of colonial settlement.

Goldstein’s book is remarkable for a number of reasons. These include the following: One is that it adds substantially to our knowledge of state formation. We now know that state formation is not just about the materiality of domination. Perhaps one reason this comes through is because of the case at hand. Goldstein argues that Tiwanaku state formation was not as coercive as that of other more famous Andean states, but meant, instead, the establishment of internally differentiated subjective frameworks that arose from cultural materialities, human ecologies, and purposive agency. Because of the time depth of Goldstein’s process-oriented research, state formation in this mode is thrown into bold relief for the contemporary reader, and thus we can no longer take the formation and expansion of the state, and the basic uniformity of types of states, for granted. This leads to a second important contribution. Goldstein takes on what he calls the “globalist” view of state formation, a school of thought holding that state societies act as systems, increasing hierarchy, centralization, and specialization as they become more economically developed and politically complex. Goldstein presents a sustained, and successful, challenge to this view and thus contributes in important ways in setting the new agenda in Andeanist archaeology. A third is his understanding of diasporas as “ethnicity in motion,” recognizing the difficulties of investigating these (by definition) mobile social forms through the archaeological record. He emphasizes the maintenance and development of identities through differing cultural practices between diasporic Tiwanaku and locals. This case takes us beyond the familiar concept of “trade diasporas” because diasporic communities of the Andes were involved in other kinds of economic activities. And finally, not only does Goldstein prove himself to be a meticulous scholar, patiently presenting a wealth of archaeological evidence, but he also shows himself to be a theorist intent on convincing the reader that the alternatives are not that attractive, one method of which

includes self-reflexive and frank discussions of the use of archaeological analogies, their seductiveness and their dangers.

In the end, while caution is certainly called for in purporting to transform social science concepts by applying a set of empirical materials that challenges the established epistemological order, the wider importance of this book is that it will make us rethink many expansive states in the ancient world. It could, for example, provide a conceptual underpinning for what are now being seen as hybrid and interconnected social and cultural formations, the *logiques métisses* of precolonial Africa, as Jean-Loup Amselle calls them (see his “Anthropology and Historicity,” *History and Theory* 32(4) [1993]: 12–31). Widening the lens a bit further, this book also provides lessons for those of us who see as the object of our study the creation and movement of diasporas in the modern and postmodern worlds. We need to rethink the development of states and diasporas as complementary and conterminous and begin to reevaluate the diaspora-state interface.

Kevin A. Yelvington  
*Series Editor*

## State Expansion

"Go!" said the king, "tame the country over there," pointing to some distant hill.

Southall (1999:33)

This book explores Tiwanaku and the role of colonization in the expansion of ancient states. I argue that Pre-Columbian Andean states originated not through conquests led by charismatic warlords but as ethnicity in motion: a demographic process of colonization that was only later followed by political consolidation. I propose that the expansive Tiwanaku polity was not the coercive centralized state structure that is commonly assumed but a consensual confederation among peoples of distinctive ethnic and political identities who shared some common identities that we now call Tiwanaku culture. These nested identities—both the distinctive and the common—spread with Tiwanaku colonists across a wide diaspora of enclave communities. Too often, we assume that expansive states grew only from the top down at the behest of powerful ruling elites. The structural variability and internal diversity of the Tiwanaku diaspora indicate that the Tiwanaku polity was pluralistic and far less hierarchical than is commonly believed. My redefinition of Tiwanaku expansion as ethnicity in motion recasts ancient state growth in the bottom-up dynamics of identity. I infer that some early states in the Andes, and perhaps throughout the ancient world, were far more segmentary than has been presumed by neoevolutionist political economists and remained so even as they grew into expansive empires.

The seeds for this book were sown by research in the Department of Moquegua, Peru, in the late 1980s, when I documented the massive colonization of lowland agricultural valleys by highland Tiwanaku colonists in the seventh through tenth centuries A.D.. My studies of household archaeology at the Tiwanaku colonial sites of Omo and subsequent excavations of Omo's Tiwanaku-style temple in 1990 favored what I call a "globalist" interpretation of Tiwanaku—as a monolithic state "core" that dominated peripheral outliers. My discovery of large, well-organized enclaves of Tiwanaku peoples in distant regions supported a globalist model of Tiwanaku as a proto-impe-

rial expansive state. The best available explanations for Tiwanaku lowland colonization, one of the earliest episodes of Andean state expansion, seemed to lie in a model of peripheral annexation under the central direction of a bureaucratic state.

This is not, however, the same book that I would have written ten or even five years ago. In the late 1990s, I chose to return to Moquegua to direct the Moquegua Archaeological Survey (MAS), a systematic settlement pattern study in this densest region of Tiwanaku colonization. My findings provide a critical regional counterpoint to the site-centered perspective of my earlier work at Omo. Reconnaissance results, now being supplemented by multisite surface investigations, excavations, and a growing series of dates, demand a new interpretation of the Tiwanaku occupation as a multiethnic landscape in the Pre-Columbian past. These new data alone would have led me to reexamine many of my own preconceptions about Tiwanaku colonization and the nature of the Tiwanaku polity.

The present reevaluation of Tiwanaku colonization goes deeper than the simple addition of new settlement pattern data, however. First, many things have changed in the archaeology of the south-central Andes since I first considered Tiwanaku expansion. In the 1980s, when Peru was a difficult and often risky place to work and Bolivia was closed to international archaeological projects, research programs on the Tiwanaku culture were few, and understanding of Tiwanaku as a political entity was in its infancy. By the late 1990s, however, an explosion of new research on Tiwanaku and its peripheries had greatly increased our knowledge of this neglected part of the ancient world. As a new generation of Tiwanaku specialists produces dozens of theses, dissertations, and articles, the debate over Tiwanaku as a social and political entity has entered a spirited adolescence that will eventually lead to a mature synthesis.

More important, the south-central Andean region is changing in ways that might not have been foreseen in the late 1980s. These changes have had a profound effect on rural society in southern Peru. Although Moquegua was one of Peru's wealthiest agricultural provinces in the colonial and republican eras, years of neglect left the region an economic backwater through most of the twentieth century, with its richest farmlands controlled by the descendants of old *hacendado* families—often absentee descendants. With the decline of the Shining Path and other terrorist insurgencies in the 1990s, Peru experienced rapid incorporation into the global economy and a long-delayed burst of internal development. The effects of these changes were felt even in rural regions like Moquegua, where both government and private sector investment spurred enormous irrigation projects, roads, power lines, and other infrastructural developments.