

Chapter 4
Dead Weight: The Indian as National Other

“The Indian race is an ethnic, economic, and social dead weight which drags the country [backward]. Either we acculturize the Indian via primary instruction and the encouragement of white immigration, or the country will retrograde into an inferior state of civilization. The dilemma is fatal.”

- Federico Páez, "Mensaje," 1937

“We present here a collection of views that largely avoid the defects that ...mar ... the photographs of the capital taken by foreign tourists that have circulated in the exterior ... [those foreigners] have presented us as an almost savage country awaiting conquest; indeed, where they have tried to show our buildings, where they have chosen popular customs, landscapes, etc, the indigenous element has been their dominant if not exclusive [theme], making everything ugly and giving an impoverished idea of our population and our culture.”

– J. Roberto Cruz & José Domingo Laso, *Quito a la Vista*, 1911

There is no question that nineteenth- and twentieth-century non-indigenous Ecuadorian rhetors—*criollo* politicians, white-*mestizo* artists, and *mestizo* peasants alike—found repeated opportunities to distinguish themselves from their indigenous compatriots. From the 1843 uprisings by rural *mestizos* who argued that paying the “personal contribution” (tribute) would make them into Indians, to a 1943 article that acknowledged indigenous people as an integral part of the nation yet described them as “distanced from society [and] deprived of the elements of culture,” Ecuadorian texts and images predominantly imagined indigenous people as profoundly other.¹ Indigenous people were “dead weight,” and their presence “[made] everything ugly”; they were savage and drunken, dirty and backwards. Indigenous people, in this sense, represented everything that non-indigenous Ecuadorian rhetors pursuing national greatness and modern progress sought to repudiate. Often, then, Indians figured as fundamentally exterior to Ecuadorian civilization and, in that exteriority, constituted the cultural and political limits of the nation-state. Such strategies of constitutive exteriority, however, coexisted with another rhetoric

of otherness, one that placed indigenous others at the center of the nation and, in so doing, highlighted the divisions that marked and made Ecuador's civic world.

Recent scholarship examining narratives of indigenous otherness in Ecuador has largely approached those narratives via the lens of constitutive exteriority, producing good results. Such work brings to light the integral role that indigenous others played in historical processes of national identification. It shows how both the legal distinction between “*indígena*” and “citizen” prior to 1857 and the “shadows of citizenship” that fell on most Ecuadorians between 1857 and 1979 grounded disenfranchisement on wide-spread assumptions about indigenous peoples’ cultural and racial otherness.² Scholars of Ecuadorian national identity have noted that rhetors who did incorporate elements of indigeneity into their sense of the national body often relied on visions of a noble, pre-Colombian indigenous heritage and imagined contemporary indigenous communities as trapped in the past, making indigenous people other through temporal distance.³ Highlighting how strategies of otherness helped picture the nation, visual culture scholars have emphasized the exoticism, romanticism, and degradation prominent in images of indigenous people,⁴ and scholars examining Ecuadorian modernization projects have pointed toward the intensive administration of difference that infused plans for national development.⁵ In all these cases, analysis of the construction and maintenance of indigenous otherness makes clear the extent to which indigenous people, positioned outside the idea of the nation, have provided the foil against which white-*mestizos* imagined that nation.

Often, then, framing rhetorics of indigenous otherness in terms of a constitutive exclusion has provided sufficient analytical insight: nineteenth- and mid-twentieth-century non-indigenous Ecuadorians repeatedly refused identification with indigeneity and located the nation either by negating the value of indigenous culture or by making indigeneity temporally distant from the

present-tense nation. And yet, frequently enough to merit attention, intriguing narratives of otherness that exceed the explanatory power of the constitutive exterior have emerged in Ecuador's national rhetorical ecology. Occasionally, Ecuadorian practices of othering have enacted a complex, conflicted, constitutive, and *interior* politics. In such moments, when Ecuadorian rhetors mark their indigenous compatriots as fundamentally other than themselves, they set *themselves*—not the Indians they describe—apart from the nation.

In the epigraph from Federico Paéz above, the Indian other appears as a fundamental problem: a burden that pulls the country toward oblivion. On a first read, Paéz's depiction of that indigenous problem appears to place the Indian as exterior to the nation; Indians are a "dead weight" that the country has to carry. They "drag" the country, an action that implies that Indians exist in an outside position. At the same time, Paéz's solutions for that "Indian problem" do not treat his indigenous other as fully exterior. Instead of arguing that the country loosen its indigenous burden, Paéz urges his audience to heal and activate it. Doing so, Paéz suggests, would make the *nation* right and healthy.

Indigenous people were clearly others for Paéz, but their fatal influence moved *within* the nation, not outside it. In this sense, we might read in Paéz's assessment an implication that the nation itself was a dead weight. Rather than picturing the Ecuadorian nation as carrying the weight of an indigenous mass, Paéz hinted—perhaps unintentionally, yet still provocatively—that another figure shouldered the burden that was the nation. Given Paéz's audience (the members of the 1937 Constitutional Assembly), his purpose (to position himself as a leader among leaders), and his proposed solution (new policies of education, hygiene, and European immigration), it is reasonable to imagine that Paéz was positioning himself and the elite *criollo* members of his audience as the unfortunate beasts of burden responsible for hauling the nation

forward. Only by reviving the inert national body could Ecuadorian leaders free themselves from the onerous nation they were otherwise obliged to shoulder.

So, yes, Indians were profoundly other and deeply problematic in Paéz's speech. They remained, as well, outside the bounds of civilization. Yet the solution Paéz announced betrayed an underlying sense that the nation—including both its current problems and its future possibilities—was something slightly other than the white-*mestizo* officials gathered to form a new Constitution. The nation itself dragged Ecuador down, despite the best efforts of her leaders. The elite, in this formulation, were not entirely of the nation. The nation was, first and foremost, Indian. And, that nation as Indian was, in turn, troublingly other.

Like the claims advanced in Paéz's speech, arguments in which non-indigenous Ecuadorian rhetors strategically made the nation other by making it indigenous generally enacted the larger constitutive strategies outlined in earlier chapters: legitimizing elite authority and absolving elites of responsibility for national trouble. Those strategies, however, had a particular edge to them: though aimed toward shaping national identity, they emphasized division far more than identification, suggesting that republican life was as marked by distinction as by cohesion. While common sense assumptions about cultural and racial difference often symbolically exiled indigenous people from the nation-state, they also, sometimes, shifted responsibility for national struggle more firmly onto the shoulders of indigenous Ecuadorians. Along the way, such othering moves positioned aristocratic strategies of government as integral to popular sovereignty. Making the nation itself strange, elites recognized but distinguished themselves from the demographic majority. They authorized their permanent leadership. And they dissociated themselves from the causes of intransigent economic troubles. Strategies of nation-othering, then, made the republic work for elites whose interests often foreclosed claims to

participation in the popular nation. They provided tactics that distinguished elites from the nation while further salvaging the resulting representative contradiction.

The processes of othering and identification in Ecuador during the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries took varied forms in different regions and moments. This chapter sketches one located history of such othering, focusing on the specific and symbolically rich spaces of Quito from the mid-1800s through the mid-1900s. Suggesting that the other-invoking, nation-making work done by Quito's elite civic institutions—political alliances, religious organizations, and academic institutes—is visible both in official texts produced by institutional figures and in paintings and photographs that depict public spaces, it analyzes the symbolic and material work done by Quiteño rhetors making the nation strategically distant from themselves.

Over its course, the chapter uses Ecuadorian rhetorical histories to trace how republican polity writ-large is haunted by otherness. Working within a recent tradition of scholarship documenting actually existing democracy,⁶ it begins with an analysis of oligarchy and representation, then examines how Ecuadorian rhetors working across expressive forms engaged rhetorics of otherness to dramatize and mitigate the underlying contradictions of popular sovereignty. The texts and images engaged here envision an ideal national society and bemoan its failures; they situate indigenous people within a national scene and attempt to erase them from it; they indict practices of exclusion and provide justification for them. In each case, an indigenous other takes center stage in the nation while white-*mestizo* rhetors and audiences stand slightly apart.

This chapter is thus about the confluence of two rhetorical strategies of nation making in Ecuador: one that uses indigeneity to figure the national body and the other that exiles indigeneity from the self. Sometimes, the chapter suggests, notions of self and other are not

directly analogous to notions of national and foreign. The nation is not always “self”; the other is not always foreign. In light of that strange disjuncture, the following pages re-evaluate the rhetorical implications of narratives of national otherness, arguing that we miss something of the complexity of identification and division when we assume that because the other is the self’s constitutive exterior, that other is equally and always the nation’s constitutive exterior. Instead, the chapter asserts, encountering and making strategic sense of internal others are important elements of actually existing republican polity, essential rhetorical tools for negotiating the disappointments and sacrifices of civic life.

<1>On Others and Oligarchies

Since its earliest Western inception, rhetorical study has often depended on theories of otherness in order to understand the work of persuasion. Traditionally, as Diane Davis notes, rhetoricians have understood otherness primarily in terms of division: humans are primordially divided from one another and rhetoric exists because of a deep urge to cross that difference.⁷ That assumption of original separation appeared in Greece at least as early as the fourth century BCE, when Isocrates, in the “Hymn to Logos,” asserted that the ability to communicate with and persuade otherwise-distant others is what allowed humans to “come together and [found] cities, [establish] laws, and [discover] arts.”⁸ Working in that same general tradition, Kenneth Burke asserted that division—in the form of a fundamental experience of distinction between self and other—is what drives humans to desire identification and makes rhetoric necessary.⁹ Jacques Derrida, credited with coining the idea of the “constitutive exterior,” made the ontological experience of division from the other fundamental to the creation of not only community but also

the self.¹⁰ In that trajectory, then, the existence of otherness not only calls into being a need for rhetoric but also forms the exigency for forming its opposites, both selfhood and community.

Writing against the grain of those assumptions in which ontological distinction defines human experience, Davis, channeling Levinas and Freud, argues that rhetoricians ought to approach identification, not division, as the original human state. That reorientation positions the creation of the self via a series of jarring encounters with uncontrollable difference that dissolve a previously unitary experience of the world. Davis's re-assessment of ontological difference bring to light a pre-existing, extra-rational identification and rhetoricity, "an obligation to respond that holds the 'I' and the other in an extreme proximity."¹¹ Within that proximity, Davis explains, "'I' am only inasmuch as I respond to the Other."¹² A sense of self then relies entirely on the proximal other.

For all these theorists, however, whether identification or division is the original state, the eventual experience of distinction becomes constitutive of both the self and the other. In their analyses, whether we seek to return to a lost state of identification or strive to overcome fundamental division, it is the yearning toward communion, toward touch, that makes community happen. Isocrates, Burke, Derrida, Levinas, Freud, and Davis all position the other as, eventually, constituting the meaning-making edge of the self—both exterior and essential. Those scholars then extrapolate from their understandings of the boundary-forming other in order to explain broader relations, particularly those between self and community. Such extrapolation, however, must be made with some caution. It must move out of the bright glare of ontological theorizing and into the historical or anthropological shadows of everyday experience in order to capture the contradictory ways that invocations of self and other underlie communal arguments and identifications. The originary relations between self and other sit relatively

comfortably in the philosophical realm; the more social questions of self, other, and community demand a social context.¹³

Treading in those social shadows of everyday life, this chapter adds to existing rhetorical treatments of otherness another way of conceiving the force of distinction. It analyzes otherness in the interstices of republican practice and stresses how the social and political divisions of representation rely on notions of a proximal other and a distant self. The pages that follow, rather than attempting an ontological treatment of the other, examine instead a particular society-centered manifestation of otherness. This analysis, in other words, is less invested in discerning the ontological primacy of identification or division in individual relations with others than in illuminating the roles played by otherness within the messy, lived processes of civic encounter. Those everyday processes point toward applied practices of othering that are repeatedly enacted in the context of representative democracy but for which no existing tool allows sufficiently contradictory nuance. In practice, the status and use of others both exceeds and fails to achieve the coherence of philosophy's other. Working from that practical spirit, this analysis of how otherness haunts republican practice begins by theorizing from the matter of particular artifacts and their historical moments.

<2>Republican Oligarchy and the Other of Representative Democracy

During the presidential campaign of 1891, Liberals critiqued the leading Progressive candidate, Dr. Luís Cordero, as just another aristocrat in republican clothing put forward by a thoroughly oligarchic party (and, honestly, they were right). One pro-Progressive Quito newspaper, *El Ecuatoriano*, took that Liberal objection head-on, positing oligarchy as the functional principle of republicanism. In an article titled simply, "Oligarchy" ("Oligarquía"), the editors pointed out that by republican rules only a select portion of the population could achieve

Ecuador's basic requirements for citizenship.¹⁴ A smaller part of that body rose further, to minor political office. Yet another culling occurred when electing members of the national legislature or the executive branch. That process was necessary, they asserted; far from conflicting with the ideal of popular sovereignty, it actually allowed such republican spirit to thrive. At each electoral stage, the editors implied, the best and brightest rose up to lead the republic.

That oligarchic process allowed the nation-state to enact the ideal republic. In it, the better few took on the task of representing the common many:

To elect Senators, Representatives, President, and Vice President of the Republic, one has to consider the aptitude of the individuals, [seeking] guarantees of talent, enlightenment, social and political position, and even historical and familiar precedent. Elections that have [brought to power] subjects without the aptitude to carry out the responsibilities assigned to them have in all times and all places resulted in disgrace ... The conditions that we would call superior are not common among all; from there emerges in practice a permanent *oligarchy* that even the most advanced civilization cannot make disappear.¹⁵

The editors further asserted that such admission of permanent oligarchy need not undermine the Constitution's assertion of Ecuador's republicanism: "though the Government of Ecuador is Popular, Elected, Representative, Alternating, and Responsible ... it has been and is *oligarchic*."¹⁶ Thus, they argued, the Liberals who decried Luís Cordero as an "oligarch" were correct in identifying the situation, but completely wrong about the implications of their accusation. Oligarchy was the only way to ensure freedom, the ultimate good of republican polity. Only oligarchic republican government could "improve the links of fraternity among men, give to each one the greatest measure of well-being possible, and reach that state of social perfection called *civilization*."¹⁷ Representation, in this sense, was an oligarchic form. Liberty

and social progress relied on a naturally oligarchic republican system by which the best of the nation, filtered via elections and the franchise, guaranteed the freedom and success of the whole. Oligarchy confirmed the capacity of the elect and, ultimately, the existence of the Republic.

There is an explicit assumption of republican otherness within *El Ecuatoriano's* assessment of representation as an oligarchic system. Simply by virtue of rising to power, the elected (and electable) were distinguished from the mass of the nation by the action of the franchise. Representation confirmed the relationship between an already *elect* leader and the mass of others who formed the reservoir of popular sovereignty. That relationship of elite self to popular other, rather than marking the edge of the nation at the outside border of hegemonic power, instead set elites at the edge of the nation. They were fundamentally connected to it, yet very much at its edge. The elite were also the elect, drawn out of the nation in order to represent it.

It may be odd to take theory lessons from the aristocratic self-justifications of a periodical thoroughly in the pocket of late nineteenth-century bankers and agro-exporters. And yet, the theory of representation elaborated on *El Ecuatoriano's* front page does rather effectively identify the practice of actually existing representative democracy, both in its own moment and today. Those editors writing in 1890 were more inclined to celebrate the *status quo* than is rhetorical theorist Ralph Cintrón writing in 2010, but both recognize that, to some extent, “All contemporary governance ... is a ratio of these two terms, these two forces [democracy and oligarchy].”¹⁸ Cintrón, whose account of twenty-first century, post-Berlin-wall democracy resonates as well with the republic of the Progressive oligarchs and with those advanced by their Conservative and Liberal compatriots, notes that,

power has always tampered with the demos by resisting, via laws and other means, equitable distribution of resources while allowing, as a kind of escape valve, the discourses of liberty to foster its distracting ideology.¹⁹

Representative democracy, in other words, is no more free of power's machinations and restrictions than any other system; it merely legitimizes such controls through different rhetorical means. Cintrón explains that oligarchy haunts democracy because of an inevitable "disjunction between the limitlessness that democratic subjectivity implies, through rights talk and all other mobilizations of democratic rhetorics, and the limitedness that material life represents."²⁰

Cintrón's analysis here is primarily concerned with limits in resources—the capacity of any individual or group to access the fundamental elements of bare life. His insight, however, applies more broadly as well: to the material conditions of actually existing representative democracy and the effacement inherent in representation. The un-even distribution of representation is endemic to republican polity.

Cintrón emphasizes the limitedness of rights in a material sense—the *stuff* of republican life is, or appears to be, in short supply. In a parallel argument focused on U.S. citizenship after *Brown vs. Board of Education*, Danielle Allen, notes that sacrifice is the quintessential experience of democratic citizenship: "Democratic citizens are by definition empowered only to be disempowered. As a result, democratic citizenship requires rituals to manage the psychological tension that arises from being a nearly powerless sovereign."²¹ Citizens have, but cannot hold republican power. While seeking out new citizenly rituals that might spread the experience of sacrifice more evenly across sectors of the polity, Allen recognizes as well, "the old bad habits" which "dealt with the inevitable fact of loss in political life by assigning to one

group all the work of being sovereign, and to another group most of the work of accepting the significant losses that kept the polity stable.”²²

Such rituals for negotiating the losses of democratic representation are not, however, only a matter of “bad habits.” As the editorial in *El Ecuatoriano* implies and Cintrón asserts directly, those rituals are inherent to republican experience and political processes. Representation—in both political and image-making rituals—elevates a few through the sacrifice of the many others. That privileging may be articulated particularly baldly in *El Ecuatoriano*, but the rhetorical force that legitimized the “bad habits” of uneven representation circulated and infused social relations in Ecuador well beyond the 1890 presidential election. To enact their justifications of actually existing practice, such republican rhetorics relied on a messy sense of otherness in which indigenous people were simultaneously positioned as the nation’s constitutive exterior and as its internal republican other. Efforts to visually organize the nation, in particular, vacillated between excision and integration, making indigenous others visible as distinct from the viewer yet profoundly (if problematically) of the nation. Distinction and order thus become the operative principles of republican life. They establish subordinate positions that authorize a sense of elite leadership. In those representative moves, the *elect* (the chosen, the upper echelon) are naturally the *elected* (the politically enfranchised) by virtue of the existence of an internal republican other.

<2>Imagining a Nation of Others

Perhaps nowhere is this late-nineteenth-century approach to order and otherness in terms of representation more visually present than in a set of four anonymous paintings of Quito’s *Plaza Grande*. Those images, painted in the 1860s, depict the buildings on each side of the capital city’s central square: the presidential palace (Carondolet), the Cathedral, the

Archbishop's palace, and the municipal building (the *Municipio*). In these paintings (Figures 30-33), visual representation and aesthetic organization interact in much the same way that political representation and oligarchy comingle in *El Ecuatoriano*'s argument and to similar effect. They structure the republic and justify its hierarchies through visions of the nation made distant from its leaders.

Each of the canvases is anchored by an iconic building of national identity, and the name of the building forms the title of the painting. The building, in each case, stretches almost the entire width of the canvas and sits heavily in the middle of the painting's lower third. Above each building (except Carondelet), an open expanse of sky just touched by mountain foothills fills the upper two-thirds of the painting (the quickly rising slopes of Pichincha shrink the sky in the Carondelet canvas to just half the image). Below each building, the *Plaza Grande* stretches toward the viewer, though its open expanse is broken in each canvas by the fountain standing in the middle of the plaza. For a viewer, the effect of that combined use of space—massive sky, narrow buildings, wide plaza and fountain—is to suggest the experience of gazing across the plaza toward each building while standing on the second-floor balcony of the building directly across the square. Thus, we see the Cathedral from the perspective of the second floor of the Archbishop's palace, Carondelet from the balconies of the *Municipio*, and so on. With the exception of the Cathedral entrance, which was public, the second floor of each of the plaza buildings would have been protected. Access would have demanded elite status, membership of one sort or another in the national elect. The viewer, in other words, is placed in semi-private or restricted space in order to take stock of the national scene. Certainly, the opportunity to stand idly gazing across the square required a leisurely assumption of authority that suggests a

distanced relationship between the viewer on the balcony and the cross-section of Quito in the plaza below.

For the plaza is indeed filled with national life in these paintings. A religious parade emerges from the Archbishop's palace and heads toward the Cathedral (or perhaps Carondelet?). Soldiers in uniform, men in suits and top hats, and women wearing full skirts and shawls cross the square and pass through the porticos of each building. Indigenous (or perhaps *mestizo*) women and men stand barefooted among their more prosperous compatriots. And, indigenous water sellers cluster around the fountain, filling urns and heading out into the city. Interestingly, the poorer, lower-class figures in these paintings seem to cluster toward the front and center of each canvas. They are most available to view and placed at the center of the national scene.

The paintings are small enough that it is difficult to discern identifying details for the diminutive figures walking along the Cathedral's promenade or passing through the porticos of the *Municipio* and the Archbishop's palace. Those details that are visible suggest that the figures are more likely meant to be middle and upper-class white-*mestizos* than indigenous or *mestizo* laborers. Despite how the paintings bring indigenous figures toward the center of the plaza, non-indigenous figures dominate the paintings in numeric terms. These paintings, in other words, are not properly seen as paintings of or about indigeneity. They are, instead, paintings about the nation: its iconic buildings, its central spaces, and its varied population. What is particularly interesting for the purposes of this analysis, however, are the ways that these paintings organize national space and, in the process, invoke the polity.

There is a fundamental sense of distinction at work in the four *Plaza Grande* paintings, and it is closely tied to questions of representation. Each painting enacts representation, depicting the order of the nation within an iconic national space. Its figures, drawn from *costumbrismo*'s

pantheon of romantic types, represent the various strata of the republic. The viewer, however, stands apart from that national catalog, claiming access to positions of authority and the right to represent the nation both visually and politically. The paintings, then, call attention to both political and visual representation and to the twin structures of aestheticization and oligarchy that authorize such representation. If political representation fits oligarchy into republican clothing, legitimizing the presence of otherness and distinction within democratic practice, visual representation aestheticizes the republic, picturing the relationship between a viewing self and a represented other in terms of a natural civic order.

Making distinctions, in this sense, forms the foundation of the republican community. That is the *El Ecuatoriano* editorial's point: republics work through election and representation, both of which require distinction between the "elect" and "electors" (and, in the case of nineteenth-century Ecuador, between the popular masses who transmit sovereignty and the enfranchised minority that receives it). The sacrifice of rights and power that is constitutive of political consent thus simultaneously marks divisions in the body of the nation and ties it together.

<2>Representative Responsibility

The aristocratic Progressives of the late nineteenth century were not the only Ecuadorians who advanced a theory of republican polity that separated the uneducated, problematic nation of others from its leaders, nor were they the only ones who imagined those ordered divisions in both textual and visual terms. Mid-twentieth-century writers and image makers reviewing Ecuadorian polity might have been less inclined to align themselves with the oligarchic elite than their predecessors, but the legitimizing act of internal othering continued to undergird their civic criticism. In fact, the moves that twentieth-century leftist authors and artists made to distinguish

themselves from both the nation's leaders and indigenous communities show even more clearly how otherness haunts republican life.

Writing almost sixty years after *El Ecuatoriano*'s authors and from a left-leaning and academic perspective, the *indigenista* social scientist Carlos Andrade Marín elaborated a similar assessment of Ecuadorian civic life in which a republican elite separated itself from a troubled nation of others. Unlike the late-nineteenth-century Progressives, however, Andrade Marín critiqued those elite for not adequately carrying out their responsibilities to the struggling nation-other:

The leading forces of the country, and among them the youth, have the primary obligation to remember that they are a minority, a fearsome minority facing a national mass of indigent Indians and *mestizos*. And [they must remember] that such a minority, however cultivated it believes itself to be, does not have the right to play political games. The Ecuadorian *pueblo* is fundamentally that mass of two and a half million Indians and *mestizos*, of illiterates, of semi-naked inhabitants of the highland plains or the jungle, that waits with indolent hopelessness for the *Patria* to call it and integrate it into its columns.²³

Andrade Marín repeatedly, in this text, marks the popular classes as the nation. His assertion that the *pueblo*, the people-nation, is “fundamentally that mass of ... Indians and *mestizos*” is matched, a page later, by a lament that “We must radically transform the Ecuadorian national mass in order to transform Ecuador.”²⁴ Andrade Marín negotiates the oligarchic nature of Ecuadorian republicanism by naming the nation in terms of its masses but distinguishing that nation from the *Patria*, the Fatherland. In such use, the paternal undertones of “*patria*” come clear: the nation of children cries out to its father-leaders who guide their children into national

adulthood. Andrade Marín was not alone in his assessment that a distinction existed between the nation's leaders and its people nor in his sense that such distinction carried responsibility.

Writing in *El Dia* in 1945, the pseudonymous columnist Tupac Amaru argued that “the defense of the poor” was “the defense of the nationality.”²⁵ Ecuadorian leaders who failed to heed the calls of the *indigenista* social scientists and pursue real reform were failing the nation.

Lambasting the elite minority—from the nation but not *fundamentally* the nation—for its willingness to sacrifice the interests of the national majority, Andrade Marín and Tupac Amaru enacted a form of republican othering. They called Ecuadorian elites into republican responsibility for the nation of others. For Andrade Marín, that meant weighting the nation with a heritage of pathology: “If we do not redeem from misery, sickness, and ignorance the Ecuadorian mass majority, uncultured, miserable, and sick, the daily political transformations of our national history will serve for naught.”²⁶ In that move, Andrade Marín made the national majority into a needing other, refusing identification with the nation in order to draw attention to the urgency of its plight and jar elites into generous action. Tupac Amaru, for his part, used the urgent need for reform to destabilize elites’ own place in the nation:

When we have achieved a fruitful balance [in society], we will be true citizens. While the ignominious neglect of the Ecuadorian [lower] classes continues, we may be politicians, professionals of all types, literati, illustrious men, but we will not be Ecuadorians. We will be lacking [the necessary] love of the national soil.²⁷

So long as elites denied their republican responsibility to create a balanced society and raise up the oppressed and neglected national other, Tupac Amaru asserts, they lost their own Ecuadorianness. The nation could not be the self.

The critique of elite neglect offered by Andrade Marin and Tupac Amaru echoed as well, though more harshly, in the work of two young, Marxist artists—Humberto Estrella and Carlos Rodríguez—who exhibited a series of paintings and caricatures in a 1940 exhibit titled *Quito Colonial*. The catalog from that exhibition reproduces several of the artists’ works alongside the speeches presented at the exhibit’s opening. Naming their presentation of twentieth-century images *Quito Colonial* and explicitly invoking the city’s colonial-era title, “Mui Noble i Mui Leal Ciudad de San Francisco de Quito” (Very Noble and Very Loyal City of San Francisco de Quito”), Rodríguez and Estrella tied their criticism of the contemporary national order to a long history of representation and exploitation.²⁸

In many of the images reproduced in the catalog, especially Rodríguez’s paintings, indigenous figures press up against the page, threatening to overflow it. Behind them, the modern colonial city haunts and hovers, an inescapable presence. The contrast between these images of Quito and those of the four nineteenth-century *Plaza Grande* paintings is stylistic, of course, but it is also spatial and rhetorical. The earlier paintings emphasize distance. The architecture and the sky were the paintings’ protagonists and the people moved across the square without disturbing it. The aesthetic order of representation was discrete, solid, and natural. In Rodríguez’s paintings, the viewer is uncomfortably close to the suffering, exploited nation. Though not quite *of* the nation, that viewer is quite distinctly present as the paintings’ subjects shoulder their way into iconic space, pushing it aside and rupturing its clarity.

The position of the viewer in these paintings is ambiguous. Very close to and entirely implicated in the circumstances depicted, the viewer is not *quite* part of them and stands instead at an oblique angle to the action. This sense is particularly strong in Rodríguez’s painting “Primicia” (“First Fruits”). “Primicia” illustrates an ongoing tradition of colonial origin in which

indigenous communities gave the first fruits of their harvest to the Catholic Church (Figure 34). In the painting, a bloated, tonsured priest with a face like a slab of stone fills the left third of the canvas. His great, rounded chest and enormous right arm squeeze four indigenous petitioners into the remaining two-thirds of the canvas. Only the head of the fourth figure fits in the image. A sacrificial lamb takes center stage in the painting, mediating between the parties. The domes and steeples of Quito above that crowded tableau are almost pushed off the canvas by the five adults in the foreground. A baby carried on the back of one petitioner appears lifelessly draped over a church roof, sacrificed to the Church along with the lamb. There is no room at the inn.

The claustrophobic atmosphere of this painting presses the painting's audience into relation with the depicted scene. One cannot help but recoil from the priest's arm and his accusatory finger pointing directly at the hat grasped submissively in the hands of the foremost indigenous supplicant. And yet, the audience is viewing a public problem and is positioned neither as an additional indigenous petitioner nor a clerical oppressor. The scene of exploitation pushes itself into view, but it is not quite our scene. Instead, the invading scene obliges responsibility to and for the visually marginalized indigenous other and demands as well that viewers distinguish themselves from the exploiting classes represented by the priest.

That experience of being obligated by the paintings but not quite participating in them resonates neatly with Estrella and Rodríguez's own description of their position within the nation. They launch harsh attacks on Ecuador's elites, making a clear division between themselves and an elite others they describe as parasitic. They also, however, set themselves just slightly apart from the national masses, expressing leftist commitment to exploited workers without entirely identifying with them. Rodríguez and Estrella open the catalog with a statement

of responsibility that identifies the authors with Ecuador yet sketches as well the nation's divisions:

Responsible to an ideological commitment and responsible to manifest the truth before all in the historical moment to which we belong, we want to reflect, at least in its larger aspects, the social, economic, and political panorama of our country, of this corner of **Indo-América**, as we might call it, composed in the majority by **Indians**, by **cholos**; (plebian people as you say) and, like all bourgeois countries, formed as well by oppressed classes and oppressive classes.²⁹

Like Andrade Marin and Tupac Amaru, Rodríguez and Estrella's division of the national body takes a substantially different form than did the divisions proffered by the editors of *El Ecuatoriano* or the *Plaza Grande* paintings. And yet those divisions remain, and they continue to be natural, inevitable, and constitutive of the actually existing republic. The structure of republican representation that Estrella and Rodríguez identify as profoundly feudal and colonial consists of power-inflected relationships among multiple sorts of others.

In their paintings and caricatures, Estrella and Rodríguez envision social relations within Quito as standing in for a larger society defined by three social classes: the feudal (or oligarchic) powers, the Church, and the oppressed.³⁰ While that framing suggests that the artists are in some way identified with the final category, their partial distinction from it had already been established by their earlier presentation of themselves as having the task of enlightening the oppressed national body. Artists, then, served as the ideal representatives for the oppressed—its republican other: “Art, noble expression of human intelligence, ought to be brought to the popular consciousness in order to teach it its routes, correct the defects of our collective organism, and above all to make us feel a longing for justice and the reclamation of rights.”³¹

Such ambivalent movement between identification and representation in Rodríguez and Estrella's images and statements points, once again, to the distinction-making structures of republican practice. Addressing injustice via the language of democratic idealism means making sense of the experience and existence of internal otherness. Republican representation highlights the extent to which others are the national majority and highlights how that majority invokes the republican responsibility of the few.

In the justifications and criticisms of existing republican order launched by Andrade Marin, Tupac Amaru, and the editors of *El Ecuatoriano*, by the *Plaza Grande* paintings and the exhibit *Quito Colonial*, we catch a glimpse of the complex rhetorical ecology by which republican Ecuador functioned. Those texts and images show a republican polity that ordered the nation by separating a majority of others from an elite minority via the uneven distribution of representation. Whether the *status quo* of national order was the subject of critique or celebration in those artifacts, they coincided in imagining an oligarchic republic in which a nation-made-other sacrificed its sovereignty and in calling leaders into responsibility for those sacrificial others. By entering positions of representation, the rhetor/self consistently pulls away from the nation even while remaining closely tied to it and fundamentally responsible for it. The relationship between populace and leaders here is not the classical ideal of representative democracy in which leaders are responsible *to* the people. It forms instead an oligarchic republic in which leaders are set apart from and responsible *for* their subjects. In this scheme, leaders don't cease to be Ecuadorians, don't entirely abdicate identification and affiliation with the *Patria*, and yet the nation has become something other than self. In the oligarchic republic, leaders are the elect; they are other than the nation of others.

<1>“Making Everything Ugly”

That sense of being set apart, both other-yet-not and compatriot-yet-not, appeared not only in texts and images that sought to order and organize systems of authority and resistance but also in artifacts that aimed to capture the degradation of the nation or picture a national ideal. In the late nineteenth- and mid-twentieth centuries, that impulse appeared most starkly in negotiations over the purpose and possibilities of different visual genres. Of particular interest for this discussion of republican otherness are treatments of beauty and ugliness that used images of national spaces and populations to invoke elite viewers' relationships with the nation as other by fixing attention on matters of [unequal] representation. Such arguments over representation and aesthetics, like the efforts to organize national space discussed above, sought to naturalize republican othering through careful framing of the polity and its indigenous others. They mitigated the ways that elites claimed sovereignty, allowing them to refuse identification with the other-majority while also remaining in a relationship with it. Such mechanisms give further insight into the persuasive workings of what Allen (writing of the United States) terms a "two-pronged citizenship of domination and acquiescence."³² In Ecuador, like in the United States, that "two-pronged citizenship" provided a deeply problematic yet durable system for reconciling the uneven distribution of republican sovereignty. It assigned different roles to different members of the republic, giving the sacrificial role almost entirely into the hands of the indigenous other.

In 1911, the Ecuadorian photographer José Domingo Laso put together a picture book of Quito scenes titled *Quito a la Vista*. In that book's preface, the editors (Laso and J. Roberto Cruz) reported that they saw the volume as "filling a gap that continues to be felt among us in terms of illustrated publications depicting the capital of the Republic."³³ They objected to the images of Quito that were circulated internationally by "foreign tourists," and they bemoaned

photographs that showed Ecuador as a “savage or conquerable country.” Such images, they argued, gave viewers “an impoverished idea of our population and our culture.” In response, they proposed a visual project that was “vindicating, a work of perfect patriotism”; it featured those national scenes “in which the industries and splendid beauty of the Ecuadorian land offer objects worthy of being perpetuated by art.”³⁴ This collection of photographs, in other words, used its images of Quito to forward an accurate vision of the nation, one produced from within.

Of particular concern to the editors was correcting what they believed to be the distorted national image that had emerged thanks to foreign photographers’ fascination with Ecuadorian indigeneity. Such photography, they complained, over-emphasized the “indigenous element,” hiding the true beauty and progress of the country and “mak[ing] everything ugly.”³⁵ This was a strange critique of existing photography to come from Laso, who was himself known for producing romantic, *costumbrista* photographs featuring indigenous subjects. And yet, that invocation of national beauty and ugliness, its explicit link to indigeneity, and its contradictory relation with Laso’s own *oeuvre* call further attention to the complicated role of otherness in republican practice.

Laso and Cruz’s treatment of ugliness and indigeneity in photography echoes interestingly, if oddly, in another critique of art launched thirty years later by members of the academic organization the *Instituto Indigenista del Ecuador* (IIE or Indigenist Institute of Ecuador). In that case, the left-leaning social scientists of the IIE found fault with artistic *indigenista* depictions of indigenous people, arguing that those paintings distorted reality by making indigenous people and their lives appear ugly. Unlike Laso and Cruz, the members of the IIE were focused on the dignity of indigenous communities rather than the dignity of the nation. At the same time, the IIE’s concern for indigenous uplift was always situated in national terms—

its campaign against degrading images was, fundamentally, oriented toward making the nation beautiful. There are, then, striking similarities between these two texts and the images that accompanied them. Both texts negotiate the national status of indigenous people and critique visual materials for distorting the image of the nation. They also work with slippery associations of self and other in which the status of indigenous people as representative of the nation swells and fades yet remains persistently salient.

<2>Framing others in and out

In one sense, Laso and Cruz's preface to *Quito a la Vista* quite clearly positioned indigenous people as "other" in the sense of a constitutive exterior. Images of indigenous people made the nation appear ugly, so patriotic photographers would emphasize the nation's white-*mestizo* modernity and high culture. Patriotism and a search for national redemption inspired Laso and Cruz to exclude Indians from the frame and emphasize instead the grand buildings and parks of the capital.

For the most part, the photographs included in *Quito a la Vista* replicate that sense that indigenous people were fundamentally exterior to a proper vision of the nation. They privilege images of architecture: colonial-era churches, scientific institutions, grand promenades. Though most of the photographs do include human figures, those figures seem incidental. They were caught within the frame because the photos were taken during the course of daily life. Not surprisingly, given Laso and Cruz's stated goals, the humans traversing those Quiteño scenes are marked as white-*mestizo* and largely as affluent: women appear in full skirts and stylish hats, children wear knickers and bonnets, priests don clerical robes, men sport suits and fedoras.

Despite that general purity, however, the album seems haunted—by the indigenous people left out of the photographs but invoked by Laso and Cruz's own words, by the photos'

curious framing, and by the long tradition of city scenes that preceded *Quito a la Vista*'s appearance. Calling those prior images and their own careful framing to mind, Laso and Cruz effectively, if unintentionally, repopulated their photographs, asking viewers to remember what was not there. Both their words and their photographs called attention to matters of framing: if previous image makers have aimed their cameras or positioned their easels to highlight Indians, Laso must be framing his shots as well in order to leave the impoverished outside the margins. But even then, it seems, it was not quite possible to frame the city's indigenous denizens out entirely.

Throughout *Quito a la Vista*, not only in the language of the preface, the editors call attention to their active framing in ways that invoke indigenous presence and align indigenous others with an actually-existing nation whose troubles haunt the beautiful photographs that Laso and Cruz sought to provide. The album lacks a photograph of one of Quito's most iconic spaces, the monastery of *San Francisco de Quito*—the first religious building built in the city after the conquest. It is not hard to guess that the church, with its large plaza given over to a popular market, simply couldn't be photographed without capturing indigenous figures in the frame. In a more active sense, the third and fourth photographs in *Quito a la Vista* show two sides of the *Plaza Grande* in ways that similarly call attention to indigenous absence (Figures 35 & 36).

Rather than providing the iconic, straight-on view used in the four paintings described above and in other popular images of the plaza, these two photographs strike odd angles, partially obscuring the buildings they purport to display and drawing attention to the difficulty of capturing the *Plaza Grande* without indigenous figures. The third photograph offers an oblique view of the presidential palace, Carondolet, and the fourth shows the façade of the Archbishop's palace. Like the *Plaza Grande* paintings, these photographs were clearly taken from the upper

stories of adjacent buildings, but where the paintings ask the viewer to gaze straight across the square, Laso's photographs were taken at closer angles: we see Carondelet from the perspective of the Archbishop's palace and the Archbishop's palace from the *Municipio*. In the Carondelet photograph in particular, the awkwardness of framing threatens to betray the mission to which it was summoned. An electric street lamp erupts into the foreground of the frame, highlighting Quito's modern system of lighting, but also cutting through the southern third of the building. A tree in the plaza garden blacks out a portion of the center of the building. The right-hand edge of the palace is closely cropped at the edge of the photograph while a section of an adjacent building appears beyond its edge at the left side of the photograph. The image, in other words, seems just slightly haphazard and out of control. It is not a particularly good photograph of the plaza or of the building behind it.

The awkwardness of the photograph calls attention to Laso and Cruz's explicit indication that their primary task has been about framing: showing the modern nation and excising egregious Indians. In it, we see a national ideal functioning in active contrast to another existing, widely circulated, and familiar vision of the nation. The typical views of the *Plaza Grande* had to be reoriented and repositioned in order for them to provide the cleared vision of the nation that Laso and Cruz had promised. The visible contrast between the plaza photographs in *Quito a la Vista* and their more familiar predecessors brings the nation-othering sense of representation and republican oligarchy into play. Laso and Cruz rely on the common sense that photography captures the real. By depicting national spaces cleared of Indians, they hope to picture the real nation as other-than-indigenous. And yet, the very care they have taken to exclude indigenous people from their images ends up calling the frame of the nation into question and invoking that other who haunts republican polity. There is a sense that excluding Indians from the photographs

was no easy task: the authors emphasize the “scrupulous care that we have taken to ensure that all our photographs appear clean and free of those groups to which we have just referred.”³⁶

Creating such clean images requires that photographers “trouble themselves,” engage “special care,” and practice heightened awareness. They had to take their photographs from odd angles and omit certain scenes. The viewer gets the sense, then, that simply walking into the street, setting up the camera, and taking photographs would not allow the sort of photograph desired.

Laso and Cruz were not alone in that urge to improve reality for the sake of an interested realism: Joaquín Pinto painted regularly from photographs, appreciating their realism, yet he argued that the work of the painter was to present their scenes “ennobled, even improved ... according to the judicious and beautiful conception of the painter.”³⁷ In *Quito a la Vista* as in Pinto’s paintings, the supposed realism of positivist representation comes into focus as artifice. Laso and Cruz are providing the nation aestheticized, not the nation as it is.

Quito a la Vista makes Quito modern, beautiful, and potential-filled. Where the editors’ preface notes the problem to be excluded (i.e. indigenous people), the introduction to the album triumphantly lists all Quito’s historical and contemporary accomplishments, including reference to an extending network of urban electrification, a soon-to-be-completed city-wide system of plumbing, and the trans-Andean railway that connected Quito to the world in 1908.³⁸ What’s worth noting here, then, is that such emphasis on beauty and modernity, progress and potential, required an active, intentional, and explicit excision of indigenous figures. That move implies that the nation’s problems are likewise blocked out of the picture and placed on the shoulders of an indigenous other that haunts the spaces of government yet can also be framed out of them to enable a new and somehow purer nation.

However, since Ecuadorian viewers seeing their nation thus depicted would have been quite aware of the excluded national problems that dogged hope for modern progress, it is too simple to suggest that the excised Indians truly serve here as the nation's constitutive exterior. Instead, though they linger at the edge of the frame, their absent presence calls attention not to the edge of the nation but to the nation-not-shown, the "ugly" nation-other from which Laso and Cruz hope to distinguish themselves and their viewers. Indians, in *Quito a la Vista*, thus stood in for the larger context of the nation. Laso and Cruz proposed to represent a wide-ranging national beauty by pulling the best of the nation apart from its problems. They avoided the "ugly" distortions enacted by other image-makers by enacting a parallel "beautifying" distortion.

<2>Distortions and Dignity

Thirty-five years later, in the pages of a book edited by the IIE, another discussion of distortion and national vision similarly contested the beauty and ugliness of indigenous images as representative of the nation's otherness. In 1946, the IIE edited a book titled *Cuestiones Indigenas del Ecuador (Indigenous Questions of Ecuador)*.³⁹ The collection, featuring Ecuador's most prominent social scientists, included a manifesto written by Institute members, two chapters outlining scholarly approaches to the "Indian Problem"; ten chapters offering social scientific studies of Ecuadorian Indians; an extensive bibliography; and an album of photographs featuring indigenous subjects. The opening manifesto lays out the IIE's understanding of indigeneity, making it clear that indigenous people were simultaneously the body of the nation and an other to the position of the IIE. They were both a distinct racialized culture and a place-based, racially ambiguous class that was integral to the nation.

The manifesto's circuitous definition of "Indian" bears quoting at length:

To attempt to define in advance who the Indian is, in a Continent where the majority is racially mixed, is to create a phantasm, an ambiguous and unnecessary pursuit... [T]he Indian problem overlaps entirely with the peasant proletariat, without need to discriminate among sanguinary groups, in order to lift them to a higher level of life, whether pure Indians or descended from an indefinable mixture. The indigenist question is fundamentally a question of economics and politics, not biology. Thus, if the indigenous peasant obtains a good salary, his own parcel of fertile land, and access to cultural improvement, the fact of being pure Indian or *mestizo* ceases to be of importance. Even now both pure Indians and *mestizos* appear in the hierarchies of the bureaucracy, military, Church, and university, but a massive percentage still remain at the margins and they ought to be transformed into an efficient agricultural factor with the economic and cultural capacity necessary for their own improvement. It is the noble pride of belonging to the Indian race, historical foundation of America, that should inspire them. [Until then], the vitality of those nations with indigenous proletariat majorities remains fatally affected.⁴⁰

For the IIE, then, indigenous heritage was problematically ambiguous. It was not possible to determine exactly who was an Indian in biological terms, yet “belonging to the Indian race” ought to be a source of pride and motivation for the “indigenous proletariat majorities.” The status of that other and yet integral majority “fatally affected” the nation.

In response, leaders and scholars were tasked with transforming that national other into “an efficient agricultural factor” and providing it with “the economic and cultural capacity necessary for [its] own improvement.” In this definition, then, the Indian was both central to the glory of the nation and central to its problems; both the nation’s fatal flaw and its future

potential. The Indian other was, troublingly, the future of the nation. The solution to that problem of the national other, according to the IIE, required establishing systems of order and administration. Economics and politics, not biology, concern the authors. A good salary, land-ownership, education, and hygiene, if extended toward the indigenous majority would save that it and, thus, the nation.

And yet, republican order was not the only sort of representation that concerned the members of the IIE. Their manifesto blended discussion of political reform with a diatribe about aesthetic representation that indicted literary and artistic *indigenistas* for envisioning indigenous others in ways demeaned the nation. The IIE manifesto condemned the *feísta* (“ugly-ist,”)⁴¹ paintings produced by artists like Kingman and Oswaldo Guayasamín, arguing that they degraded indigenous people and replaced indigenous realities with a dangerous and destructive artistic license. In his chapter of *Cuestiones*, the famous social scientist Pio Jaramillo Alvarado expanded that criticism. He excoriated literary and artistic *indigenismo*, arguing that its visual form “took the Indian as model in order to deform him, having ignored his spirit, stereotyping it using an imported and degenerate impressionism.” Jaramillo Alvarado continued with a critique grounded in aesthetic and rhetorical terms, “though the beautiful Andean landscape and the indigenous man have indeed been faithfully interpreted in the painting and sculpture of Quito, the modernist reaction has gone too far and must return to reasonable aesthetic proportions.”⁴² The “improved” realism practiced by Pinto and *costumbrismo*, in other words, represented the nation better than did the expressivist social realism of the *indigenistas*.

Enacting that preference for romantic realism, the editors of *Cuestiones* provided readers with a more appropriate set of representative images. The photographic album included at the back of the book, the opening manifesto asserted, “is a demonstration that the human type of the

Ecuadorian Indian is of noble expression, even in those groups pummeled by the misery to which they are condemned.”⁴³ For the IIE, the album offered an alternative depiction of Ecuador’s indigenous people that corrected the excesses of artistic *indigenismo*; it used photography to forward an argument about the beauty of indigenous communities and the nation as whole even in the face of exploitation. Like their predecessors, however, the visual arguments composed by the IIE positioned indigenous people as the nation precisely by making that nation other than the reader/viewer. Rejecting the representation offered by their *indigenista* compatriots as too distancing, they nevertheless returned to the distancing strategies of earlier eras.

Though the members of the IIE were fierce critics of the status quo who genuinely hoped for an end to oppression and worked consistently in favor of indigenous communities, their approaches exemplified those traditions of investigation, classification, and administration that made the nation other from its governing elites. In addition, as A. Kim Clark points out, popular uptake of the *indigenistas*’ efforts often re-inscribed rather than upended common sense beliefs about the cultural strangeness of indigenous people.⁴⁴ The depictions of indigenous people provided in the IIE album corroborate this placement—maintaining visual values drawn not only from romantic *costumbrismo* but also scientific and anthropological photography. Ironically, though the Institute’s *indigenistas* criticized pictorial *indigenismo* for the ways its intentionally ugly style failed to capture the “genuine interpretation of the Ecuadorian Indian,” their own chosen images, though sometimes beautiful, still emphasize poverty, distance from civilization, and social degradation.⁴⁵

The “Album Indigenista,” published both as part of *Cuestiones* and as a separately bound album, features thirty-four photographs of Ecuadorian indigenous people. Only the subject of the final photograph is identified by name: the indigenous communist leader, Dolores Cacuango.

Despite *Cuestiones*' assertion that the album would show the dignity of Ecuador's indigenous people, its photographs are inconsistent in the level of respect they pay their indigenous subjects. In some cases, such as in the photographs "Casique de los indios Colorados," "India Zámbara," and "Casique de Otavalo," indigenous figures appear regal, distant, and wise (the classic image of the noble savage, perhaps) (Figures 37-39). In others, including one captioned "One cup too many! – The Indian Tragedy," no word but "degraded" seems appropriate to describe the vision of indigenous life offered up (Figure 40). The album honored a sense of indigenous nobility and criticized the effects of racism and failed policy. It also, however, repeatedly visualized poverty and exclusion as endemic to indigenous life in ways that called into question how representative the beauty and dignity of indigenous others might actually be.

The IIE's declared mission, to use *indigenista* texts to "create in the conscience of citizens the urgency, the categorical imperative, to elevate the indigenous problem to the first level [of concern] in the solution of national problems," makes clear that the continued image of indigenous otherness was a necessary component for activating the collective sympathy of those responsible for the nation made of others.⁴⁶ As representatives for the popular other, leaders were called to address the "economic misery that affects the majority of the population forming the peasant class, misery that affects the national life in all its manifestations."⁴⁷ Cultivating that responsibility in the conscience of the nation's leaders, however, required getting the picture right.

According to *Cuestiones*, the distorted, demanding Indians of artistic *indigenismo* got the balance wrong, using an imported aesthetic inappropriate to the particular realities of Ecuador. The heavy, rebellious, exaggerated Indians painted by Kingman and his colleagues threatened authority and made the nation ugly. They ruptured the republican system. Such Indians were, for

the social scientists of the IIE, so entirely other that they could not summon the necessary representation or responsibility from elite viewers. The aestheticized realism of the album's photographs, however, whether they showed indigenous dignity or degradation, maintained a patina of beauty. That aesthetic representation, in turn, validated representative processes in the political realm by calling the elect into responsibility for the masses. The visual order of beauty and ugliness in the album reinstated republican systems of identification and division even as the text as a whole critiqued the republic's neglect and exploitation of indigenous populations.

<1>Representing Others

This chapter's analysis of order and beauty, representation and responsibility suggests that contradictions of interiority and exteriority are endemic to the creation and maintenance of republican nation-states. The relative political power, economic stability, and cultural homogeneity of a given republic might mitigate or hide the sacrifices of representation, but they are never absent. Negotiating interiority and exteriority, finding ways to maintain internal others in their liminal state, presents one of the fundamental rhetorical problems of republican life, both historically and in the present moment, both in Ecuador and beyond.

The popular people in whom sovereignty resides quite easily become a restive mass that troubles stability and modernity; a national *we* shifts fluidly to a national *they*. Nations are made up of others. The quintessential task of nation-making, then, is to find ways of imagining those others in relation to the self that allow for a sense of community. Scholars have frequently interpreted that process as emphasizing proximity: in imagining the nation, we imagine a sense of "we" that allows the nation to cohere. In the examples elaborated here, however, there has been another force at work. Division coincides with identification as the primary means of

making the public whole. Much as we might wish it were different, that process of distinction and othering is as fundamentally republican as the more typically recognized strategies of identification. Distancing oneself from internal compatriots allows space for practices of administration, it redresses national failings without extending responsibility, and it lays the lines of faction that transect any human conglomeration. In this sense, the pages above echo the forms of border- and demoformation that Etienne Balibar addresses when he writes that, “border areas—zones, countries, and cities—are not marginal to the constitution of a public sphere but rather are at the center.”⁴⁸ The center of a public conglomeration rests not only at the point where power is concentrated but also at the place of the *problem*, “the sites where a people is constituted through the creation of civic consciousness and the collective resolution of the contradictions that run through it.”⁴⁹

This chapter has suggested that internal divisions between self and other play crucial roles in making republican polity work, justifying the inequities of representation. The next chapter inverts the equation, examining moments of identification in which non-indigenous rhetors do the unexpected and position themselves as if they were indigenous. Despite the somewhat dramatic difference in strategy, however, the identifications highlighted in the next chapter share a rhetorical objective with this chapter’s examples of division: both identification and division attempt to claim legitimate access to the nation and resolve otherwise troubling contradictions in the experience of national life.

¹ Ministerio de Previsión Social, *Día del Indio*, 5.

-
- ² A. K. Clark, "Indians, the State and Law; de la Torre, "Usos políticos"; Guerrero, "Administration of Dominated Populations"; Sattar, "Indígena o Ciudadano"; Williams, "Administering the Otavalan Indian."
- ³ see Fitzell, "Teorizando la diferencia"; Muratorio, ed. *Imágenes e imagineros*.
- ⁴ see Grijalva Calero, ed. *Plástica y literatura*; Muratorio, "Images of Indians"; Pérez, "Exoticism"; Pequeño Bueno, *Imágenes en disputa*.
- ⁵ see Kingman Garcés, *Ciudad y los otros*; Prieto, *Liberalismo y temor*.
- ⁶ Cintron, "Democracy"; Fraser, "Rethinking"; Paley, "Toward an Anthropology of Democracy."
- ⁷ Davis, *Inessential Solidarity*.
- ⁸ Isocrates, "Nicocles," ¶6.
- ⁹ Burke, *Rhetoric*, 22.
- ¹⁰ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 313.
- ¹¹ Davis, *Inessential Solidarity*, 56.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 62.
- ¹³ This distinction between the 'other' of ontology and the other of social life, incidentally, is likely the source of Davis' frustration with Burke, who claims simultaneously that identification-through-consubstantiality is our originary state and that "identification is compensatory to [essential] division." Burke, always attentive to the ambiguities of substance, sees a difference between individual origins and communal experience. Burke, *Rhetoric*, 22; Davis, *Inessential Solidarity*, 22-26.
- ¹⁴ "Oligarquía."
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 389. emphasis original
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 390. emphasis original

¹⁷ Ibid. emphasis original

¹⁸ Cintron, "Democracy," 113.

¹⁹ Ibid., 106.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Allen, *Talking to Strangers*, 41.

²² Ibid.

²³ Andrade Marín, "El indio," 145.

²⁴ Ibid., 146.

²⁵ Amaru, "Carta de Tupac Amaru," 3. Though this columnist invokes the name of the last member of the Inca family who led a short-lived rebellion against the Spanish colonizers in the late sixteenth century, *El Dia*'s Tupac Amaru wrote only occasionally about indigenous issues.

²⁶ Andrade Marín, "El indio," 146.

²⁷ Amaru, "Carta de Tupac Amaru," 3.

²⁸ Rodríguez and Estrella, *Quito colonial*.

²⁹ Ibid., 5. emphasis original

³⁰ Ibid., 7.

³¹ Ibid., 6.

³² Allen, *Talking to Strangers*, 41.

³³ Laso and Cruz, *Quito a la vista*, 1.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ qtd. in Joaquín Pinto, "Paisaje" 1.

³⁸ Laso and Cruz, *Quito a la vista*, 4.

³⁹ Instituto Indigenista Ecuatoriano, ed. *Cuestiones indígenas*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, I-II.

⁴¹ Note this word is F-E-I-S-T-A, from *feo* or ugly, not F-I-E-S-T-A, meaning “party”

⁴² Jaramillo Alvarado, "El Indio," 35-36.

⁴³ Instituto Indigenista Ecuatoriano, ed. *Cuestiones indígenas*, III.

⁴⁴ K. Clark, "Medida de la diferencia," 115.

⁴⁵ Instituto Indigenista Ecuatoriano, ed. *Cuestiones indígenas*, III.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, IV.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ Balibar, "World Borders," 72.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*