

Preface

My first trip to the Titicaca Basin was in 1982, as the guest of the late Victor Barua and his wife, Lucy Barua. I was fascinated by the people and archaeology of this region and have returned every year since 1985 to conduct or plan research. At the time of those early trips, I realized that archaeologists and naturalists had worked in the region for more than a hundred years, uncovering a rich and deep prehistory. Beginning in 1988 and continuing every year since, I have conducted my own excavation and survey projects. This book synthesizes this accumulated research and places these data in a contemporary theoretical context.

There is much debate these days about the nature of archaeological explanation and its practice in constructing or reconstructing the past. I consider myself a processual archaeologist in the broadest sense of the term. As I hope to illustrate in this work,

processual archaeology is much more holistic than its detractors maintain. I believe that many of our colleagues too quickly abandoned comparative analysis and scientific logic. The fact is that the deeper we look at regional sequences, with better and better chronologies, the more we see striking parallels between different areas of the world. There simply are a limited number of effective ways to organize complex societies, and people independently arrived at these solutions in many areas of the world. At the same time, I believe that we must produce “thick archaeologies” of the cultures of the world that celebrate the unique contributions of peoples, both present and past. In short, I seek to provide a scientific narrative that models the prehistory of the region from the first settled villages around 2000 B.C. to the Spanish Conquest in the 1530s.

Following this processual tradition, all of the

models and ideas presented in this book are testable with existing and future data as we refine our concepts of Lake Titicaca Basin prehistory. Likewise, I hope that some of the data in this book will be useful to scholars outside the Andes for comparative analyses of other areas of the world where ranked societies and states independently developed.

Because much of my research has been published, data are not reproduced here in great detail, but readers who wish to critically assess my ideas may want to consult these earlier publications, which are listed in the references section of this book. The Juli-Pomata survey is available in Stanish et al. 1997. A Spanish translation of this book and an expanded appendix on the survey sites are available on the website of the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at the University of California, Los Angeles, under the Andean Lab homepage. A discussion of raised-field agriculture is available in Stanish 1994. Excavation data from the site of Tumatumani are available in Stanish and Steadman 1994, and a discussion of the Inca occupation is found in Stanish 1997 and 2000. Results of my work with Brian Bauer on the Island of the Sun can be found in Bauer and Stanish 2001. Additional articles listed in the bibliography may serve as a useful companion to this book. Unpublished data are also available on the UCLA website and shortly will be forthcoming in monographs. This is particularly important for the survey of the Huancané and Putina valleys in the north. Most of these data have not been incorporated in this book. However, I have written the interpretative sections in such a way that none of the ideas presented here contradict the preliminary results of that survey.

The first chapter provides an overview of the prehistory of the region and the broad theoretical conclusions of this work. Subsequent chapters introduce my theoretical framework, the history of archaeological research, and the geography, ecology, and

ethnography of the Titicaca Basin. Chapters 6 through 10 synthesize the data from six archaeological periods in the Titicaca region. I have attempted to separate, as much as possible, the empirical data from my own hypotheses and theoretical speculations. Chapter 11, the conclusion, summarizes the prehistory of the region within the theoretical framework presented in chapter 2.

Some notes on terminology and orthography are necessary. I use *archaeology* to refer to the science; that is, the method and theory of studying the past. I use *prehistory* in a specific sense to refer to the actual past studied by archaeologists. *History* is used in two senses: a broad one to refer to constructs of the past, and a narrow one to refer to the study of people in the post-European contact periods. In this sense, archaeology is a method of studying history. The meaning of this term should be understandable from the context in which it is used.

I do not prefer any particular orthography for Aymara, Quechua, or Hispanicized indigenous words. I try to conform to the most common usage while respecting, where possible, historical precedent. I use the term *Pucara* to refer to the Upper Formative-period culture in the region, as well as the huge type site and corresponding ceramic style designations. I use the term *pukara* to refer to the fortified hill-tops characteristic of the Late Intermediate or Altiplano period in the region. In general, I prefer a *w* to *hu*, as in *Tiwanaku*, but use the *hu* when it is the most common spelling or if it is entrenched in the literature. *Inca* is spelled with a *c* instead of a *k* because Pat Lyon insists. I use the original orthography in all quotes and maintain original orthography when used as a period designation. For most proper nouns and other terms that may be confusing, I have included a backnote with alternate spellings. Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.