



**CONFRONTING COLONIALISM: MARYKNOLL CATHOLIC
MISSIONARIES IN PERU AND GUATEMALA, 1943–1968***

Susan Fitzpatrick Behrens

Working Paper #338 - May 2007

Susan Fitzpatrick Behrens is an assistant professor of history at California State University, Northridge. She was a fellow at the Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame in 2005–06, where she completed revisions to her manuscript, *Transnational Faith and Transformation: The Maryknoll Catholic Mission in Peru, 1943–1986*. Her research has appeared in *The Americas* and the *U.S. Catholic Historian*. Fitzpatrick Behrens is currently serving as a council member of the Latin American Studies Association section on Ethnicity, Race, and Indigenous Peoples.

*Special thanks to the Maryknoll Mission Archives for access to materials, to the Kellogg Institute for International Studies for the opportunity and time to write, and to Christina Jiménez, Christine Kovic, Marixa Lasso, Alida Metcalf, Milagros Peña, Eric Van Young, and two anonymous reviewers for extensive and helpful comments on the article. All errors and omissions remain my responsibility.

ABSTRACT

My goal in writing this paper was to try to explain how Catholicism became embedded in the social and political structures of Peru and Guatemala and how this affected Maryknoll proselytization in Puno and Huehuetenango in the twentieth century. I argue that during the colonial period Catholic clergy served as intermediaries between indigenous communities and Spanish officials. The character of their relationship depended on local demands for labor and was, as a result, distinct in Peru and Guatemala. Demand for labor was consistently high in Puno because it was near the site of the Potosí mines, recognized as the most important source of income for the Spanish crown during the colonial period. This relationship ensured that Catholic clergy acted as enforcers of Spanish efforts to dominate indigenous communities. For their part, Andean caciques charged with protecting community interests and mediating with Spanish officials sought to limit incursions by Spanish clergy, economic elites, and governing officials. By contrast, Guatemala was an economic backwater during the colonial period. Spanish clergy came to act as “defenders of the Indians” in opposition to the interests of Spanish economic elites and governing officials. Mayan people engaged with Catholicism to restructure their communities and to establish barriers to incursions by outsiders.

I believe these differences had a long-term impact on development of relations among the Church, the state, and indigenous people in Peru and Guatemala. I seek to trace these differences as they evolved through the colonial period and independence era and to examine their influence on the proselytization programs undertaken by Maryknoll Catholic missionaries from the United States in Puno and Huehuetenango in the mid-twentieth century. I believe that they help to explain specifically why Catholic conversion in Guatemala contributed to the development of a Mayan-led and organized political movement that provided the means by which indigenous people engaged with the Guatemalan state, while Catholic proselytization in Peru had less impact on indigenous communities.

RESUMEN

Mi objetivo al escribir este artículo fue tratar de explicar cómo el catolicismo se asentó en las estructuras políticas y sociales de Perú y Guatemala y cómo esto afectó el proselitismo de los misioneros Maryknoll en Puno y Huehuetenango en el siglo XX. Sostengo que durante el período colonial los miembros del clero católico funcionaron como intermediarios entre las comunidades indígenas y los funcionarios españoles. El carácter de sus relaciones dependía de la demanda de trabajo local y, como resultado, en Perú fue distinto de Guatemala. La demanda de trabajo fue consistentemente alta en Puno porque estaba cerca de las minas de Potosí, reconocidas como la fuente de ingresos más importante para la corona española durante el período colonial. Esta relación aseguró que los miembros del clero católico participaran de los esfuerzos españoles para dominar a las comunidades indígenas. Por su parte, los caciques andinos, encargados de proteger los intereses de las comunidades y mediar con los funcionarios españoles, trataron de limitar las incursiones del clero español, de las elites económicas y de los funcionarios de

gobierno. En cambio, Guatemala fue una economía irrelevante durante el período colonial. Los miembros del clero español actuaron como “defensores de los indios” en oposición a los intereses de las elites económicas y los funcionarios de gobierno españoles. El pueblo maya adoptó el catolicismo para reestructurar sus comunidades y establecer barreras contra las incursiones externas.

Creo que estas diferencias tuvieron un impacto de largo plazo sobre el desarrollo de las relaciones entre la Iglesia, el Estado y las poblaciones indígenas en Perú y Guatemala. Procuró rastrear la evolución de estas diferencias a lo largo del período colonial y la era de la independencia así como examinar su influencia sobre los programas de proselitismo adoptados en Puno y Huehuetenango a mediados del siglo XX por los misioneros católicos Maryknoll de los Estados Unidos. Creo que estas diferencias ayudan a explicar específicamente por qué la conversión al catolicismo en Guatemala contribuyó al desarrollo de un movimiento político liderado y organizado por mayas que proveyó los medios a través de los cuales el pueblo indígena se vinculó con el Estado guatemalteco, mientras que el proselitismo en Perú tuvo menos impacto sobre las comunidades indígenas.

Maryknoll Catholic clergy from the United States established missions in Puno, Peru and Huehuetenango, Guatemala in 1943. The missionaries shared the same mission goals and ideals, similar social backgrounds, and comparable training in the Maryknoll seminary. They also adopted the same mission programs and policies in the two regions, which appeared structurally similar. Puno and Huehuetenango were remote highland departments where mestizo minorities controlled political and economic resources and acted as the primary links to national governing officials. Indigenous people, who formed the majority of the population in both Puno (92.36%) and Huehuetenango (73.5%), were disenfranchised socially and politically.¹ Most indigenous people in Puno and Huehuetenango were monolingual speakers of indigenous languages. The departments' highland geography, remarkable for dramatic mountain peaks and profound valleys, created an additional obstacle to communication. Finally, Puno with 28 priests to serve a population of 645,000, and Huehuetenango with no priests to serve 176,000, suffered an equivalent scarcity of clergy.² Although Maryknoll missionaries recognized Mayan and Andean people as Catholic, they believed that the scarcity of clergy contributed to a practice of folk-Catholicism (*costumbrista Catholicism*) combining pre-Colombian religious practices with those of the official Catholic Church. Maryknollers hoped to establish modern orthodox Roman Catholicism in indigenous communities and to provide material assistance. They believed implicitly that doing so would transform "Indians" into modern citizens.

Within a decade, Maryknollers in both Puno and Huehuetenango were celebrating the extraordinary success of their missions. Thousands of indigenous people in Puno and Huehuetenango embraced Maryknoll practices emphasizing participation in sacramental life, recitation of prayers, and knowledge of catechism. Yet, the character of this Catholic renaissance and its results differed dramatically in Puno and Huehuetenango. Mayan people in Huehuetenango not only accepted elements of modern Catholicism, they also used it to restructure their communities, to develop alternative networks to promote political and economic transformation, and to create a Mayan Catholic identity that transcended individual communities. The Mayan people who effected this transformation became an important force behind the 1978 creation of the Committee for Campesino

Unity (CUC), the first Mayan-led and organized political movement in Guatemala.³ In Puno, by contrast, it appears that while Andean people embraced elements of Maryknoll Catholicism, they engaged it to gain access to resources rather than to transform their communities. In Puno, Andean people created a system of hierarchically linked intermediaries. Indigenous catechists acted as intermediaries between their communities and Maryknoll clergy, while clergy came to serve indirectly as intermediaries between indigenous communities and the Peruvian government. This system of intermediation enabled indigenous people to gain access to new resources, while maintaining the relative insularity of their individual communities and limiting their direct participation in national politics. At the same time, the Peruvian Church and state engaged the system of intermediation to promote a top-down political transformation culminating in the reforms initiated by the military government of Juan Velasco Alvarado. Stated simply, in Guatemala Catholic transformation contributed to a “bottom up” effort facilitating Mayan direct engagement in national politics, while in Peru it promoted a “top down” transformation leading to reforms ostensibly in the interest of indigenous communities, but with little direct participation by them.

The differences evident in indigenous communities in Puno and Huehuetenango were paralleled by differences in the development of Maryknoll clergy. The Maryknoll missionaries who settled in Peru and Guatemala in 1943 were American nationalists, anti-Communists, and doctrinaire Catholics. By 1968, however, Maryknollers’ goals and ideals appeared transformed. They became vocal critics of American foreign policy, advocates of radical social change, and promoters of intercultural Catholicism. They became closely identified with liberation theology and progressive Catholicism. Maryknoll’s Orbis Books became the most important United States publisher of Latin American liberation theology. Many Maryknollers came to believe that by providing aid they had buttressed an unjust capitalist system. Increasingly they saw their role as radically changing society to create a more just world. Missionaries in Peru and Guatemala shared these views, but they appeared more radical in Guatemala where in 1968 a group of clergy was expelled from the country for meeting with leaders of the Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes (FAR), the armed wing of the Communist Party.⁴ By contrast,

in Peru Maryknollers worked quietly within the system, promoting a larger process of institutional change initiated by the Juan Velasco Alvarado military regime.

These differences might be attributed to the distinct political contexts in Peru and Guatemala. In Peru Maryknoll could work within the political system because the military government sought to promote transformation and seemed closely allied with liberation theology and progressive Catholicism. By contrast, in Guatemala the military dominated government actively and violently opposed reform, making more radical measures and even revolution appear to many as the only means of promoting political transformation. Yet, I would like to suggest that this assumption might be turned around. In other words, I would argue that Maryknoll and other Catholic clergy who settled in Peru and Guatemala in the 1940s and 1950s facilitated the development of networks linked with indigenous communities that created the foundation for political transformation. In Guatemala, because Mayan people actively engaged and directed these networks they became the primary instigators in political transformation which conflicted with the interests of the country's military and established elite. Foreign Catholic clergy, such as the Maryknoll missionaries, who had facilitated the development of these networks and continued to provide resources to support them, came to appear as allies of Mayan activists and thus enemies of a military-dominated state. By contrast, in Peru, the military-dominated state successfully engaged Catholic networks controlled by clergy to access indigenous communities and to promote a top-down reform. Andean communities derived benefits from this clergy-state alliance, but maintained their autonomy and rejected direct political engagement.

Maryknoll, in fact, was one component of a much larger Catholic transformation in Peru and Guatemala. By 1966, of the 1,432 clergy in Guatemala 1,235 were foreign and just 197 were nationals,⁵ In Peru, by 1973 only 38.8 percent of the country's clergy were Peruvian, while 61.5 percent were foreign.⁶ Most clergy, including Maryknoll, settled in remote highland communities to work among indigenous people and in recently settled urban *barriadas* (squatter settlements). The people of these communities appeared the poorest and most neglected by the Church and their respective states. Maryknoll's experience in Puno and Huehuetenango is thus representative of a much larger religious transformation that facilitated political transformation in both Peru and Guatemala.

Religious transformation initiated by foreign clergy and political transformation of Peru and Guatemala were mutually reinforcing processes. The importance of foreign religious agents in political transformation raises questions about assumptions regarding religion and modernization and about the role of foreigners in national development in Peru and Guatemala.

Yet the differences between the Maryknoll experience in Puno and Huehuetenango suggest that while the religious and material innovations they introduced offered transformative opportunities, missionaries did not control the outcomes. Instead, the results depended on how national Church and government officials and local indigenous communities incorporated Maryknoll missionaries and engaged their resources for their own ends. While indigenous people exercised autonomy in this process, I believe that it was historically contingent. Specifically, the historical relationship among the Church, the state, and indigenous people in Peru and Guatemala initiated during the colonial period and carried through the independence era and to the twentieth century strongly influenced indigenous people's response to Maryknoll (and other) missionaries, thereby defining the character of their mission and its results.

In this paper I seek to explore this historical relationship and to examine its influence on the Maryknoll mission in twentieth-century Peru and Guatemala. Catholicism was central to the colonial heritage of Peru and Guatemala, but it played a distinct role in each country. In Peru, Catholicism was embedded in the power structure. Catholic clergy and Andean caciques acted as parallel intermediaries who together provided the principal means by which national and local Spanish elites accessed indigenous communities. Maryknoll missionaries who settled in Puno were incorporated into a system of intermediation strikingly reminiscent of this colonial structure, yet one that also responded to the state's need to provide for an emerging middle class. In fact, the majority of material resources the missionaries provided in Puno benefited the middle class, even though the Maryknollers hoped to aid indigenous people. For their part, indigenous people recognized the clergy's role in local power dynamics and sought the spiritual and material benefits offered by Maryknoll, but did not allow the missionaries to fundamentally change the structure of their communities. By contrast, in Guatemala, the Church and Mayan people formed at times a semi-autonomous sphere only tenuously

linked to and often opposed to Spanish governing officials and elites. Mayans historically engaged Catholicism to structure and define their communities and to establish terms of negotiation with outsiders. They relied upon clergy to assist them in this endeavor. There was thus a historical tradition of Mayan-controlled religious transformation in which Mayan people and Catholic clergy were allied indirectly and together obstructed outside officials' access to Mayan communities. Although the Guatemalan Church and state approved and supported Maryknoll's settlement in Huehuetenango, Mayans guided the missionaries' incorporation. At the same time, in rural areas middle-class ladinos rejected Maryknoll missionaries reinforcing an exclusive alliance between clergy and Mayan Catholics. The efforts of this Mayan-Catholic alliance to transform social, political, and economic conditions confronted direct opposition from local elites and the military-dominated state.

This paper examines how the historical role Catholicism played as a mediating force in relations between indigenous communities and the state influenced the contemporary, twentieth-century reincorporation of clergy. In the first section, I analyze briefly the role that Catholic missionaries played as links between indigenous communities and the state during the colonial period. I suggest that two influences strongly conditioned the form of relations among the Church, the state, and indigenous people during the colonial period: first was the social organization of indigenous communities and the role religion played in them, and second was the way clergy came to mediate Spanish demands for tribute and labor. The second section of the paper examines how the relationship among the Church, the state, and indigenous people changed after independence, suggesting changes followed differences evident during the colonial period. The final section examines the incorporation of the Maryknoll missionaries during the period from 1943 to 1968, illustrating how they followed and reinvigorated existing channels between and among the Church, state, and indigenous people while at the same time initiating religious and political transformation.

CATHOLICISM: A COLONIAL LEGACY

The importance of Catholicism in the conquest of Latin America does not need to be recounted. The Church provided the legal justification for conquest, the institutional framework through which to effect it, and the personnel to facilitate it. Yet the Church also provided the “conquered” with means of restructuring their communities, of defending themselves against Spanish abuse, and of justifying rebellion. Catholic missionaries became crucial intermediaries between indigenous communities and Spanish governing officials because of this paradoxical relationship. Missionaries could “defend the Indians,” and still represent Crown interests.

The most important Crown interest was attaining wealth which required access to and control over indigenous people’s labor. Catholic missionaries played a crucial role in facilitating labor extraction. The relationship that evolved among missionaries, indigenous people, and Spanish officials depended on both demand for labor and pre-Colombian organization of labor, ensuring that this relationship differed in each Latin American region. The Church and Spanish state were inextricably bound in Mexico and Peru—the economic centers of the colonial Spanish enterprise. Spanish officials in these regions grafted their labor systems to those established by the religious states of the Aztecs and Incas. The relationship between demand for labor and Church/state relations and existing state systems may help explain why missionaries played a fundamentally different role in Puno, Peru and Huehuetenango, Guatemala during the colonial period.

As the site of Potosí, the most important silver mine in Latin America, the viceroyalty of Peru was at the center of colonial power. Puno provided much of the free and forced indigenous labor to the mine and clergy played a key role in facilitating access to this labor.⁷ In the 1540s the Spanish crown sought to implement the New Laws designed to curtail *encomenderos*’ power over indigenous people. Initially this effort led to civil war as *encomenderos* fought to protect their interests.⁸ By the 1560s, however, the Crown prevailed. Spanish officials also strengthened the role of missionaries as intermediaries by allowing them to guide a program of forced resettlement. Although it was designed to facilitate proselytization, resettlement also enhanced access to labor and opened vast tracks of land to the Spanish. Researchers argue, in fact, that the enforcement

of the New Laws represented a period of confluence of interests among the Spanish Crown, clergy, and entrepreneurs.⁹ From the time the mine was discovered in 1545 until the Bourbon reforms in the eighteenth century and subsequent loss of Potosí to Bolivia following independence, ensuring access to indigenous labor was necessary for the survival not only of the colony, but of Spain, and as a result, of the Catholic Church. As one Spanish colonial official seeking to ensure continued access to labor explained, “Without the mita [labor draft], Potosí would fall; when Potosí fell, then Peru would fall; when Peru fell, then Spain would fall; when Spain fell, then the Catholic Church would fall; and when the Catholic Church fell, the world would be left to the mercy of Protestants.”¹⁰ The survival of the Church, the state, and the economy were thus inextricably linked and all depended on access to Andean labor. Catholic clergy played a key role in facilitating access to indigenous labor in Southern Peru because they served as the principal Spanish intermediaries between indigenous communities and Spanish governing officials. The power of the Spanish state and Church thus grew together with each relying upon the other for the strength and legitimacy to control Andean labor and mediate the force of colonizers.

Missionaries in Guatemala, while they also helped to facilitate access to Mayan labor by promoting resettlement, did so in the context of what has been described as a colonial backwater. Historian Murdo MacLeod has argued that the dominant characteristic of colonial Guatemala was the unsuccessful search for a *produit moteur*, an export product that would fuel the colony. In this context, Mayan resettlement appeared to be tied more directly with missionaries’ proselytization goals and only incidentally with the expansion of Spanish state power. MacLeod asserts that Catholic clergy did not become a strong force in Guatemala until the 1550s, when they entered the region en masse and became a source of competition with existing Spanish interests. Moreover, the scarcity of resources in Guatemala made clergy reliant upon Mayan communities for resources necessary to survive. This combination of factors contributed to an alliance between Spanish missionaries and Mayan people in opposition to Spanish settlers and governing officials. Missionaries in Guatemala became known as “defenders of the Indians.”¹¹ Bartolomé de Las Casas, Bishop of Chiapas, which was part of the Kingdom

of Guatemala, was the most important though not the only representative of clerical defense of indigenous rights.¹²

The populations of both Peru and Guatemala were decimated by disease during the colonial period and they followed a similar trajectory of decline, reaching their nadir in the seventeenth century.¹³ In Peru, population decline corresponded with the exhaustion of the most easily accessible silver veins in the Potosí mines. In the 1560s, Andean people, who had controlled silver production during the period from the Spanish discovery of Potosí, refused to continue their labor. At approximately the same time, a new amalgamation process which promised to restore profitability to the mine was discovered, but implementing it required access to cheap labor. In 1572 Peru's viceroy, Francisco Toledo, instituted the mita labor draft which replicated the *mit'a*, the Inca system of labor extraction. The Spanish mita required that 1/7 of all men in each community between the ages of 18 and 55 contribute labor to the mine in exchange for a wage fixed by the Spanish crown at a low rate.¹⁴ At the same time, in response to the Taki Onqoy rebellion in 1565, the Catholic Church enhanced its control over indigenous communities by undertaking an "extirpation of idolatries." This violent attack on what Church officials described as the last vestiges of Andean idolatry helped to enhance the Catholic clergy's position as intermediaries whose power was superior to that of Andean caciques traditionally charged with mediating relations between indigenous communities and the Spanish state.¹⁵ Thus the Church helped to facilitate control over indigenous communities by imposing religious practices and enhancing missionaries' role as intermediaries. The expansion of Church power worked in tandem with the expansion of Spanish economic conquest and direction of indigenous labor.¹⁶

If the seventeenth-century depression led to renewed economic vigor and control over labor in Peru, it had the opposite effect in Guatemala. As the economy of the Kingdom of Guatemala fell into decline, Spanish colonists from the capital began to move into the Eastern highlands to establish self-sufficient ranches. Mayan people living in the Western highlands of Guatemala were left to restructure their communities and to recover (or re-establish) their cultural traditions. Murdo MacLeod argues that indigenous people took Spanish Catholic institutions, notably the *cofradía* and the *caja de comunidad*, and transformed them into broker or barrier institutions.¹⁷ Funds deposited

by the community into the *caja* were used to “buy off” outsiders to keep them at bay.¹⁸ At the same time, these institutions allowed Mayan people to purchase the services of clergy, thereby enhancing an informal alliance with them. In his examination of the parish of Huehuetenango from 1524–1821, Adriaan Van Oss observes that in the seventeenth century indigenous people and Mercedarian friars created what appeared as an independent kingdom within the Kingdom of Guatemala.¹⁹

In the seventeenth century Catholicism played a fundamental role in restructuring indigenous communities and defining the terms of their engagement with Spanish officials. Yet the form of this change was radically different. In Peru, the Catholic Church and clergy worked with agents of the state and economic elites to ensure tighter control over Andean people. Clergy enhanced their power at the expense of Andean caciques.²⁰ In Guatemala, Mayan people redefined the terms of their relationship with Catholic clergy and worked with them to bar access by Spanish governing officials. Mayan people, in effect, used Catholic institutions to restructure their communities and to control the form of tribute they would pay and the channels it would follow. In Guatemala, it appeared that Mayan people and missionaries had created a self-sufficient, semiautonomous region in the western highlands. The interests of clergy and Mayan communities appeared allied and were, in some cases, opposed to those of the Spanish state and elites.

In Peru, the bonds between the Church and state were reinforced in the period immediately preceding independence by the Túpac Amaru rebellion. Túpac Amaru claimed the mantle of both the Inca past and Catholicism. He advocated creating a restored Inca kingdom that would recognize the Spanish Crown and allow Andean people to become true Catholics by destroying peninsular officials whose abuse undermined the practice of Andean Catholicism.²¹ Túpac Amaru suggested that he and Cuzco’s Bishop Moscoso y Peralta (who was later accused of supporting the rebellion) could lead the new country together.²² Researchers have demonstrated that the Túpac Amaru rebellion spread most rapidly in communities where caciques and clergy united in support of it. They also assert that clergy (and specifically Bishop Moscoso y Peralta, who turned against Túpac Amaru by excommunicating him and transforming the archbishopric palace into an army garrison), were directly responsible for the defeat of the movement.²³

This experience surely enhanced the government's sense of reliance upon the clergy for control over Peru's Andean people.

INDEPENDENCE

In the post-independence period, relations between Church and state in Peru and Guatemala followed lines drawn during the colonial period. J. Lloyd Mecham identified independent Peru as a "State-Church" in which "there existed a perfect cooperation between the religious hierarchy and the political autocracy."²⁴ Peru was the only Latin American country to retain the *patronato real*, the right to name bishops after independence.²⁵ The reasons for this continued relationship can be ascertained from the historical role the Church played in Peru as a unifying force and thus a source of control over indigenous people. This relationship was explained succinctly in 1855 in debates over the exclusion of "false cults" in which a congressman asked rhetorically:

What if not the unity of belief is the marvelous link that unites Peruvians so tightly and sweetly and with equal rights? What if not the Catholic Faith realizes the miracle to maintain united in a single national body such distinct peoples and races? Who but her crosses such great distances, flattening the Andes and the many mountains that spike the territory, and filling with charity hearts that otherwise would be dominated by invincible antipathies, establishes and preserves the exchange of affection that allows us to truly call ourselves compatriots, and produces the sense of community in social life, that is the community of thoughts, wills, and interests: the capacity to be governed by one law common to all and by a supreme authority.²⁶

Yet conditions in Peru did change, especially in Southern Peru whose ties to Potosí, which had been weakened by the Bourbon Reforms, were severed by the post-independence division of territory. Nils Jacobsen observes that in the period following independence the economy of Southern Peru fell into relative decline, providing indigenous communities an opportunity to recover similar to that enjoyed by communities in Huehuetenango in the seventeenth century. Andean communities regained access to land and it appeared that sharp distinctions between racial groups diminished as a wealthy class of Andean people developed with a poor class of mestizos and creoles. Jacobsen suggests that with the rise of the wool export trade in the 1860s, colonial relations based on enforced racial hierarchies were restored to ensure mestizos

and Spanish access to indigenous land. Racial distinctions came to supercede class distinctions and were reinforced by a gradual encroachment on indigenous people's land, supported by corrupt governing officials. The vast haciendas characteristic of Southern Peru emerged during this period.²⁷ A distinct form of labor extraction founded on exploitation of indigenous people evolved and became linked to Catholicism. Hacendados who controlled not only land but also political positions became the principal links between indigenous communities and the Peruvian government.²⁸ Their positions were reinforced by clergy who provided religious services centering on the community fiesta with its corresponding religious *cofradía* and helped to establish the relations of *compadrazgo* (godparents) that were central to the hacienda system.²⁹ In the 1930s the first indigenous rights commissions traveled to Puno. They consistently identified hacendados and clergy as allied forces who together exploited Andean people.³⁰ Hacendados and clergy together ensured access to Andean labor and acted as the primary links between indigenous communities and the Peruvian government, making it impossible for indigenous people to obtain justice.³¹

The situation in Guatemala was distinct. Following independence, the Liberal government immediately instituted a series of reforms that directly attacked the corporate interests of clergy and Mayan communities. In 1829 the government expelled the country's archbishop and 289 members of the clergy, abolished the monastic orders which played such a prominent role in the western highlands and confiscated their property, established civil marriage and abolished the tithe.³² In 1839 the government legalized marriage for secular clergy. Attacks on clergy interests were replicated in attacks on Mayan communities and *cofradías* which had served as barriers, undermining their potential to "buy off" governing officials. An 1824 law provided for legal appropriation of *cofradía* resources.³³ In 1837, the government introduced the Livingston Codes which provided for a new penal system, equal rights under the law, a head tax, and privatization of property.³⁴ The Liberal state thus directly attacked indigenous communities and the Catholic institutions and clergy that had served as barriers. By 1871 just 119 clergy remained in the entire country.³⁵ Virginia Garrard-Burnett notes that as a result of these changes the "power and wealth of indigenous *cofradías* declined precipitously from the early to the middle years of the nineteenth century." Church

officials, she notes, “complained that Indians were ‘giving up the *cofradías*’ and that ‘no one can be forced to serve.’”³⁶ This decline was hardly surprising in the face of the Liberal attacks on both clergy and *cofradías*. It illustrates that Mayan people in Guatemala were not blindly bound to religious traditions. Instead, Mayans transformed religious institutions, structures, and practices in response to and as a means of guiding social, political, and economic transformation.

In 1837 a cholera epidemic provided a catalyst for a rebellion led by General Rafael Carrera, a lower-middle-class mestizo from the Eastern highlands, who garnered popular support from ladinos and Mayans. Liberals attributed Carrera’s success to his cooptation of clergy who were said to have instigated the popular rebellion by claiming that the government had poisoned the water supply to annihilate indigenous people and confiscate their land.³⁷ General Carrera ruled Guatemala from 1839 to 1865. He restored some Church power while maintaining firm control over it.³⁸ Carrera invited the Archbishop to return, re-established the tithe, and even regained the *patronato real*.³⁹ He also reestablished laws to protect indigenous communities and their land. Yet both Mayan communities and the Church had been fundamentally transformed. Indigenous communities became on the one hand increasingly engaged with the state through direct appeals to Carrera and participation in court processes, especially in competition with other communities over land, but also increasingly insular in their identity. Mayans institutionalized the expression of these two tendencies by recovering the *cofradía* system and grafting it to the municipal government. Garrard Burnett asserts that during this period *cofradías* were transformed into more “Indian” institutions that identified as Catholic, but functioned without the intervention of clergy.⁴⁰ Indigenous people in effect engaged Catholicism to regain the corporate status they had lost as a result of liberal reforms and to institutionalize access to the state they had gained through appeals to Carrera. By organizing their communities around the Catholic *cofradía* and grafting it to the secular municipal government, Mayan people gained a measure of autonomy and control over their labor and resources. Moreover, while each community was unique and maintained a distinct identity, the structure of the *cofradía* system extended throughout the western highlands of Guatemala. Thus Catholicism provided indigenous people with a way of maintaining the particularity and, in some measure, insularity of their

communities, while still creating a shared governing structure that made it possible to link them through the mediation of the municipality to the national government.

In the post-independence period, Catholicism continued to play a central role in both Peru and Guatemala, but the terms of its establishment were decidedly different. In Peru, the government actively promoted Catholicism, mandating that it remain the official religion and declaring that “the government recognizes as one of its first duties that of maintaining and conserving it by all the means that are within the bounds of human prudence. Whoever attacks its doctrines and principles, either in public or in private, shall be severely punished in proportion to the scandal he may have caused.”⁴¹ Catholicism provided a way to integrate Peru’s socially, culturally, and economically diverse population. Peruvian government officials appeared to fear that they could not control the population without the support of the Church. Felipe Paz Soldán, a key Peruvian official, noted that “the Judicial power has no power . . . if one part of the society gives respect and veneration to the Judiciary, the other looks at it with evil eyes. But the ecclesiastical power, invested with sacred character, working over the consciences and threatening with excommunications and offering pardons, counts on the fear, the ignorance, the fanaticism [of the populace].”⁴² In rural Puno, hacendados who gradually took over indigenous people’s land reinforced their power through provision of religious services which they gained for communities by appealing to clergy on their behalf. The *cofradía* system in Puno reinforced control exercised by hacendados and clergy who were, in turn, linked to the Peruvian state. The foundation for relationships among people and groups was a system of intermediation whereby Andean communities worked through hacendados and clergy to access the state. By contrast, in Guatemala Liberals attacked Catholicism, apparently fearing that clergy and indigenous people would unite in opposition to them, a fear that was realized with the Carrera rebellion. With the decline of Carrera it appears that indigenous people used Catholicism to institutionalize a structure of power which enabled them to maintain their autonomy, yet still linked them with the ladino governing structure through the municipality. Neither clergy nor hacendados participated directly in this system of mediation, which relied instead on Mayan intermediaries linked to ladino governing officials with political power, but limited economic resources. These differences would strongly influence the form of

the Maryknoll missionaries' incorporation into Puno and Huehuetenango in the twentieth century and their long-term impact.

The number of clergy in Peru and Guatemala declined throughout the period from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth century as the Liberal governments of these countries encouraged the expansion of export agriculture. The decline in Guatemala, where Liberals actively opposed the Church, was more dramatic than that in Peru, where the government continued to support the Church. In Peru, the decline was most evident in impoverished rural departments where indigenous people formed the majority. This decline limited the power of clergy to serve as intermediaries between indigenous communities and their respective national governments, making them instead more dependent on local power holders for status and resources. As the governments of Peru and Guatemala began to initiate centralization programs in the 1930s and 1940s, clergy—most of them foreign—were permitted to enter the countries where they were guided into existing clerical roles.

MARYKNOLL TO PERU AND GUATEMALA

In the first half of the twentieth century the Peruvian and Guatemalan governments sought to centralize control and to extend it to rural areas. In Puno, a series of indigenous rebellions from 1896 to 1906 signaled to the national government both the danger of the situation and the limits of national government control.⁴³ The number of clergy in Puno had fallen from 92 in 1866 to 51 in 1900 to just 28 in 1943, reducing their ability to act as effective intermediaries.⁴⁴ Although new intermediaries—including the first Seventh Day Adventists who settled in Puno in 1911 and the Comité Pro-Derecho Indígena Tawantinsuyo (Tawantinsuyo Indigenous Rights Committee), established in 1920—entered the region, they lacked the institutional structure and national reach of the Church. At the same time, in Guatemala, the dictator Jorge Ubico sought to centralize control over rural regions. He established a system of *intendentes*, officials he named to govern municipalities. Ubico initiated a slight reversal of the long-standing Liberal efforts to minimize Church control in 1943 by inviting the first Maryknoll missionaries to settle in the country to work with the Mayan population in the western highlands. Similarly, it seems that the Peruvian national government, working with the national

Church and the papal nuncio, embraced Maryknoll missionaries and encouraged their settlement in Puno.⁴⁵

There were two related factors conditioning Maryknoll missionaries' incorporation into Puno and Huehuetenango. The first was the degree to which the Church and government directed the mission endeavor, and the second was indigenous and mestizo people's response to the missionaries. These factors were, as I hope I have shown, contingent upon the historical relationship among the Church, the state, and indigenous people in Peru and Guatemala. In Peru, the Church exercised direct control over Maryknoll missionaries and the state sought to use them to reinforce its power. In the 1940s, when the Maryknollers settled in Peru, the principal problems confronting the Church and state were ensuring control over indigenous people who had engaged in a series of devastating rebellions in the preceding decade, responding to the needs of an emerging middle class, and addressing the problem of mass migration. Maryknoll became directly involved in each of these problems, ensuring that while the missionaries sought to work among the indigenous people, they came to serve the interests of the Peruvian Church and state by providing for a more diverse population. In fact, Peru's emerging middle class became the primary beneficiary of Maryknoll programs, while indigenous people received, in effect, the crumbs.

By contrast, in Guatemala, while the Church and state supported the Maryknoll missionaries by approving their settlement in Huehuetenango, they did not directly control the clergy. As a result, once they settled in Huehuetenango, Maryknollers began negotiating directly with local people to establish modern orthodox Catholicism. Ladinos rejected Maryknoll Catholicism outright, while indigenous people responded to the missionaries selectively. In some cases Maryknoll's efforts to impose new practices of Catholicism and to repress Mayan practices of *costumbrista* Catholicism, which the missionaries identified as "pagan," led to direct and violent confrontations. Yet, some Mayan people, especially young men, who had been excluded from the benefits of the *cofradía* system, turned to Maryknoll to bypass the authority of community elders and established ladino power brokers.⁴⁶ Young Mayan men and women became the principal beneficiaries of the spiritual and material resources Maryknoll provided in Huehuetenango and they used them to effect a dramatic social, political, and religious

transformation of the western highlands. Maryknollers in both Peru and Guatemala provided education, medical care, and credit cooperatives, but in Peru most of these benefits went to the middle class, while in Guatemala they went almost entirely to Mayan people.

PERU

In 1943 six veteran Maryknollers who had been proselytizing in Asia, one priest-teacher from the seminary, and six newly ordained priests were assigned to Puno. Salvador Herrera, Puno's Bishop, had been extremely enthusiastic when he learned that a group of United States clergy was in Peru seeking a mission field. Local lore has it, in fact, that immediately after being named bishop Herrera embarked on a journey to Lima seeking help for his abandoned diocese. He is said to have stopped first in Arequipa to call on the Sisters of the Santa Catalina Convent to pray for the success of his endeavor. He would later claim that his prayers were answered at a dinner party in Lima where he met Maryknoll Superior General James E. Walsh.⁴⁷ Peru's papal nuncio seemed equally enthusiastic about Maryknoll. In the colloquial style typical of Maryknollers, Bishop Walsh declared that the nuncio "took [the news of their interest] like a trout grabbing a fly, said there was work waiting everywhere. . ."⁴⁸ The decision to send Maryknollers to Puno seemed mutually beneficial. The missionaries found a place to send their clergy, the papal nuncio found much needed religious personnel and resources, Bishop Herrera found support for his diocese, and the Peruvian government found a source of stability.⁴⁹

Bishop Herrera had definite plans for the Maryknoll missionaries, although they did not learn of them until they arrived in Puno. The Maryknoll General Council minutes from January of 1943, just a few months before the first priests' departure, note that "No reply has been received to our inquiries about the nature and extent of the work viewed there for our priests."⁵⁰ Judging by the extent of the labors he wanted the Maryknollers to perform, it may be that Bishop Herrera feared sharing his vision with them might dissuade them from coming to Peru. In 1943, Father Kiernan informed Maryknoll Superior General James E. Walsh that:

The Bishop wants us to do various things. In three months take over the teaching of English at San Carlos—he will see to it that the Adventist is kicked out. In six months take over the direction of the Colegio—six years

of primary instruction. In one year bring the junior seminarians back here from Arequipa and run this place as a junior seminary, moving the Colejio to another location—whether he intends to build, I do not know. In six months to institute English classes for elderly men here. In three to six months send two priests to one mission and two priests to one other mission—places unnamed. He prefers to have them in twos. When we can preach in Spanish take over San Juan parish in town—the two men assigned there to live here. The joker seems to me to be that in all these things we shall have to assume the financial burden. The Bishop says that when we take over we can raise the tuition price and people will pay it—but the present tuition is 10 soles a year, about \$1.35. Raising it might mean 100 soles, but that would hardly be enough to pay the lay teachers who get 200 soles a month at San Carlos. He has also mentioned that we might build our own Colejio for the secondary or media school—but is that our work? . . . He has mentioned that he would like to have Maryknoll Sisters build a school for Indian girls. Perhaps I am wrong, but anything we put our hand to will have to be paid by us. Our income will never amount to more than \$1,000 yearly.⁵¹

With the exception of the work in the unnamed rural provinces and the school for “Indian girls,” all of these labors were designed to aid Puno’s middle class and none of them, as Father Kiernan implied in his cryptic “but is that our work?” conformed with the Maryknollers’ ideal of their mission role. Father Kiernan also identified one of the central problems the missionaries would face: how to finance their labors. It was immediately evident that despite being a Catholic country in which the state supported the Church, the national government would not finance fully the missionaries’ endeavors, although it would provide crucial assistance. In fact, the priests would discover that the national government, indigenous people, and Maryknoll supporters in the United States would be the primary sources of support for their endeavors in Peru, even though the mestizo middle-class minority would become the primary economic beneficiary.

During the period from 1943 to 1953 the Maryknoll missionaries’ work was confined almost entirely to urban Puno, where they directed the San Ambrosio pre-seminary and oversaw the parish of San Juan. Although the pre-seminary was presented as a means of promoting indigenous men as clergy, in practice it became a source of education for Puno’s urban, middle-class mestizos. The vast majority of boys who attended the school were the children of white-collar workers and few of them became clergy.⁵² After an intense conflict with local clergy, Maryknoll also gained control of the

Parish of San Juan, a predominantly middle-class parish, which also served Aymara and Quechua speakers who had migrated to the city. For a brief period from 1944 to 1947, the Maryknollers also served in the remote rural provinces of Sandia and Carabaya, but the highland geography, remoteness, and vastness of the territory quickly defeated the missionaries, forcing them to return to the urban center.

The period of sustained growth and development of the Maryknoll mission in Peru was from 1954 to 1968. During this period the missionaries became embedded into Peru's social structure by providing crucial spiritual and material services to the country's diverse population. In rural Puno, Maryknollers introduced a catechetical system whereby each community elected a representative (much like a cacique) responsible to learn Maryknoll Catholic doctrine and teach it to his community. Maryknoll thus established a new system of mediation by promoting Andean catechists who acted as intermediaries between clergy and communities. Although it was designed to facilitate proselytization, the catechetical program also offered a means to disseminate material aid which was provided to Maryknoll clergy by the Peruvian national government and the United States Church. By 1959 there were 1,950 catechists working in the department of Puno. They effectively controlled all interaction between Maryknoll clergy and indigenous communities. Andean community intermediaries either sought out Maryknollers, asking to participate in the system, or head catechists, paid by Maryknoll, met with community lieutenants or hacienda overseers to arrange to meet with the community. Father John Schiff's description of "rural missions" illustrates both the program's "success" and its shortcomings:

"Campo" [country] missions. Each[indigenous] director works a certain number of days a week preparing an "estancia" [ranch] for a mission. Each director has a number of "estancias" in his care, and these he hits with a mission once a year. Hence, the director always has one going. He works intensively with the local volunteer in a given "estancia" for about a month depending on the religious state of the "estancia". Some might need less, others might need more than a month. He visits all the houses, lines up matrimonies (takes testimony), arranges for adult and infant baptisms, prepares First Communions, visits and instructs the sick, etc. When all is ready, he advises the priest a week beforehand and the date is set. The priest then takes care of Mass, confessions, instructions, matrimonies, baptisms and sick calls on that day.⁵³

As is evident in Father Schiff's description, the indigenous director facilitated all interaction with communities. "Volunteer catechists," Andean men whose role was to teach catechism locally, further mediated relations between the Church and communities. Together, the catechetical director and the volunteer prepared the community by teaching members the requisite prayers and rituals necessary to obtain spiritual and material benefits from the priest. Communities that refused to name a catechist or have an annual mission were denied the fiesta mass required to maintain balance between the terrestrial and celestial spheres.⁵⁴ Those who fulfilled the mandates of the catechetical system ensured their access to Catholic rituals performed by the priest for the annual fiesta and other events and to material assistance.

Although they were designated "volunteers," catechists received "*propinas*" (tips), *viveres* (food), and funds for "alphabetization" (literacy programs).⁵⁵ In 1954 Catholic Relief Services, which received food under the auspices of the United States Food for Peace Program, established Caritas Peruanas to distribute staples to the country's poor.⁵⁶ Maryknoll directed the distribution of this food, while the Peruvian government covered the cost of transport and waived import duties. In Puno, Maryknoll relied on catechists to distribute food aid to remote communities. Although some Caritas aid represented outright grants, it was also provided in exchange for Andean people's labor on infrastructure projects, especially road construction.⁵⁷ Thus indigenous communities were bound to the Church through a set of hierarchically linked intermediaries, which provided spiritual and material resources, but also extracted labor in a way that served the interests of the Peruvian government. Maryknoll missionaries and Andean catechists acted as parallel but hierarchically linked intermediaries. Maryknoll clergy had no access to communities without the guidance of catechists, while catechists relied on clergy for sacramental life and material resources provided by the Church and the national governments of the United States and Peru. This system of intermediation did not touch the internal structure of Andean communities, which remained insular and closed to outside officials.

While the catechetical system facilitated relations with indigenous communities in rural Puno and provided them with minimal spiritual and material resources, Maryknoll

introduced programs of education and credit cooperatives in urban centers to facilitate relations with a mestizo middle class. Maryknoll Father Daniel McLellan founded the first credit cooperative in Puno in 1955. It had 23 associates and 603 soles in capital. By 1960 there were 3,506 associates and capital of 9,114,438.49 soles. A housing cooperative movement was quickly added to the credit cooperative movement. In 1959 Father McLellan had plans drawn up for seventy-two low-cost cooperative houses in Puno. These were typical American houses with “four bedrooms, a dining room-living room combination, three bathrooms, a kitchen, and a laundry room with a patio out back.” The final price was \$1,800. Purchasers were to pay off this cost over a period of 13 years 3 months at 480 soles (\$18) per month, placing the houses out of reach for the majority of Puno’s indigenous people.⁵⁸

Although Maryknoll priests reported that it was difficult to start the credit cooperative movement in Peru, it quickly attracted the national government’s attention. As Father Dwyer reported in 1956:

When we were fighting to get going one had to corner a big shot of the Government to get him to listen to the idea, but now they are looking us up and high Government officials are very interested. The man, who dope has it probably will be the next president, is interested and told the Pastor of San Juan that if he makes the Presidency we should see him in August about Credit Unions for which there is a crying need since 20% interest on loans is common. The idea of Credit Unions was believed to be inoperable in Peru, but now they are convinced it can be done, but that it will be the Church who does it because the people will have confidence and trust if priests are leading.⁵⁹

The priests did lead. In 1958, at the request of Father McLellan, the Episcopal Assembly introduced an initiative to form parish credit cooperatives and established a central office of parish credit cooperatives. “In 1958 thirty-four priests from 14 Archdioceses, Vicariates, and Prelatures attended the introductory course in Credit Cooperatives given by Father Dan in the Catechetical School of Puno.”⁶⁰ Although the Central Office of Parish Credit Cooperatives was founded to assist Catholic parishes, in 1959 it expanded its services and advice to aid any organization seeking to open a credit cooperative. That year sixty-two cooperatives, most of them on factories and farms, requested assistance.⁶¹ In April the central office was transformed into the Peruvian Credit Union League in Lima, and Maryknoll Father Dan McLellan was named managing director.⁶² This

transformation made possible the incorporation of Peru's credit cooperatives into the international federation of cooperatives. Although the ecclesiastical element was removed from the name, the Episcopal Assembly of 1959 reported that "the leadership of the Federation . . . is in the hands of the Church, and already the Central Office is the only place where truly efficient technical assistance is offered to the nation."⁶³ By 1959 the number of credit unions in Peru had increased from 1 (Maryknoll's in Puno) to 112, of which 50 were operated by parishes.⁶⁴ The credit cooperative movement gained international attention and received United States aid through an Inter-American Development Bank loan. Indigenous people in Puno did not benefit from this program.

Maryknoll also established a number of Catholic schools in middle-class communities in urban Peru. In 1950, St. Rose of Lima, the first parochial school in Peru, was established by Maryknoll in Lince, a middle-class neighborhood in Lima. The establishment of this school was followed by that of Our Lady of Sorrows Parish, founded by Maryknoll in a new settlement in Arequipa in 1954. In 1956 Maryknoll started Our Lady of Guadalupe parochial school in La Victoria, a lower-middle-class settlement in Lima. Finally, in 1961 the Maryknollers opened Our Lady of Pilar Parish in Arequipa. Each of these schools benefited an emerging middle class composed of both recent migrants from rural areas and of established residents in urban Lima and Arequipa. The schools helped to satisfy a demand that the Peruvian government could not (or would not). Maryknoll also came to play an important role in the *barriadas*, or "young towns," as they would be designated by Juan Velasco.

Thus while the Maryknoll missionaries settled in Peru with the hope of transforming the indigenous people of rural Puno into modern Catholics and citizens, most of their efforts and resources came to be directed toward an emerging middle class. While the middle class enjoyed the benefits of Maryknoll-directed parochial schools and credit cooperatives, indigenous people gained only minimal benefits in the form of sacraments, food aid, and basic literacy programs. Indigenous people in Puno, for their part, seem to have taken the benefits offered by the missionaries while maintaining the insularity of their communities by restricting clergy's access to them. The role of the Andean catechist was not incorporated into community governing structures nor did it compete with them. The civil-religious hierarchy continued to direct internal governance,

while the catechist came to act exclusively as an external mediating force responsible for working with clergy. Although catechists might also serve in the civil-religious hierarchy, doing so fulfilled a separate *cargo* or community responsibility. Although Maryknollers did not initiate a radical transformation of either religious practices or social structure, they did come to serve as an alternative to hacendados by providing spiritual and material resources and creating a new link to national governing officials. Moreover, in urban centers they played a key role in promoting social mobility and in helping middle-class people and residents of *barriadas* gain limited political enfranchisement. Their efforts depended on a system of hierarchically linked intermediaries ensuring that each sector of Peruvian society remained, in effect, relatively isolated from the others. Middle-class students and cooperative members who participated in Maryknoll programs had virtually no interaction with Andean communities in Southern Puno through the mediation of Maryknoll. Andean communities in Southern Puno had only limited interaction with each other; instead, catechists from each community appealed directly to Maryknoll for resources.

HUEHUETENANGO

If the Maryknollers in Puno were subject to extensive control by external authorities, most importantly Bishop Herrera, those in Huehuetenango appeared almost abandoned. Maryknoll Fathers Arthur Allie and Clarence Witte arrived in Guatemala in 1943. Shortly after their arrival they embarked on a journey through the western highlands to assess the mission potential of various departments. They reported that “everywhere the clergy [of whom there were few] seemed genuinely pleased to have us here and nearly all offered us a welcome to their own particular section.”⁶⁵ The missionaries identified Huehuetenango “as the ideal mission territory for ourselves.” A few months later, the Maryknollers’ choice was affirmed by the papal nuncio who “assigned” them to their chosen department. Immediately two of the three priests working in Huehuetenango were reassigned and within six months the third died, leaving the two Maryknoll clergy to serve 176,000 people. The people to priest ratio in Huehuetenango was thus 88,000 to one, making it even worse than Guatemala’s national average of 30,000 to one.⁶⁶

As the religious leaders responsible for ensuring the practice of Catholicism, the Mayan civil religious hierarchy affiliated with the *cofradía* guided Maryknollers into communities. The civil-religious hierarchy played a role analogous to that played by Peru's Bishop Herrera and hacendados. In contrast to these Peruvian officials whose authority was based on their national status, however, the authority of Mayan leaders of the civil-religious hierarchy was defined locally. It was founded upon their control of religious ritual and their service as intermediaries between Mayan communities and ladino-dominated municipalities. When Maryknoll settled in Huehuetenango the legitimacy and authority of both the *cofradía* and municipality were in decline. In 1944 Guatemala held its first elections which initiated a ten year "democratic spring." The elected presidents, Juan José Arévalo and Jacobo Arbenz initiated a series of reforms, including replacing the appointed *intendentes* of the Ubico era with elected municipal governing officials. For the first time, Mayans could run for office and serve as *alcaldes*. Direct election had the potential to replace both the *cofradías'* civil religious hierarchy and ladino governing officials. Together these officials controlled access to land and labor.

The democratization of the municipality corresponded with a land crisis. The expansion of the export economy and a population increase together contributed to a devastating land shortage which forced increasing numbers of Mayan people from the western highlands to work on coastal coffee plantations for devastatingly low wages. Anthropologist Charles Wagley reported that in Santiago Chimaltenango in 1937 only 21 percent of the people had sufficient land, the remaining 79 percent had to augment their income with outside labor.⁶⁷ The *cofradía* system which revolved around fiestas to honor community saints contributed to the exploitation of Mayan laborers. Ladino labor contractors offered alcohol in exchange for contracts focusing specifically on the period of the fiesta. At the same time, participation in fiesta rituals which was mandated for all community members required large expenditures of money on candles, food, clothing, and alcohol.

Although Maryknoll clergy did not understand the dynamic relationship among municipal ladino officials, labor contractors, and Mayan leaders of the civil-religious hierarchy, they identified fiestas as an obstacle to establishing "modern Roman

Catholicism.” To priests the fiestas appeared as “little more than drunken org[ies].” Just months after he settled in Huehuetenango, Father Witte was invited to celebrate a fiesta mass. In the account he wrote of this experience, Father Witte seemed barely able to contain his anger and disgust. He decried the fiesta’s excesses, lamenting that “by the evening of the first day the drinking began in earnest, and the next two nights and days were nothing less than a drunken orgy. Dancing and drinking and the obscenities that cannot be absent from an excess of this combination filled the days and nights.” Father Witte concluded that while the excesses were “a disgrace to the Indian . . . the greater disgrace is on the disreputable Ladinos who sell the filthy stuff . . . who have no shame or compassion and seek only personal profit, who by raising the price when the supply of liquor begins to run low to double and triple the standard and by other such tricks rob the poor Indian of the little he has, theirs I say is the greater sin.”⁶⁸

These judgments placed Maryknoll missionaries in direct opposition to ladino officials and leaders of the civil-religious hierarchy who they condemned as “witch doctors.” Although the missionaries’ views showed little cultural sensitivity, they indirectly served the interests of both the Guatemalan state, seeking to democratize municipalities, and some young Mayan men seeking ways to bypass the age-based *cofradía* and gain access to political authority. The Maryknoll missionaries quickly came to provide spiritual and material resources to Mayans who might embrace “modern Roman Catholicism.” As Father Alfred Smith observed in 1946:

An Indian came in asking for a remedy, I readily brought him over to the pill dispensing section and then found his complaint was an inability to speak Spanish. Sulfathizole or quinine seemed inadequate so I figured that afternoon was as good a time as any to start our classes in alfabetization. The government is very interested in literating the illiterate and I figured it would be a handy contact. Schools have only been in operation here for eight years and the vast majority of young people and old can neither speak, read, or write Spanish. One important aspect of this situation is that at present according to the new constitution a native mayor or alcalde can be elected, as opposed to the appointee of Ubico’s regime. We now have an Indian alcalde, but unfortunately there are only a handful of Indians qualified for the job, mainly due to language deficiency.⁶⁹

Although Father Smith recognized the potential confluence of Church and state interests, he emphasized that illiteracy also represented an obstacle to establishing the faith,

making it a religious issue. “The Indian has a fearful inferiority complex and a handful of mixed bloods or ladinos have no trouble keeping them in a subservient position. I figure that this lack of self-respect is an obstacle that prevents their becoming full-fledged Catholics and shall do my best to combat it.”⁷⁰

Maryknoll soon began to provide Mayan people with basic literacy courses and medical care. By 1953, they had established two schools, seven medical dispensaries, one cooperative, four developed recreation programs, and two social projects. Included in their mission were 20 Maryknoll priests, 1 Maryknoll brother, 6 sisters of the Holy Family (Belgians), 281 Mayan catechists and teachers, and 12 indigenous employees. They estimated that 101,000 of Huehuetenango’s 177,000 people participated in Maryknoll projects.⁷¹ All of these efforts focused specifically on Mayan people. This emphasis was evident in Brother Felix Fournier’s memory of the first directorate of the Malacatancito credit cooperative. “Looking at those barefoot men, in what are surely much patched clothes, the name Board of Directors seems incongruous, but knowing the men, and this is the beauty of the cooperative movement, they are Directors in every sense. While at the moment they are dealing in a hundred dollars it will not be long before the capital will be in the thousands, and the Board of Directors will be taking it in stride too.”⁷²

Like education programs, credit cooperatives conformed with the interest of Guatemala’s reformist national government. Ironically, because Maryknoll missionaries from the United States identified President Jacobo Arbenz as a communist they had little direct interaction with him. Indeed, in some cases the clergy entered the country illegally as “English teachers,” ensuring that while there was a confluence of interest between the modernizing, reformist government and the modernizing reformist missionaries, there could be no formal recognized alliance. During the democratic decade, Maryknoll initiated programs that enabled Mayan people in Huehuetenango seeking to confront the authority of exploitative ladino municipal officials and the traditional Catholic leadership of the *cofradía* with a means of doing so. Moreover, this effort seemed to conform to an unconscious tradition of using Catholicism to restructure communities during periods of political and economic transformation. John M. Watanabe observed that in Chimal, converts to Maryknoll Catholicism gained legitimacy by asserting that they could explain

the significance behind long-established practices.⁷³ Although Protestantism offered another alternative religious means of transforming communities, it represented a more direct rejection of traditional Catholic faith and corresponding community structures and identity. Conversion to Maryknoll's orthodox Catholicism, while it sometimes led to violent confrontations, could also be defined as merely a reform of existing religious practices, beliefs, and institutions. Charles Wagley reported that by the 1950s Maryknollers "converted groups of Indians toward more orthodox Catholic practices" while Protestants had just "a handful of converts in several communities."⁷⁴ It would be more accurate to say that by the 1950s virtually all of the municipalities in Huehuetenango had a large contingent of indigenous people who had chosen to convert and were using their new faith to construct an alternative to the *cofradía*. The process of conversion and its results were very much controlled by Mayan people. Maryknoll clergy provided a religious language, resources, and legitimacy, but they did not control Mayan people.

Community members, identified by Arturo Arias as a "new Indian bourgeoisie,"⁷⁵ whose economic resources were gained by bypassing the *cofradía*, and who were excluded from *cofradía* benefits yet still subjected to the costs of fiestas, found an alternative in Maryknoll. This alternative was not without its costs. *Cofradía* leaders used every means possible to prevent community members from converting. Father Hugo Gerbermann reported in 1952 that the leaders of San Gaspar Ixcel had written to the government minister and the bishop asking that their community be annexed to a parish where "an old Spanish padre" would provide the requisite religious services without trying to change anyone's practices. Father Gerbermann claimed that "all the headmen in San Gaspar are all chimanes (medicine men, or rather witch doctors), who do not want to lose their hold over the people, which they would have if the people had begun to learn the doctrine. So they spread the word that I was a Protestant and subjected those who came to Mass and doctrine to all sorts of abuses, even throwing some of them in jail. On one occasion they beat up a poor woman and left her lying on the hammock stretched across the river for footmen."⁷⁶

In at least one case, the leaders of the *cofradía* appear to have joined forces with the local ladino governing officials to threaten violently Maryknoll clergy and Mayan

Catholic converts of the community. In 1949 Maryknoll Brother Felix Fournier went to visit Father James Curtin in Ixtahuacán. Brother Felix reported in a letter home that the day he arrived Father Curtin noted in passing that he would also “see some fun [because] some stinkers in town have sent down to the capital for some kind of committee to come up and throw me out of Ixtahuacán.” The situation seemed less amusing later in the afternoon when the clergy were informed by the local Catholics that the opposition composed of a former *alcalde* who had lost his position in the elections and “all of the malcontents, the witch doctors against whom Fr. Curtin has been relentless until their livelihood has been greatly reduced, the opportunists, and drunks,” had formed a mini-militia and were planning to attack the clergy. By afternoon the priests were holed up in the parish center with some eighty indigenous supporters, none of whom was armed (according to Brother Felix), waiting for an attack by some two hundred people armed with machetes. The conflict ended when the “unwilling *alcalde*, still afraid of old Don Umberto [the old *alcalde*] sent a telegram to Huehuetenango asking for support.” The next day the Catholic contingent was saved by the governor and a force of government soldiers. Douglass Brintnall notes in describing a similar conflict between Maryknollers, indigenous Catholics, and the *cofradía* leadership in Aguacatan, that Mayan people he interviewed thought very carefully before converting and waited until they knew that the Maryknoll clergy had the requisite force to confront the *cofradía* leaders. After each major conflict of this type the number of conversions appeared to increase. Conflict enhanced a sense of alliance between Mayan Catholics and clergy and also relied on the indirect support of the Guatemalan Church and state.

By 1951 the Maryknoll priests, whose number had increased to just eighteen, claimed to have effected a remarkable religious transformation. Maryknoll Father Edward J. McGuinness observed that “the marvelous success of the Maryknoll mission and the success of others among the Indians of Guatemala stands as a very evident and constant reminder of the fact that the Holy Spirit is the primary and principal cause of growth of the Mystical Body and we are but the instruments employed to effect that growth.”⁷⁷ There were two principal problems that confronted the Maryknoll missionaries by 1953. First was the sheer volume of requests by Mayan Catholics for religious services which were difficult to fulfill because of geographic and cultural

barriers. Three-quarters of Huehuetenango's residents were of Mayan descent and spoke one of twenty-four to thirty different Mayan languages.⁷⁸ The department was composed of thirty-one municipalities with outlying *aldeas* (clusters of homes) or *caseríos* (settlements of scattered homes) attached to them.⁷⁹ As Father McGuinness explained of his parish in Cuilco, "the parish contained some 53,000 souls. How to get to all of them was an almost herculean task. [Since they] were scattered over an area so large that a two-day horseback trip was the only way to reach the end of our parish limits."⁸⁰ The other central problem the missionaries faced in Huehuetenango was their utter failure to reach ladinos. In 1951 Father Edward J. McGuinness observed that "the ready reception of God's grace [by indigenous people] as contrasted by the obduracy of the *Ladinos* (those of Spanish blood) is the most outstanding characteristic of the Church of Guatemala . . . There is indication there that God is blessing a race of people. Just as God favored the Jews over the other nations and peoples of their time by making them His chosen people, so now too there is reason to believe that God is favoring the Indian people over the *Ladino* people." This situation was unacceptable because "it is this class of people who rule the country, although they are a numerical minority in comparison with the Indian population. The Church in Guatemala is not strong, nor is it firmly established so that its influence is felt; and unless there be some unusual and very unexpected turn of events whereby the Indian population will rule the country there is little hope of the Church ever becoming firmly established until the *Ladino* society is brought into the Church."⁸¹

Thus by 1953, Maryknollers in Huehuetenango confronted obstacles of geography and culture analogous to those experienced by the missionaries in Puno, but these obstacles affected proselytization of indigenous people only. The missionaries confronted virtually opposite problems in relation to the mestizo middle class. In Puno, from 1947 to 1953, the Maryknollers were confined almost entirely to work among the mestizo middle class in the urban center. By contrast, in Huehuetenango, by 1953 the missionaries were lamenting their complete failure to reach ladinos even as they were celebrating their success among the Mayan people. Missionaries in both regions would adopt the same solution to overcome the obstacles of geography and culture that confronted them in the proselytization of indigenous people. In 1954 they introduced catechetical programs

designed to facilitate proselytization in remote indigenous communities. Although the programs were identical, their form was adapted to local demands, and as a result it was distinct. The divisions between urban mestizo and rural indigenous would be reinforced by the introduction of the catechetical programs and the concomitant introduction of material benefits: credit cooperatives, schools, and hospitals. In Huehuetenango these benefits would accrue exclusively to indigenous people, while in Puno they had accrued almost exclusively to mestizos. In Puno the catechetical system became a means of disseminating spiritual and material aid, while in Huehuetenango it became the foundation for developing an alternative network linking Mayan people throughout the department.

In Huehuetenango, the catechetical system adopted was based on the model of Catholic Action that had been introduced by Monseñor Rafael Gonzalez, auxiliary bishop in the diocese of Totonicapán.

On January 21, 1953, His Excellency Monseñor Rafael Gonzalez, the Auxiliary Bishop of the diocese visited Cuilco. . . . During the time he was here he spoke to us of his method of Catholic Action in the town of Totonicapán and of the wonderful results he achieved through it. While in Rome a few years ago the Holy Father told him that Catholic Action was the only means whereby Latin America, in view of the horrible shortage of priests, could be rechristianized. The system the Bishop used in Totonicapán is based upon a large number of volunteer catechists who are brought together at regular intervals and given catechetical instruction. Then each catechist selects five houses in his village and arranges with the father of the family for his regular visitation of that house. The catechist visits one house each evening and after reciting the rosary with the family explains the point of doctrine that was explained to him at the catechist conference. When the number of catechists began to grow the Bishop selected a *junta* from each village consisting of a President, secretary, treasurer and vice-president. The “juntas” from all the villages were expected to meet regularly at some central location which was visited regularly by the Bishop. On returning to their villages the members of the “junta” would then in turn explain the point of doctrine to their catechists, and then the catechists would proceed to visit their houses. At regular stated intervals, perhaps once a month, the Bishop would call a general meeting of the catechists of all the villages and give them a day of conferences or a day of recollection. Each catechist was given his identification card and made a promise to propagate and defend the Holy Catholic Faith.⁸²

Catholic Action created an alternative means by which Mayan people could organize and establish links to Mayan people outside of their communities. The “juntas” would seem to have the potential to be in direct competition with the civil-religious hierarchy. The regular meetings of “juntas,” while their purpose was to “catechize,” also offered an opportunity for indigenous people from distinct communities to meet, to plan, and to organize. The system also provided a means by which indigenous people through their juntas gained access to a Catholic network that had developed in the Western highlands. Ricardo Falla reports that in San Antonio Ilotenango, Catholic catechists and converts created a parallel structure to the *cofradía*.⁸³

Following the United States–sponsored overthrow of the democratically elected reformist president, Jacobo Arbenz, in 1954, Maryknoll and other clergy were rewarded for their anti-communism. The number of foreign clergy in the country increased dramatically. Many clergy initiated programs similar to those of Maryknoll focused on cooperatives, medical care, education, and the development of infrastructure and dependent on Mayan catechists. These programs closely paralleled the developmental strategies of the United States–dominated Guatemalan government. In some cases, they received direct support under the auspices of USAID. Yet, the weakness of the Government of Guatemala (GOG) was such that the alliance appeared to be between the US government and the Church rather than through the mediation of Guatemalan officials.⁸⁴ Maryknoll (and other missionaries) and Mayan community members again came to appear allied and relatively isolated from the national government in the western highlands. While they enjoyed the tacit support of the Guatemalan and US government, their links to government officials were tenuous at best. At the same time, the catechetical system when combined with education, medicine, and credit programs provided Mayans with a means of creating a network linked to distinct Mayan communities and to an international force of clergy.

In 1955 Maryknoll Brother Felix Fournier informed his family back home that “Catechists and doctrine classes practically dot the countryside”⁸⁵ A 1957 Maryknoll report on technical assistance in the department of Huehuetenango listed 602 lay leaders in training. That number would increase exponentially not only in Huehuetenango but throughout the highlands of Guatemala where Catholic Action was established. In 1958

the Maryknoll catechists, whose numbers had increased to 1,000, met in Chiantla for a regional Congress of Catholic Action.⁸⁶ In 1963 Brother Felix noted in an enthusiastic letter home that “the Church in Guatemala is on its way up. That was the big impression that hit me as I was traveling around from the end of July to the end of September. For one thing, there are now five times as many priests in the country as there were when we first came. And there are more catechists (17,000) in the country than there are soldiers.”⁸⁷ Catholic catechists and converts became the principal beneficiaries of Maryknoll schools and credit cooperatives, increasing their potential to engage in political transformation. This popular Mayan Catholic transformation came to conflict directly with the interests of Guatemala’s elite and its military-dominated government.

CONCLUSION

Maryknoll missionaries who entered Puno, Peru and Huehuetenango, Guatemala entered the history of the Catholic Church and its relations with indigenous people and the state. To suggest that the introduction of “modern Catholicism” represented a spiritual reconquest of indigenous people is patently absurd. The missionaries had neither the resources nor the power to dominate the populations of Puno and Huehuetenango. The indigenous people in these departments, however, recognized that the missionaries had a power that might help them. Within the limits imposed by structural conditions, history, and culture, people engaged Maryknoll missionaries and their spiritual and material resources to achieve their own ends. In Puno, the Catholic Church and clergy were embedded in the existing power structure. Maryknoll represented an alternative simply because the clergy were outsiders. They disliked hacendados and preferred to identify with Andean people. Indigenous people used this preference and the available resources to develop the missionaries as an alternative to hacendados who could provide them with spiritual and material benefits. Yet most Maryknoll resources in Peru were directed toward an emerging mestizo middle class and clergy ultimately depended on links to the national Church and state. Andean people’s pragmatic embrace of modern Maryknoll Catholicism, reflected, I believe, the history of relations among the Church, state, and indigenous people. In the short term, clergy might provide benefits, but ultimately they were allied with national power structures. By maintaining their insularity through the

hierarchically linked catechetical system, Andean people gained access to spiritual and material resources, while avoiding reliance on clergy.

By contrast in Guatemala, Mayan people, in keeping with historical tradition, engaged modern Catholicism to restructure their communities and to create an alternative network through which to gain access to spiritual and material resources and to organize politically. Just as the *cofradía* had been linked to the municipal government but not controlled by it, the Catholic alternative was linked to the infrastructure of the largely foreign Catholic Church that had come to dominate the western highlands, but not controlled by it. By grafting their individual communities to this universal Catholic structure, indigenous people gained a way to transcend community boundaries and to create a national movement. They thus paralleled the nineteenth-century development of the *cofradía* system, which by grafting to the municipal government gained a way of evading direct control by the national government and retaining community autonomy. Ultimately this parallel Mayan-Church alliance would come into direct confrontation with the Guatemalan national government and military which actively and violently opposed reform.

The Maryknoll experience in Peru and Guatemala provides insight into both the unintended and unanticipated role of religious forces in “modernization” and of the degree to which these contemporary forces were shaped by historical precedents. This experience contests the assumption that modernization and secularization were necessarily mutually reinforcing processes and that public religion would decline in the modern world. It may also help to explain why these assumptions were invalid, at least in the context of Latin America. The Catholic Church was the only institution whose historical role in the region ensured both a kind of legitimacy and an established space in society that extended from elite urban centers to impoverished rural indigenous communities. Clergy had established roles within these geographically, ethnically, and economically distinct social groups in the twentieth century that depended less on their national origins than on the history of the Church in the receiving society. Stated simply, it did not matter if a priest was from Spain, Canada, or the United States in the role he was expected to perform in a local community. It did matter, however, how these national origins influenced his perception of his role which might and often did extend beyond

local demands. This confluence and confrontation between existing expectations which established a place for foreign clergy and their distinct goals had the potential to be transformative. Yet, transformation was influenced by local expectations established by the history of relations among the Church, state, and indigenous people.

NOTES

¹ Charles Wagley, "The Maya of Northwestern Guatemala" in *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, Robert Wauchope, gen. ed., *Part I: Ethnology*, Evogn Z. Vogt, vol. ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969), 46–68, 55; Dan Chapin Hazen, "The Awakening of Puno: Government Policy and the Indian Problem in Southern Peru, 1900–1955" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1974), 14.

² Bruce Johnson Calder, *Crecimiento y cambio de la Iglesia Católica Guatemalteca: 1944–1966* (Guatemala: Editorial José Pineda Ibarra, 1970), 19; Account of a trip to the West Coast and the Northwestern Highlands, June 9–26, 1943. 80. Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, Maryknoll Mission Archive (MMA); Leigh A. Fuller, SJ, "Catholic Missionary Work and National Development in Guatemala, 1943–68: The Maryknoll Experience," (master's thesis, New York University, 1971), 63; Hazen, "The Awakening of Puno," 5.

³ Greg Grandin, "To End With All These Evils: Ethnic Transformation and Community Mobilization in Guatemala's Western Highlands, 1954–1980," *Latin American Perspectives* vol. 24, no. 2 (March 1997): 7–34; Arturo Arias, "Changing Indian Identity: Guatemala's Violent Transition to Modernity," in Carol A. Smith, ed., *Guatemalan Indians and the State, 1540–1988* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), 230–257; Richard Wilson, *Mayan Resurgence in Guatemala: Q'eqchi' Experiences* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995).

⁴ The actions of this contingent of missionaries did not represent the views of Maryknoll missionaries in Guatemala, many of whom strongly condemned these clergy for putting the mission at risk. Nonetheless, the Guatemalan Church and state came to identify all Maryknoll clergy as potential revolutionaries and subjected them to scrutiny and even threatened to expel them from the country. Philip Berryman, *Christians in Guatemala's Struggle* (London: Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1984).

⁵ Calder, *Crecimiento y Cambio*, p. 59

⁶ Jeffrey Klaiber, SJ, *La Iglesia en el Perú: Su Historia Social Desde la Independencia*, Tercera Edición (Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 1996), 65–66. This increase in foreign clergy in Guatemala corresponded with a general increase in the number of foreign clergy throughout Latin America (though some countries received greater concentrations than others). The number of priests and nuns from the United States increased as follows: 1956 South America 728, Central America 329; 1960 South America 981, Central America 433; 1968 South America 2455, Central America 936; 1978 South America 977, Central America 433. "U.S. Catholic Overseas Mission Personnel," (Washington DC: Mission Secretariat), U.S. Catholic Mission Association (USCMA) archive, MMA. See also: Edward L. Cleary, OP, *Crisis and Change: The Church in Latin America Today* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1985). The increase in foreign clergy throughout Latin America would suggest that this process was occurring not just in Guatemala, but throughout the region.

⁷ Peter Bakewell, *Miners of the Red Mountain: Indian Labor in Potosí, 1545–1650* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984); Jeffrey A. Cole, *The Potosí Mita, 1573–1700: Compulsory Indian Labor in the Andes* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985).

⁸ The Spanish Crown granted the first conquistadores the right to extract labor and produce from indigenous communities assigned to them in exchange for introducing these subject people to Catholicism. This grant, which ostensibly excluded direct control or ownership over indigenous people's land, was known as an *encomienda* and the Spanish grantees were known as *encomenderos*.

⁹ Murdo J. MacLeod, *Spanish Central America: A Socioeconomic History, 1520–1720* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Woodrow Borah, *New Spain's Century of Depression* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951); Eric Van Young, *Hacienda and Market in*

Eighteenth-Century Mexico: The Rural Economy of the Guadalajara Region, 1675–1820 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

¹⁰ Cole, *The Potosí Mita*, 60.

¹¹ MacLeod, *Spanish Central America*, 119.

¹² *Ibid.*, 107.

¹³ Linda A. Newson, “Indian Population Patterns in Colonial Spanish America,” *Latin American Research Review* vol. 20, no. 3 (1985): 41–74.

¹⁴ Cole, *The Potosí Mita*.

¹⁵ Sabine MacCormack argues that the extirpation of idolatries marked a significant shift in Spanish proselytization marked by an intolerance equivalent to that exhibited by the Inquisition towards heretics and nonbelievers. Sabine MacCormack, *Religion in the Andes: Vision and Imagination in Early Colonial Peru*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 387–392. See also Susan Ramirez, ed., *Indian-Religious Relations in Colonial Spanish America* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, 1989). Thomas A. Ambercrombie (“La perpetuidad traducida: del “debate” al Taki Onqoy y una rebelión comunera peruana” in Jean Jacques Decoster, ed., *Incas e Indios Cristianos: elites indígenas e identidades cristianas en los Andes coloniales*, Lima: CBC, IFAE, Asociación Kuraka, 2002, 79–120) argues that the extirpation of idolatries provided ambitious Spaniards with a means of enhancing their position in society. It came on the heels of efforts by indigenous people and clergy—spearheaded by Bartolomé de Las Casas’s support for the New Laws—to undermine *encomenderos*’ power by eliminating their right to grant their *encomiendas* to their heirs.. The extirpation thus provided *encomenderos* with a new means of controlling indigenous people even as the Crown and clergy sought to undermine their power. At the same time, it enhanced the power of Spanish missionaries by charging them with responsibility for taking control of errant Andean communities.

¹⁶ Peter Bakewell, *Miners of the Red Mountain*, and Ann M. Wightman, *Indigenous Migration and Social Change: The Forasteros of Cuzco, 1570–1720* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1990), 34, both reveal that Spanish control over Andean communities was limited at best. Andean community members responded to the Potosí mita by fleeing their communities. In some cases, they labored at Potosí forming a free-wage labor force; in others they settled as “forasteros” [foreigners] in distinct Andean communities and urban centers; in others they settled on haciendas, gaining protection as *yanacona* laborers. Bakewell describes Yanaconas as a “a minority made up of people who did not belong to any *ayllu*—the kin group that was a basic building block of the social structure; neither did they form any *ayllu* of their own. To this extent, they might be said to be ‘free-floating’ in a society whose other members had a rigidly defined place.” This status enabled Yanaconas to evade Spanish labor demands by fleeing and/or laboring for Spanish hacendados in exchange for protection from Spanish officials.

¹⁷ MacLeod, *Spanish Central America*, 327. *Cofradías* were institutions devoted to the worship of a patron saint. Participants in the *cofradía* shared responsibility for performing rituals and providing support to worship the saint. *Cofradías* were transferred to the New World where indigenous and African people transformed them to conform with their religious practices and ideals and social and political organization. Indigenous *cofradía* leaders, known collectively as the “civil-religious hierarchy,” protected funds garnered by the *cofradía* to support the saint’s cult in a “*caja de comunidad*” (or community chest).

¹⁸ Nancy M. Farriss in *Maya Society Under Colonial Rule: The Collective Enterprise of Survival* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984) provides a detailed analysis of how Mayan people adapted and transformed Spanish Catholic institutions and ideas to fulfill their needs and to restructure their communities. She also recounts the highly dependent relationship between clergy who relied upon Mayan communities for their resources and Mayan “converts.”

¹⁹ Adriaan C. Van Oss, *Catholic Colonialism: A Parish History of Guatemala 1524–1821* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

²⁰ Luis Millones, comp., *El retorno de las huacas: estudios y documentos sobre el Taki Onqoy, siglo XVI* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1990).

²¹ Jan Szeminski, "Why Kill the Spaniard? New Perspectives on Andean Insurrectionary Ideology in the 18th Century," in *Resistance, Rebellion and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World, 18th to 20th Centuries*, Steve Stern, ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

²² Leon G. Campbell, "Church and State in Colonial Peru: The Bishop of Cuzco and the Túpac Amaru Rebellion of 1780," in *Journal of Church and State* 22 (1980): 251–70.

²³ Boleslao Lewin, *La rebelión de Túpac Amaru y los orígenes de la independencia de Hispanoamérica*, tercer edición ampliada (Buenos Aires: Sociedad Editora Latino Americana, 1967); Scarlett O'Phelan Godoy, *La gran rebelión en los Andes: de Túpac Amaru a Túpac Catari* (Lima: Petroperu, 1995).

²⁴ J. Lloyd Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America: A History of Politico-Ecclesiastical Relations*, revised ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934, 1966), 160.

²⁵ Pilar García Jordán, *Iglesia y Poder en el Perú Contemporáneo, 1821–1919* (Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas," 1993), 27.

²⁶ *Exposición del Capítulo metropolitano de Lima a la convención nacional, sobre la exclusión de los falso cultos y sobre los derechos de libertad y de propiedad de la Iglesia* (Lima: Impreso por Francisco Solis, 1855), p.5, Colección de Vargas Ugarte, Archivo de los Jesuitas, Santo Toribio, Perú Iglesia 39b, doc. 44.

²⁷ Nils Jacobsen, *Mirages of Transition: The Peruvian Altiplano, 1780–1930*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993)

²⁸ Julio Cotler, *Clases, estado y nación en el Perú*. (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1978).

²⁹ José María Arguedas, *Todas las Sangres* (Lima: Editorial Horizonte, 1985).

³⁰ Marcela Calisto, "Peasant Resistance in the Aymara Districts of the Highlands of Peru, 1900–1930: An Attempt at Self-governance" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at San Diego, 1993); Clarinda Matto de Turner (*Birds Without a Nest: A Novel*, J.G.H., trans., 1904, emended by Naomi Lindstrom (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996)) offers a fictional account of the triumvirate of power established by clergy, hacendados, and caciques.

³¹ Cotler, *Clases, estado y nación en el Perú*, identifies hacendados as the principal link between indigenous rural communities and the Peruvian state, which would represent an enormous problem after agrarian reform in 1968.

³² Mecham, *Church and State*, 315–316.

³³ Greg Grandin, *The Blood of Guatemala: A History of Race and Nation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), 92–93, 269, and fn. 77–78.

³⁴ E. Bradford Burns, *The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 96–98.

³⁵ Richard Newbold Adams, *Crucifixion by Power: Essays on Guatemalan National Social Structure, 1944–1966* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1970), 278.

³⁶ Virginia Garrard-Burnett, *Living in the New Jerusalem: Protestantism in Guatemala* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 57–58.

³⁷ Ralph Lee Woodward, Jr., *Central America: A Nation Divided*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 104.

³⁸ H.M.B. Ingersoll, "The War of the Mountains: A Study of Reactionary Peasant Insurgency in Guatemala, 1837–1873," (Ph.D. diss., George Washington University, 1972).

³⁹ Mary P. Holleran, *Church and State in Guatemala* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949) 127, 140–141.

⁴⁰ Garrard-Burnett, *Living in the New Jerusalem*, 58. *Cofradías* were actually replaced by *guachibales*, which were equivalent institutions that operated without Church sanction.

⁴¹ *Estatuto provisional* for the governance of Peru issued by General San Martín, quoted in Mecham, *Church and State*, 161.

⁴² Ibid., p. 25.

⁴³ Manuel Burga and Alberto Flores Galindo, *Apogeo y Crisis de la República Aristocrática*, cuarta ed. (Lima: Rikchay Peru, 1987), 111.

⁴⁴ Historiográfica de Puno, Itmo. y Rdm. Sr. Dr. D. Juan Ambrosio Huerta, Dignísimo Obispo de la de la Diócesis, 163 AJ, Anexos de la Memoria del Prefecto del Departamento de Puno, Puno 9 Junio 1900, BN (E834 30ff).

⁴⁵ William D. McCarthy, MM, “Notes for a History of the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers in Peru” (unpublished manuscript, 1998).

⁴⁶ Kay B. Warren, *The Symbolism of Subordination: Indian Identity in a Guatemalan Town* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978); Douglass E. Brintnall, *Revolt Against the Dead: The Modernization of a Mayan Community in the Highlands of Guatemala* with a forward by Charles Wagley (New York: Gordon and Breach, 1979); Ricardo Falla, *Quiché Rebelde: Estudio de un movimiento de conversión religiosa, rebelde a las creencias tradicionales, en San Antonio Ilotenango, Quiché (1948–1970)* (Guatemala: Editorial Universitaria de Guatemala, 1980); John Watanabe, *Mayan Saints and Sinners in a Changing World* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992); Richard Wilson, *Maya Resurgence*.

⁴⁷ Informal Conversation with Juan Domingo Cáceres Olazo in the Archivo Regional de Puno, December 24, 2002.

⁴⁸ James Anthony Walsh, Trip to South and Central America April 5 to August 11, July 27, 1942, cited in William D. McCarthy, MM, “Notes for a History.”

⁴⁹ Edward Cleary (*Crisis and Change*, 14–15) described Peru’s next papal nuncio, Rómulo Carboni, as the “nuncio as entrepreneur” for his extraordinary ability to attract foreign clergy and resources to Peru.

⁵⁰ General Council Minutes, January 18, 1943, cited in William D. McCarthy, MM, “Notes for a History.”

⁵¹ Arthur Kiernan, MM, Letter to James E. Walsh, MM, April 16, 1943, Puno, MMA.

⁵² In 1968, after twenty-five years of operating the pre-seminary, it had produced fewer than a dozen clergy. Robert Kearns, MM, *Maryknoll Fathers in Peru, 1965–1977*, vol. 4., (n.p., n.d.), 168, MMA.

⁵³ John Schiff, MM, “Catechetical Follow-up in the parish,” at Puno Rural Catechetical Conference, October 22–23, 1963, in Kearns, *Maryknoll in Peru*, vol. 3, 204–220, 217.

⁵⁴ “Sometimes a community is cold and indifferent. . . . It should be explained that unless they do have a catechist there will be no annual feast-day. This is a hard decision to make and should be arrived at only after much prayer and a long period of patient waiting for the people to decide for themselves. Father Robert Kearns, “Recruiting and qualifications of the catechists,” in Kearns, *Maryknoll in Peru*, vol. 3. 191–197 and 193.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ “Catholic Relief Services in Peru,” (1954) p. 1, Catholic Relief Services Archive, Baltimore, MD.

⁵⁷ “Proyectos de Desarrollo Comunitario Promovidos por Cáritas del Perú,” Folleto “Cáritas,” Archivo de *El Comercio*, Lima, Peru; Phillip Erbland, MM, interview by William D. McCarthy, MM, tape recording, Lima, February 11, 1996, courtesy of the Maryknoll Society History Project.

⁵⁸ Kearns, *Maryknoll in Peru*, vol. 2, 20.

⁵⁹ Arthur J. Dwyer, Puno Diary, June, 1956, Maryknoll Priests Peru Diaries, MMA. I suspect that the politician referred to was Pedro Beltrán, an important opposition leader who was said to have instigated the Ciudad de Dios invasion to publicize President Odría’s failure to meet the housing needs of Peru’s new urban residents. Beltrán played a crucial role in introducing mutual savings and loan associations, of the type Maryknoll advocated, in the 1950s. David Collier, *Squatters and Oligarchs: Authoritarian Rule and Policy Change in Peru* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 69–70.

⁶⁰ Kearns, *Maryknoll in Peru*, vol. 2, 95.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 97. Father Dan McLellan was subsequently named “Director of the Institute of Human Relations and Production” at San Marcos University as well.

⁶³ Memoria Para La Asamblea Episcopal Peruana Sobre el Desarrollo de Cooperativas de Crédito Parroquiales en al Año 1959, Archivo del Obispo de Juli (AOJ).

⁶⁴ Oficina Central, Cooperativas de Crédito Parroquiales, Memoria Para La Asamblea Episcopal Peruana, 1959, AOJ; and Federación Nacional de Cooperativas de Crédito del Perú, Estadísticas 1966, AOJ.

⁶⁵ Clarence J. Witte, MM, March 24, 1943, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA.

⁶⁶ Calder, *Crecimiento y cambio*, 19.

⁶⁷ Forward by Charles Wagley in Brintnall, *Revolt Against the Dead*, p. x.

⁶⁸ Clarence Witte, MM, “Thoughts and Jottings for Soloma,” October 1943, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA.

⁶⁹ Alfred E. Smith, MM, San Miguel Acatán Diary, August 1946, MMA.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Community and Social Survey Guatemala (July 1, 1953), Maryknoll Seminary Library (MMSL).

⁷² Brother Felix Fournier, Letter to Mabel, Will, and Family, July 1, 1953, MMA.

⁷³ John M. Watanabe, “Enduring Yet Ineffable Community in the Western Periphery of Guatemala,” in *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540 to 1988*, Carol A. Smith, ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), 197.

⁷⁴ Charles Wagley, “The Maya,” 62. Protestant missionaries settled in Panajachel in 1920, but it took them nearly two decades to gain a convert. (Ricardo Falla, SJ, “Evolución Política-Religiosa del Indígena Rural en Guatemala (1945–1965)” en *Estudios Sociales Centroamericanos* Año 1, numero 1 (Enero–Abril 1972) 27–41, 32). Although Douglas E. Brintnall identifies conversion to Catholicism and conversion to Protestantism as nearly identical processes, he notes that conversion to Protestantism started later and might have been in response to people’s distress at the level of conflict between *costumbristas* and Catholic converts. (Brintnall, *Revolt Against the Dead*.) This same kind of step conversion facilitated by Protestants’ tolerance for *costumbre*, is evident in Michael E. Mendelson, *Los escándalos de Maximón* (Guatemala: Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, Publicación no. 19, 1965).

⁷⁵ Arturo Arias, “Changing Indian Identity.”

⁷⁶ Hugo Gerbermann, MM, Ixtahuacán Diary, March 1952, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA. See also: “Colotenango . . . Almost every week we see a few new faces among those who come in to learn the doctrine. In spite of the fact that the witch doctors and even the alcalde are trying to keep the people away from the doctrine classes, the number is steadily increasing.” Hugo Gerbermann, MM, Ixtahuacán Diary, January 1952, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA.

⁷⁷ Edward J. McGuinness, MM, Guatemala Diary, October 1–15, 1951, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA.

⁷⁸ Brintnall, *Revolt Against the Dead*, 15.

⁷⁹ Adams, *Crucifixion by Power*, 139.

⁸⁰ For a description of a similar experience with foreign clergy, see: Luis Z. de León V.; presentación y notas, Jesús Borrego, *Carchá : una misión en Guatemala : entre los Kekchíes de Alta Verapaz*, (Guatemala: Centro de Estudios de las Misiones Salesianas, 1985).

⁸¹ Rev. Edward J. McGuinness, MM, Guatemala Diary (Jacaltenango), October 1951, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA.

⁸² Edward J. McGuinness, Huehuetenango, Guatemala, Cuilco Diary, December 1953, Maryknoll Priests Guatemala Diaries, MMA.

⁸³ Ricardo Falla, *Quiché Rebelde*.

⁸⁴ Gordon Lewis Bowen, "Interests and Ideals: American Foreign Aid to Latin America, 1960–1965" (PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1978). Bowen observes that United States aid to Guatemala in these years consistently bypassed the government of Guatemala even though the intention was to strengthen and centralize the government.

⁸⁵ Brother Felix Fournier, Letter to Laura, Frank, Christine, March 28, 1955, MMA.

⁸⁶ Fuller, "Catholic Missionary Work and National Development in Guatemala," 116.

⁸⁷ Brother Felix Fournier, Letter to Dad, Kay, Gaby and Laura, September 6, 1963, MMA.