Preface

This study addresses the topic of conservation of archaeological heritage in Mexico, the manner and context in which it has developed, its relationship with government institutions, and very specifically the identification of social elements or actors in the processes of destruction or conservation which affect this collective resource. I decided to bundle in this work both the analysis of various aspects of current issues in conservation and the preparation of a proposal to study the management of archaeological resources in a systematic manner at the national level. This stems essentially from reflections both theoretical and practical which emerge from a professional life developed within institutional or "official" archaeology in Mexico. From this flows a need and urge to set the topic in an appropriate academic context.

These reflections flow from settings of serious danger and frustration experienced in the field while trying to put in practice an array of institutional programs, projects, and assignments which have as a common objective the official version of archaeological heritage conservation. In effect I argue here the traditional manner of addressing the conservation of this heritage is inadequate and obsolete, essentially an ongoing process of improvisation to address the conflict-laden character of the social circumstances which envelop Mexico's cultural heritage. The institutional structure charged by law with the conservation of archaeological monuments has demonstrated on repeated occasions its inadequacy to complete its objective. This is attributable to a series of fundamental contradictions which exist between the formal practice of archaeology and the political reality in which it, as an institution, is imbedded.

The State, on the other hand, shows us a treatment of cultural issues which is far from homogeneous. It appears almost as an aggregation of nearly-autonomous institutions, each struggling to move forward with its priorities for the six-year presidential term without giving much thought to the integrating mechanisms which ought to exist in relation to collective resources.

At the academic level one notes a failure in the preparation of specialists. While archaeologists sooner or later confront the need to conserve archaeological heritage on the basis of law, paradoxically they do not receive the minimal training in the government universities which permits them to discharge this specialized function. The result is that until now all of this happens outside ant clear set of rules and without an explicit institutional policy which goes beyond the obeying the interests of a State currently characterized by a neoliberal stance, within which cultural heritage is considered a simple commodity for consumption.

The importance of this study lies in the fact that it is an innovation in the way in which archaeological preservation is seen as part of a broader system of resource conservation, and from this springs a proposal to create in a formal manner the field of Archaeological Resources Management in Mexico. This is separate in theory and practice from the science of archaeology, although they may interact closely according to the circumstances of a particular case. This new field becomes in effect a specialization for those with professional training in archaeology, architecture, anthropology, or other fields which can be linked with the conservation of cultural heritage.

This study is based on a comparative analysis of the issue of destruction of cultural resources which confront Monte Alban and Mitla, the two most important archaeological sites in the Oaxaca Valley of southern Mexico. This importance, while in some measure related to the fundamental role the sites played in the cultural development of the area, today stems from the attention they receive from the mass public as a tourist attraction as a consequence of their exploration and reconstruction at the start of two critical periods in Mexican archaeology. While the status of bring open to the public is not a uniform condition for the archaeological heritage of the country, it can be considered representative of a current policy tendency toward cultural heritage, which is to exploit and overexploit the aesthetic attractions of the sites as a commodity to generate income for the national treasury. This, however, does not take into account the variety of interests among communities and individuals whose lands are overlapped by the pre-Columbian sites, and without taking into account the differing perceptions archaeological remains generate among differing populations.

Therefore across this study I try to demonstrate how different interests converge on the same object the interests of different actors. For one actor it may be academic preservation; for government it might be policies which legitimize overexploitation of the resource; and for others, the disagreement of the communities which, drawing on diverse ways to resist, display a willingness to engage in drawn-out litigation in order to defend their right to exploit resources yielded by cultivation or extractive activities. The object of everyone's attention is the archaeological zone, which must bear the pressures generated by all social groups for which it has some significance. This is the reason I propose the task of protecting the archaeological heritage—which today is a task which rests on the shoulders of government archaeologists with little or no training—should in reality be considered within the context of a specialty focusing on the management of archaeological resources. That is, within a broad conceptualization of conservation of resources within the country there needs to be a strategy which assigns a sustainable value to this kind of non-renewable resource.

This kind of study in the field of anthropology can be justified as the central issue surrounding the resources which concern us are the human settlements, one in certain ways a traditional Zapotec community and the other part of the suburbs of the city of Oaxaca. Both represent challenges at two levels. First, we need to understand the origins of the distress caused the communities by the presence and decision-making processes of government agencies such as the National Institute of Anthropology and History in relation to resources the communities consider theirs. Second, we need to understand their organizational capacity to form groups in defense of their interests and their willingness to pursue inter-generational struggles to secure those interests. We need to have an academic capacity to understand both levels as a means of developing real alternatives in the form of participative solutions between communities and the State. These solutions stress the importance of educational processes and the general of income. Without losing sight of the importance of conservation, the new specialist needs to be able to respond effectively to the needs of and for the tourist visit. The new specialist needs to understand the importance of and mechanisms to educate communities. And above all, it is vital to foster the active and responsible participation of the owners in the processes or exploitation as well as conservation of the archaeological resources they consider to be theirs.

As the government currently shows little capacity to resolve severe problems of destruction attributable to diverse agents in the archaeological sites, the alternatives proposed here to deal with the central social problems require specialists trained in the humanities and prepared to recognize different kinds of conflicts and the actors who create them. And these new professionals must at the same time explore the possibility of promoting organizational change within the institution charged with cultural heritage preservation. They will need to address the dual challenges of controlling overexploitation on the one hand while on the other responding to the extreme poverty of the original population. If there is not a serious rethinking of the traditional foci of archaeological heritage conservation, developing on the basis of its experience a new approach to the Mexican School of Archaeology, we will pay a high price. That price will be to participate in the creation of commercial projects in which the remains in some of the monumental archaeological zones serve only as a backdrop for the indiscriminate commercialization of Mexican culture.

Author's Note

This publication reflects a convergence of two significant streams of interest and involvement in cultural resources management. As the text itself indicates, one stream derives from my professional experience as an archaeologist with the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) in Mexico, and from a conviction that effective conservation of our archaeological heritage requires new approaches to meet new and demanding challenges. My position as archaeologist responsible for the complex site at Mitla, Oaxaca, reinforced this conviction in a very immediate fashion, and a Fulbright-Garcia Robles doctoral fellowship at the University of Georgia provided the time for reading, debate, and a sharpening of focus. The dissertation, this text, Mexico's first Certificate Program in Cultural Resources Management, and the opportunity to test innovations in planning and management in the archaeological zone of Monte Alban are all consequences of this stream. Hopefully these accomplishments respond in some way to the support and encouragement provided by colleagues and senior administrators at INAH.

The second stream of interest and involvement flows from contact and dialogue with a wide range of professional contacts in different settings. From a symposium on cultural property protection at the 1995 meeting of the American Society for Public Administration in San Antonio came continuing contact with the National Park Service, and somewhat later other connections with ICOMOS in Paris. Francis McManamon and Richard Waldbauer of the NPS Archaeological Assistance Division have been particularly attentive to brokering linkages between their agency and INAH, and the publication of this text in English stems from their efforts. Henry Cleere at ICOMOS has been insistent on the importance of learning from the accomplishments and frustrations of others, and has supported that insistence by sending me on technical assistance missions to Central America.

The academic and professional experience of the past several years means that were I writing this text today it would be different in some ways but very much the same in others. Had the National Park Service and Society for American Archaeology not imposed some practical deadlines the temptation to do substantial revision might have proven overwhelming. This is particularly true given the current national debate in Mexico as to whether, how, and under what circumstances responsibility for conservation of archaeological heritage should be opened to participation by other sectors of society. As Mexico grapples with this debate it faces a profound challenge in deciding how to learn from its own experience as well as the experience of others. This book is a contribution to that challenge.

Nelly Robles Garcia
Monte Alban, Oaxaca
July, 2000

Translator's Note

When the National Park Service and the Society for American Archaeology offered the opportunity to translate this work into English a senior scholar in the field advised me not to do it. The problems, he said, are:

A.one invests huge amounts of time which inevitably distracts from the rhythm of one's own work, yet in the end the primary accomplishment is enhancing someone else's career, not one's own;

B. those familiar with the author's work or the subject matter will be critical of interpretation, tone, and detail, while those lacking such familiarity will critique the absence of supplementary materials which make the text more accessible; and

C. a previously-positive relationship with the author comes under strain when the sometimes-cursory revisions of translations in progress give way to "THAT is NOT what I meant at all!" on seeing the published version.

Experience may yet prove him right, but the utility of making available an English-language version of a text which has contributed to rethinking both the legal foundations and the professional practice of cultural resources management in Mexico leads me to assume the risk.

The text from which this manuscript was prepared is a slightly-edited version of the author's 1996 doctoral dissertation at the University of Georgia, which was modified to serve as a working document for Mexico's first certificate program in cultural resources management, held in Oaxaca in 1998. As a document written by the Mexico's leading expert in the field for practitioners trained primarily in archaeology it made assumptions about shared knowledge of history, concepts, and institutional arrangements not likely to form part of the background of most foreign readers. This required some occasional modifications of wording, organization, and detail in an effort to bring additional clarity to the text. Unfortunately a tight production schedule kept us from having enough feedback to resolve every doubt. Similarly, this has been an exciting but turbulent field in the past several years, but early in the process we had to decide not to try to incorporate contemporary issues and debate because it would have entailed a significant research effort not feasible in the circumstances.

Finally, and in part related to the previous commentary, this should be read not as a strict translation but as an interpretation. Despite the convention of the "translator's note", in the end the clarifications and corrections leave a few ghostly fingerprints of interpretation, of the presence, however muted, of the person responsible for the conversion from one language to another. I did not strive to match word for word, but idea for idea, argument for argument, and to provide the critical data to support them. This means, of course, that the accomplishments and contributions of this study should be seen as Nelly Robles Garcia's, while the errors of omission and commission are mine.

Jack Corbett
Oaxaca, Mexico
July, 2000

Introduction

DECEMBER, 1969: When it was proposed in 1930 that I carry out the excavations at Monte Alban the fundamental objectives were to generate data which would provide more complete knowledge regarding Zapotec writing and calendar systems, begin architectural studies of monumental structures, and study ceramic sequencing. It was also proposed that I do some excavation in tombs to obtain information about religion, clothing, and adornment of the Zapotecs as well as samples of Zapotec and Mixtec lapidary art and goldsmithing…Tomb 7 at Monte Alban was discovered during the first field season. At that time the author worked on his own under an exploration concession granted by the Secretary of Education through the Department of Monuments, under the direction of Jose Reygadas Vertiz. Architect Ignacio Marquina was the Director of Prehispanic Monuments, and both gave all kinds of assistance in order to make excavation possible. During this first field season I counted on the support of two institutions, the Panamerican Institute of Geography and the National University…In addition the Secretary of Education assigned as my aide Mr. Martin Bazan, in charge of the archaeological zones in the state of Oaxaca…For the first time private parties contributed economic support, including D.W. Morrow, Eleazar del Valle, Rafael E. Melgar and J. Velasquez Uriarte…I cannot end this introduction, having mentioned the people who participated in the exploration of the tomb, without adding the humble but indispensible collaboration of the workers who carried out the excavations. I have to thank them for, besides their work and enthusiasm, the honor they demonstrated when through their hands passed, extracted from the earth which had filled the tomb, the small gold and jade counters, the smallest pearls, and the innumerable pieces of turqouose from the mosaics on which their ancestors had labored. To mention them is a pleasant obligation.

On January 6, 1932, we began exploration of the mound of Tomb 7…As it was a saturday, a day on which we paid the workers, I had left Licenciado Valenzuela in charge in order to go down to Oaxaca to collect the funds. When I came back up accompanied by my wife, on arriving where Valenzuela was he said the word "Guelaguetza", which signifies "offering" or "gift," and hung on me the jade collar and showed me the conch trumpet…Valenzuela and I had carried out an early inspection of the tomb, a surface survey walking along the stones which stuck irregularly out of the ground, and it permitted us to make a preliminary inspection without destroying artifacts or human bones. On illuminating the earth in the tomb one could see shining points of the pearls, the gold counters, and the innumerable little plates of turquoise which formed at one time rich mosaics…On leaving the tomb we were absolutely convinced of the enormous artistic and scientific wealth we had discovered, and I thought I had no record or notice that anywhere in America had discovered a treasure of this nature" (Caso 1969: 11, 45).

SUMMER, 1987: "During the archaeological field season in the zone at Mitla, Oaxaca, my activity concentrated on aspects of conservation and maintenance there, as this was my specialization within archaeology and because it was all the chronic budget shortfall at the National Institute of Anthropology and History permitted, a common condition during those years. One of the priorities in my project was reinforcing with iron frames those pre-Columbian lintels which carry the back wall of the Catholic church. Here it is worth remarking that at the moment of the Conquest Mitla was still a living community, so the conquistadors decided to humble the old religion by building the church building on top of a pre-Columbian Zapotec palace. Currently the fact that the lower part of the structure is from the pre-Columbian era while the upper part is colonial makes us…INAH's personnel…responsible for safeguarding and conservation of both monuments.

With this in mind and having discussed with municipal authorities our work plan for the season I proceeded to evaluate the nature of the damage found in both buildings. This consisted of cracks in the colonial walls of the church as well as in the pre-Columbian lintels, cracks clearly related to the tremendous weight of the more recent structure on the older one. I decided, together with the team of architects from INAH's Oaxaca Regional Center who provided technical support, to put in place the frames previously mentioned. To do this it was first necessary to remove the accumulated earth fill and stones from the areas where the frames would be placed. To do this I went with my group of masons and helpers to begin removal of this layer in order to uncover the area where we would do the technical work. We were directly below the pre-Columbian lintel inside Dwelling 9, Patio C, of the Church or North Group.

Immersed in the work we suddenly heard a group of people approaching us, shouting and making signs for us to get out of there. They arrived at our worksite and shouted at me that I should take my people and leave, that we had no right to be excavating there, that we were thieves who wanted to steal from the church. These shouts were seconded by the wandering vendors who prowl the archaeological zone. I tried to calm the animus and explain what we were doing, that far from damaging their church we were going to reinforce it and had permission of the municipal authorities. In the midst of all the shouting I suddenly felt a gun barrel pressed against my head. One of the crowd threatened to kill me right there, stating bluntly that the mayor had no right to give permission to work in the church and that I headed a group of thieves. At that point my crew boss intervined, and speaking vigorously in Zapotec he thrust himself in front of the crowd, machete in hand, and dragged me away. As we moved away I could see a large crowd of vendors from the Artisans Market and a number of the custodians from the archaeological zone. After this incident obviously they did not permit us to finish our work, not even to touch the lintels, and the hostility was such that I decided that the principal responsibility of my crew chief would be to protect me. The rest of the field season I worked in Mitla under the protection of a bodyguard" (Robles 1987).

These two examples show us quite clearly how and to what degree the environment of archaeology and archaeological conservation in Mexico changed over a perioid of fifty years. The romanticism of the early period, the interest and respect our discipline could inspire, was demonstrated by the significant support forthcoming from the highest levels of government in the form of contracts for personnel and noteworthy budgets. Today this romantic science has become a devalued activity marked by threats to the physical integrity of the archaeologist, an atmosphere of conflict, minimal interest outside the profession, and little or no support from institutions. Today the professional practice of archaeology in Mexico is marked by painful cutbacks in budgets for research and a lack of additional positions for archaeologists in an era when urban growth, tourism development, and infrastructure construction puts the nation's archaeological heritage increasingly at risk. An analysis of this change, and in particular of the social conflicts associated with it, is a principal concern of this study.

Background

A central theme in the text is the significance of the social components…the groups, institutions, communities, organizations, and other actors…which form the contemporary context of archaeological conservation in Mexico. To understand these components the study addresses the specific cases of the archaeological zones of Mitla and Monte Alban in the cultural setting of the Oaxaca Valley in southeastern Mexico. These sites present critical research and conservation management challenges for the central institution in Mexican archaeology, the National Institute of Anthropology and History.

The social components mentioned above form part of the context of archaeological conservation and cultural heritage permeating our daily work but largely latent, and we pay little attention to them until a crisis demands it, or until their unexamined dynamics bring a halt to our professional practice as archaeologists and protectors of cultural heritage. Proof of this is that their study is a recent theme in the context of cultural heritage conservation in Mexico (Bonfil 1990; Garcia Canclini 1992: 180-190, 1995; Florescano 1993), and is practically nonexistent in discussions of conservation of archaeological heritage, where it is mentioned only very sporadically in recent studies (Schavelzon 1981, 1990; Robles and Moreira 1990; Vasquez Olvera 1995; Rozat D. And Contreras 1995).

International statements or accords which function as recommendations for architectural or urban heritage conservation emerge from both international bodies (UNESCO; OAS; ICOMOS) and meetings or congresses of architects or other professionals. Starting with the Charter of Venice (1964), signed by Mexico, these statements have addressed the need to link society at large with policies and programs intended to preserve this heritage (INAH Oaxaca Regional Center 1982).The definition of "social component" or social actors and the nature of their intervention in preservation becomes the task of research and public policy on a nation-by-nation basis. Here the important point is that international documents recommend society in general be accorded an active role in the dynamics of cultural heritage conservation. In the Mexican case such participation has been addressed since the start of modern legislation on this subject. Article 2 of the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historical Monuments (published May 6, 1972) specifically recognizes INAH's obligation to organize or authorize civic associations, local organizations, or groups of rural residents to act as auxiliary bodies in the preservation of national cultural heritage and to control looting or vandalism (INAH 1995: 7-8). In the same sense, Article 4 anticipates the participation of state and municipal authorities in the application of this law.

In cases such as national or regional museums the role of civic associations, principally as "Friends of Museums," has had a positive effect on their operations. For community museums the local organizations or committees have been the key agents in their creation and continued survival (Morales and Camarena 1995). In some circumstances, such as the salvage and restoration of religious architecture, communities request assistance, provide resources, and support restoration. In the case of archaeological monuments the history is quite different, as there are few cases where INAH has received ongoing support from community organizations. This is attributable to the fact that, as the large archaeological zones are under the direct administration of the federal government and the rest—the great majority—are unexplored, so local residents cannot appreciate their significance. In turn under the same legislation INAH archaeologists find themselves obliged to stop or prohibit activities which may damage subsurface archaeological heritage. Such action is rarely greeted enthusiastically by the property owners affected or by community officials.

Across time the complexity of the relationship between federal archaeology and communities has developed in a way which give rise to situations such as the confrontation in Mitla described earlier. It is for this reason the research presented here focuses on the social and political elements which intervene in the relations between conservation archaeology and society in its most general sense. Here I start from the fact that this subject has not been recognized as an accepted field of study by professionals involved in the task of archaeological heritage conservation, and therefore has not been included as part of the academic preparation available in this area. Nevertheless, I will argue in this text that only by analyzing these social actors can we begin to understand the different levels of conflict which appear on a daily basis as part of the work we do. On the basis of such analysis we will be able to engage, in an effective, long-term fashion, social actors who today confront us as adversaries and whose actions, even when not intentional, contribute to the destruction of archaeological remains.

Through this research it is possible to identify a variety of circumstances which play important roles in the relationship between government archaeology and communities. For example, we come to understand the implications of the institutional practice of boundary-setting as it affects those areas considered to have archaeological remains and the economic resources involved. In turn this means understanding the complex systems of land tenure present in Oaxaca and how these relate both to individual properties and to collectively-held resources. Another consideration has to do with patterns of land use in areas where there are archaeological remains, whether these patterns are consistent with what is legally permitted in relation to heritage conservation, and how they relate to public policy. At present official practice is to support a single type of use—tourism—for archaeological areas, a use remote from the experience of neighboring communities and from traditional production of foodstuffs or other contributions to community survival, but which is an increasingly important element in the economic relationship between Mexico and the rest of the world. Finally, a critical contribution of this research is to address the significance of social groups organized to demand their rights, reaffirm ancestral political practices, solicit services, and act in collective defense of their interests in the face of government decisions which affect them.

Methodology

The character of the data on which this research is based probably will generate a certain degree of nervousness among planners, archaeologists, and other specialists in the field owing to the obvious absence of material extracted from government agencies, e.g., census data, typologies, official statistics, graphs and tables, and the official results of national programs. On the other hand, it gives most weight to primary ethographic materials, field observation, and on-site verification of maps addressing land tenure, land use, and boundaries. Such approaches and the data they generate are not part of "standard" research or conservation practice, as these generally depend on data published or collected by government agencies, and the boundary maps published by these agencies e.g., INEGI, INAH, or SRA. Rarely does orthodox research practice pay much attention to margins of error or overlapping boundaries frequently found on such maps, and which are the hidden basis of conflicts between communities or between comunities and government agencies. This is unfortunate, as a lack of understanding of the significance of boundary-setting in relation to community resource use and social dynamics leads researchers and government practitioners to reduce to a set of technical considerations issues which for the communities involved are central to their identity and survival.

A fundamental concern in this project has been to narrate facts, describe situations, and listen to the testimony of people who as individuals or organized groups feel themselves affected by official practices intended to protect the archaeological sites in question. I try to understand, through the application of ethnographic techniques, the depth of social issues generated through the presence and official control of archaeological resources in combination with a range of other factors. Ideally this exercise will enable us to reassess the possibility of a convergence of interests with these individuals and groups in a participatory process which brings closer the ideal of protection of archaeological sites for the collective good and assures that communities feel they are heard in decisions with respect to cultural heritage. The challenge is to reach this objective without damaging the individual or collective interests or resources which in many cases represent the only significant asset, however acquired, these people possess. In this repect a major element in the research design and process centers on the identification of these actors, the spaces they occupy, their basis of power and influence, and their sense of their interests, on the premise that to the extent we understand them, whether as isolates or in relation to other actors or issues, we will come closer to understanding the contemporary social context of archaeological heritage which concerns us.

Organizing the Research

This research was carried out in two parts: (A) fieldwork, and (B) documentary review. Fieldwork meant approaching different communities, organizations, and individuals for informal interviews with different actors in different positions: heads of households; leaders of political, business, and religious groups; ejido and communal lands commissioners, municipal authorities; public employees in a range of professional and administrative roles; and scholars. Interviews were generally arranged through key informants (Young and Young 1961: 141), who also played an extremely important role in helping to identify sincere resposes and accurate data. Interviewing meant stepping outside my official role, displaying an open mind which encouraged interviewees to express freely their concerns and ideas. It also meant using local language and references, as these contributed to building levels of confidence and shared understanding, similar to the methods of Rapid Rural Appraisal (Grandstaff 1990; RPA Trainers Workshop 1991; Rhoades 1987). My status as a Oaxaca native and as someone recognized in the local research community also was important, as I shared with informants a common background in the cultural, historical, and environmental contexts important for the research.

Although several communities in Oaxaca have been studied extensively by ethnographers (Parsons 1936; Beals 1945; De La Fuente 1957; Malinowski and De La Fuente 1957; Butterworth 1962, 1970; Nahmad, 1965, 1995; Selby 1966; Diskin 1967; Cook 1968; MacLowry 1970; Waterbury 1970; Chance 1971; Kearney 1972, among others), for the specific areas addressed in this project there is a paucity of relevant prior research. The ring of settlements around Monte Alban has been touched only tangentially, although many themes found there have been explored in other urban anthropology studies carried out in the economically distressed neighborhoods of the city of Oaxaca (Butterworth 1970, 1973; Higgins 1974, 1983, 1986; Murphy 1991, 1994; Selby, et al, 1990; Winter, et al, 1990; Rees, et al, 1991), and in the analysis of social inequality in the city (Stepick and Murphy 1980; Murphy and Selby 1985; Murphy 1987; Murphy and Stepick 1991). Mitla is the focus of one of the pioneering ethnographies on Oaxaca (1936) and of some other studies centered on commerce (Beals 1979: 165). Many of the categories of analysis used here draw on these previous studies.

Another aspect of fieldwork was a series of intensive ground surveys of the areas officially designated as the "Archaeological Monuments Zone of Monte Alban" and the "Archaeological Monuments Zone of Mitla", according to the Public Registry of Archaeological Zones and Monuments of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (1993). Fortunately the Monte Alban surveys coincided with the 1995 formation of an interagency commission charged with a review of existing conditions within the official boundary, a charge which involved a ground survey by officials from various agencies, with elected officials from communities surrounding the archaeological zone, and leaders of organized groups when they wished to be there, or with trusted informants.

For the surveys of Mitla personal experience of more than ten years, coupled with intimate knowledge of the site, community leaders, and key informants, proved essential. For example, in Mitla some interviews had to be repeated several times, as given the delicate relations of INAH with the community it was obvious in many cases the early responses were distorted. If personal experience proved an asset in many ways, both the people I wanted to interview and I myself had to overcome the less pleasant moments of that experience. Ground verification of the maps used in distributing agrarian lands was accomplished in the company of the Ejido Commissioner and officials from the Office of the Agrarian Solicitor.

The other component of the project was documentary research. This included both review of published material and a great emphasis on archival work. Through exhaustive analysis of the technical archives of the Archaeological and Juridical Sections of INAH's Oaxaca Regional Center it became possible to approximate the social reality which forms the developmental context of institutional conservation. Files of applications for construction permits, documents on the suspension of construction projects, atttempts to regulate land use, agreements with different muncipal, agrarian, or agency officials, plans for development projects, and above all documentation showing the genesis and behavior of social organizations were used as primary materials in assessing the social character of conflicts which have confronted both archaeological zones.

It is important to note that this is probably the first time that such data have been utilized for academic research related to archaeology, as generally these files have been stored only with the idea they may be of some use in processing legal cases INAH may handle. Nevertheless, they proved themselves fundamental in the search for materials to be analyzed in the course of this research.

The presentation of this project takes the form of a comparative study of the social dimensions of site conservation and management at Monte Alban and Mitla. Not only are these two sites of great academic importance in studying the cultural development of Oaxaca, and in appreciating the economic implications of their great contributions to the tourism industry, but because they represent two realities, two types of social universe which make it possible to contrast key issues in protected archaeological areas. In the case of Monte Alban we will see the dynamics of conflict associated with the urbanization of a middle-size city, while in the case of Mitla we are dealing with a mixed urban-rural environment marked by a strong sense of ethnic identity.

The social context currently surrounding Monte Alban includes its marginal neighborhoods (Murphy and Stepick 1991: 64), settlements subsidized by the government (Murphy and Stepick 1991: 69), ejidos, communal lands, and private properties. Each category of land use and tenure generates specific social groups identifiable by their geographic location, membership in defined social strata, and their degree of rootedness in and possession of land.

This is not the case in Mitla, which presents a uniform context and a settlement pattern which surrounds and invades the archaeological zone. It does not present great social differences, as it is an ethnic community still structured socially according to ancient custom (Parsons 1936). The social groups discussed in the course of this text appear to be formed in large measure around a territorial base presumed to have significant value in terms of access to or control over those areas of the archaeological zone open to the public. It becomes difficult to differentiate among groups which overlap in a small space. Through participation in the day-to-day dynamics of the community, where systematic observation begins to shed light on what at first appears to be turbulent, unpatterned activity, one learns to appreciate the larger and purposive forces at work. As an example of this, on my arrival in Mitla in 1984 I was capable of seeing only two groups of people with economic interests in the archaeological zone, but through my participation, experience, interviews, and greater understanding of the complexity of the community, today I can see at least fourteen different categories of actors seeking access to the same resource.

Institutional Background

The Golden Age of Mexican Archaeology

All the studies addressing the history of archaeology in Mexico (Bernal 1979; Gandara 1992; Litvak 1985; Matos 1983; Olive 1995; Schavelson 1990) concur in recognizing a period of brilliance, great accomplishments, and substantial impact on Mexican society in general and the academic world in particular. This period began with Manuel Gamio and Jose Reygadas Vertiz between 1917 and 1928, reaching its peak between 1937 and the early 1950s. We now refer to it as the Mexican School of Archaeology for the distinctive theoretical mix applied to the Mexican case: an emphasis on the relationship between anthropology anrd archaeology; the incorporation of stratigraphy for chronological division of excavated materials; the design of policies for heritage conservation with an emphasis on reconstruction techniques for monumental pre-Columbian architecture; interdisciplinary studies; and above all, it places archaeology within the environment of the respected sciences and makes "…the practice of archaeology a profession of political faith" (Litvak 1986: 147).

The natural leader of the early period was Manuel Gamio, succeeded in the 1930s by Alfonso Caso, who in turned formed an extensive group of contemporary followers, including Ignacio Bernal, Jorge R. Acosta, Ignacio Marquina, Eduardo Noguera, Florencia Muller, Ponciano Salazar, Cesar Sanez, Eulalia Guzman, and Juan Valenzuela, to mention a few. Others, such as Albert Ruz and Jose Garcia Payon, although within the same school, followed their own line of development.

The origins of the Mexican School of Archaeology may be traced directly to the dynamics of the courses on physical anthropology, ethnology and indigenous languages which were offered in the National Museum between 1906 and 1929 (Avila 1995: 312), and in the International School of Archaeology and American Ethnography founded in 1911. Support came from the governments of Mexico, Prussia, France and the United States, and from universities such as Columbia, Harvard, and Pennsylvania. Among individual founders are such leading figures as Franz Boas, Alfred Tozzer, and Eduardo Seler.

Franz Boas exercised a dominating influence on the theoretical focus of Gamio with his conception of anthropology "as the study of all human manifestations, ancient and contemporary, biological, material, and spiritual, focused on the object of scientific study, in the sense of being seen as an academically justifiable methodology which presents verifiable conclusions upon examination of the data presented as relevant to the examined phenomenon" (Litvak 1985: 5). For Gamio the practice of archaeology could be justified only in the context of a integrated, interdisciplinary anthropology, as he demonstrated in his famous book The Population of the Valley of Teotihuacan. His object of study emphasized the "…continuity between the magnificent past of the pre-Columbian culture and the problem of Indian peasants, marginalized and impoverished, in the present" (Litvak 1985: 5).

The other influential aspect of Gamio's work, in addition to academic excellence, was his political and administrative contribution to archaeology. His theoretical arguments led to concrete action while occupying a variety of institutional positions. In 1916 he was the director of the International School, in 1917 Director of Anthropology in the Secretary of Agriculture and Development, and in 1924 Under-secretary of Public Education. As a high level decision-maker his ideas influenced public policy. The mission of the Bureau of Anthropology under Gamio was "…to discover the true roots of Mexico and to proudly exhibit them to the world. The restoration of historic and archaeological buildings became, in a sense, a part of this program, almost a public education exercise: research teams had the responsibility for discovering the past and had to restore it in order to present it to the public. They were a group of thinkers whose theories would have great weight in the following years" (Schavelson 1990: 76). This practice, followed until the 1950s, was in essence a way "…to see and feel the history which, transmitted by the educational system from elementary school on, provided Mexico one of the bases for creating its sense of nationality, its indigenous past" (Litvak 1986: 148). The Mexican School institutionalized archaeology, founding training and reseach centers, and convincing the government to direct funds to the reconstruction of the massive archaeological monuments we can see today.

Alfonso Caso provided continuity to the work of Gamio, and through his accomplishments established an approach to archaeology which made it one of the most prestigious sciences in the country. His 18 field seasons at Monte Alban were carried out in an enviable context of institutional funding, private support, and citizen participation which characterized Caso's career as an archaeologist and later in indigenous affairs.

For Caso, who before becoming an archaeologist had graduated with a law degree from the University of Mexico, a central concern was to provide a legal basis for archaeological work. In this spirit he transformed the Department of PreHispanic Monuments, which had replaced the original Bureau of Anthropology into the National Institute of Anthropology and History through a law signed February 3, 1939, and where he occupied every possible position, including that of its first director. The Institute took responsibility for, and still does today, "…not only all exploration and research in Mexico, under a single roof, but also museums, not only at the national level but also many of the regional museums which were created (Bernal 1979: 184). The law establishing the Institute characterizes archaeological monuments as public property and for that reason protects them as collective goods (INAH 1980).

The National School of Anthropology and History (ENAH for its acronym in Spanish) was founded at the same time as a branch of the Institute to generate its own human resources, an approach which assured a certain degree of feedback and some continuity between theory and practice. Since its founding the ENAH has been characterized for an unusual educational framework which teaches anthropology in an integral fashion, that is, with all specialties—archaeology, social anthropology, ethnology, linguistics, and physical anthropology—in the same school with students sharing classes (Avila 1995). At the same time Caso founded the Mexican Society of Anthropology, an academic association which since its founding continues to offer a common meeting ground for specialists in different areas. While it has passed through some difficult periods its biennial meetings still serve as important connections for academic discourse and for evaluation of the professional practice of archaeology in Mexico.

It is important to remember these new institutions were created in the generation after the Mexican Revolution when the country was going through a wide array of important internal transformations. To leaders of the period one of the most significant challenges was to create the institutional mechanisms and resources which would help overcome deep divisions in society and serve as a basis for national progress. Furthermore, at this time Mexico experienced a number of serious confrontations with some of the great powers of the period (especially the United States) over the nationalization of the petroleum industry and expropriations (Avila 1995: 313). The high visibility of archaeology and the ideology of nation-building to which it contributed created, when coupled with dynamic and respected leadership, a rare opportunity for organizational development and fieldwork to proceed in tandem.

Bernal, commenting on the era, observes "…archaeology had to behave as an adult even though it was in fact very young. In this period a major accomplishment was to accumulate the material, even if not complete, for the construction of something more substantial afterwards…In the valleys of the central mesa, in Oaxaca and in the Peten it was possible to establish a correct chronology, at least from the perspective of succession. In Yucatan, highland Guatemala, Veracruz, the Huastecas, Tabasco, and to a lesser extent in western Mexico, research revealed important cultures…" (Bernal 1979: 187).

In the area of restoration the Mexican School developed reconstruction techniques to a high degree, validating reconstruction by analogy "on the grounds that it was very probable that this is the way it had been" (Schavelson 1990: 132). The academic specialization of restoration of archaeological structures began, although probably not in a conscious manner. This specialty shares the history of institutional archaeology in Mexico, in large part due to the early leaderhip and guidance of Jorge R. Acosta.

The greatest project of Caso was the research, reconstruction, and dissemination of his work on Monte Alban. His presence grants the site not only the status of a model for the management of archaeological resources in that era, but makes one long for the professional and popular respect accorded to the work of the archaeologist of the time. Even today, almost forty years after the last field season of Caso at Monte Arlban, some of his workers and their descendents remember and idealize his stature with recollections such as: with Alfonso Caso one sure did great explorations!

The era of extensive reconstruction of archaeological monuments receives continuing criticism today, when contemporary concepts of architectural restoration based on new theories and practices make the criteria and perspectives of the past unacceptable. Nevertheless, taking into account the nationalist objective of the time, i.e., to show to Mexico the origins of its own people, we find more ethical and justifiable the underlying principle of reconstruction than its utilization today in the pursuit of the economic benefits generated by tourism. One can equally argue the period has been idealized, and that the archaeologists of the day also collided with the interests of communities protective of their sites. This is certainly true, as the unpublished records of archaeologists such as Ignacio Bernal, Lorenzo Gamio, y Roberto Gallegos remind us of their conflicts in communities in Oaxaca. Nevertheless, the fundamental point is that taken on balance and in the context of the times, the outcome of the archaeological work of this period was more positive than negative.

A final but important note about the academic careers of both Gamio and Caso, as both finished out their professional lives working in support of indigenous populations. This is not mere coincidence, as they, having spent a lifetime evaluating and valuing the riches of the pre-Columbian world agreed as to the urgency of protecting the still-surviving elements of these cultures. In the end both turned to that fusion of archaeology and anthropology to link their absorption with the past with their commitment to the present.

The Modern Period of Official Archaeology in Mexico

As we have seen the Mexican School of Archaeology located the discipline close to federal government decision-making, a location which was advantageous at first but which changed as the larger political picture changed with increasing industrialization after the Second World War. "The world had changed and the discipline with it without Mexican archaeology having noticed…The country had deliberately entered a period of industrialization and massive public works which shifted archaeology to an activity more concerned with salvage than a self-generated research field" (Litvak 1985: 21). On the other hand, the tourism considered by the central government as a potential bonanza required INAH to respond to pressures completely foreign to the orginal spirit for which it had been created. "The commitment with the state derived from the construction of scenic backdrops to attract tourism, an alternative supporting the sustainable development favored by recent governments. The quality of the "restorations" was not always satisfactory, and on repeated occasions Mexico violated international agreements in the field of restoration to which it was a signatory" (Gandara 1992: 36).

Paradoxically, one of the serious problems confronting Mexican archaeology today derives from the enormous confidence which it enjoyed regarding the principles and practice of the Mexican School. This confidence led Mexican archaeologists to shut themselves up in their own universe, a universe with a particular theoretical perspective in addition to the practical one emphasizing monumental reconstruction.Thus broad discussions at the international level regarding archaeological theory in Mexico were seen as topics of interest to the "others", but not to Mexicans. This lack of participation in the international context stemmed from a great confidence in Mexican accomplishments, and therefore a lack of interest in foreign schools which would facilitate communication with the larger world. Students rarely bothered to use texts in other languages, nor did researchers seek to publish outside Mexico. In essence their universe was reduced to production for domestic consumption, which is not to say that this is bad, just that it did not place Mexican experience in a wider context.

Toward the close of the decade of the forties there was some acknowledgement of the formulations of Gordon Childe and the British environmentalists. This meant that during the 1950s the Mexican School would confront—not always respecting scientific etiquette—followers of the environmental school, best represented by Pedro Armillas (Garcia Barcena 1995: 124), and the majority of the followers of historical particularlism complementing reconstruction techniques, whose opponents perjoratively baptized them "pyramid-nuts" (Gandara 1992: 37).

With the emergence of international political movements in 1968 the ENAH opened itself to a marxist theoretical current and also began to include foreign faculty. These, besides bringing their political experiences to Mexico—the majority came from Latin American countries with military regimes—managed to extend the horizons of students not only through the study of historical materialism, but also by opening the possibility of reviewing theoretical positions from countries such as the United States and England, although in many cases these were the object of criticism a priori. At this time there was another significant modification of relations between theory and practice which still affects Mexican archaeology. On the one hand the ENAH participated actively in teaching marxist doctrines and in political criticism of the imperialism of advanced countries and collaborating governments in the Third World. But on the other hand, during the same period the structure of INAH is gradually refined to serve the interest of government, i.e., the creation of more effective infrastructure to facilitate the participation of the country in global economic processes.The priorities of the 1970s had to do with carrying out the salvage archaeology necessary for industrial and tourist expansion, or the construction of new communications links, not with the nation-building of the 1930s.

This expectation generated the possibility of real conflict within archaeology, and in this respect I am in complete agreement with Gandara (1992) that since the 1970s the central policy concern has been to harness archaeology to the needs and priorities of government. Yet in many respects there was a significant discontinuity between the interests of government and the direction of education at the ENAH. My personal experience as a student there during this period was that in reality in the classrooms—and I express this sincerely although my professors perhaps may feel offended—we saw little relationship between marxism and archaeology. Perhaps the little we learned about archaeology we learned from the "traditional" professors, repudiated in the ENAH but who could be found in their cubicles in the basement of the Museum of Anthropology. But I do not deny the experiences in practical collective politics have been of great utility, above all at the moment of labor negotiations between professionals and administrators of the INAH.

In the last semesters of study a large number of students…if not all…were absorbed by the newly-created Department of Salvage Archaeology if the INAH to serve as the work force taking charge of the "protection" and "salvage" of archaeological sites in areas which would be affected by infrastructure projects underway the length and width of the country in the mid-1970s. There were countless salvage archaeology projects related to gas and oil pipelines, highways, dams, subway lines, irrigation canals, and other public works projects. The reality of this crush of work was that in many cases salvage projects were conducted not by experienced archaeologists or by someone with an understanding of what to do. Rather, the norm was to trust the best students as "field supervisors" and the most patient as "laboratory supervisors". What caliber of work could be realized by a handful of highly-politicised students without any idea of archaeological practice?

On the other hand, in spite of a generation of intense field effort by a generation of archaeologists dedicated to salvage archaeology, to this date Mexico does not have even a minimal manual which discusses strategies and techniques for true salvage archaeology, assessing the means to make maximum use of the partial data obtained in such settings, when at the international level since the early 1960s there has been a substantial bibliography (Adams 1968, 1973; Brew 1962; Miller 1957; Wendorf 1962, among others). Here we see the practical consequences of Mexico's version of the "not invented here syndrome" derived from the historical particularism of the Mexican School of Archaeology, i.e, that there is little to be learned from others because circumstances in Mexico are unique and the way we do things is just fine.

The generation of the 1970s and somewhat more recently today are the primary source of INAH personnel for middle and upper echelon positions. In many cases the confusion between theory and practice continues. Worse, in many cases we ignore the utility of coherent political action in the defense of archaeological practice and the conservation of cultural heritage. Sadly we see cases of colleagues who give in to mid-level bureaucrats, forgetting academic work as well as the activist politics they used to believe in order to put themselves completely at the service of government policy. Today this means to give priority to tourism infrastructure and projects which have public visibility. In some cases we see a confusion of pragmatism with servility, believing "…we can satisfy two different loves at the same time: our scientific conscience and our commitments to government and our upward mobility" (Gandara 1992: 165).

The conservation of cultural heritage as a responsibility of the archaeologist

A serious problem confronting government archaeology since its inception is the confusion, stubbornness, or self-serving convenience of treating the disciplines of archaeology and cultural heritage conservation as the same. In this sense government archaeology seeks compliance with the four basic tasks assigned by federal law: protection, conservation, research, and dissemination, tasks with clear legal definition. Nevertheless, neither the law nor archaeological theory argues these four legal responsibilities need to be implemented by a single professional…the archaeologist!

Returning again to historical experience and the origins of the Mexican School, the team assembled by Caso for the exploration of Monte Alban included Jorge R. Acosta, who effectively took over the direction of the reconstruction team. In other sites in the Valley of Oaxaca such as Yagul and Dainzu it was Ignacio Bernal who directed restoration, while in other sites restorations have been based on early architectural surveys by Ignacio Marquina. If they were all archaeologists they also shared the characteristic of having studied architecture or having demonstrated a special talent in this area. What I am trying to make clear here is that it is not sufficient to be an archaeologist to carry out—as if by magic—good restorations, or to guarantee the conservation or archaeological or historical heritage. My argument is that this field needs to be understood and respected as a specialty of archaeology and architecture, that as a discipline which has its own philosophy, methods, techniques, and theories (Brandi 1990; Chanfon 1988; Molina 1975; Schavelson 1990)and it should not be confused with the science of archaeology. This argument is hardly new, as at the international level a range of authors (Cleere 1989; Lipe 1984; McGimpsey and Davis 1977) have shown the difference and provided research leadership on the subject.

What I am arguing here is the need to recognize what is understood elsewhere in the world, that the topic of archaeological resources protection and management is a true specialization and merits respect for its content. This issue reappears in the next chapter. One can make much the same argument for dissemination, as apart from whether or not one is an archaeologist the individual with responsibility for dissemination should have the appropriate training in communications, museum studies, and conservation of cultural materials. Sadly even today we see the directorships or regional museums allocated as political "rewards" or offered to those without preparation or insight in dissemination as payment for political services rendered. This is a topic well worth exploring, but I will continue to center my analysis on the case of archaeological heritage conservation and restoration.

The methodological frameworks inherited from the Mexican School—the same ones we continue to use, although they are now outdated—compel us to think that a "normal" consequence of research on an archaeological project is that the restoration of great monuments should be the work of the dusty, suffering archaeologists engaged in the research itself. Nevertheless, few members of the non-academic public know, and perhaps even fewer in the world of archaeology think about, the lack of preparation among archaeologists to carry out work which forms part of a different discipline. While in Mexico both archaeology and archaeological conservation share an overlapping history, share research interests and respond to certain policy paradigms (Gandara 1992: 162), in practice they have clearly-differentiated methods and theories.

It is only necessary to review the program of study at the ENAH to appreciate the alarming lack of preparation in heritage conservation. For example, during four years of study the class of 1979 had but a single course on pre-Columbian architecture and nothing on building materials or construction systems, much less the theory, methods, and techniques of restoration. Some years later the ENAH developed an elective course in the restoration of pre-Columbian architecture. As of 1989 a student in the eighth semester of archaeology has to take a course in restoration and conservation, and another in resources management and archaeological law (ENAH 1989, 1995). The first course consists of sixty hours of coursework and is essentially a technical review of the physical aspects of deterioration (natural agents, construction materials, soils, packing materials), that is, it is focused on first aid for in situ conservation. The second course—which for the first time in history makes reference to resources management—is in fact designed to address the legal issues in archaeological heritage conservation and the structure of INAH (ENAH 1989: 75, 79). These courses, nevertheless, represent less than 5 percent of the courseload in the major, as preparation for carrying out activities which in one's professional life account for more than 50 percent of the time invested.

The same criticism might be made regarding preparation to deal with social issues associated with archaeological sites. Unfortunately the encounter in Mitla summarized in the first chapter shows clearly how archaeologists and conservarion professionals need to be prepared academically to deal with conflicts with and within communities. For this it is necessary to have a profound understanding of the elements and dynamics of the social setting which interact differently at each site. This knowledge should be acquired systematically as part of the specialization in anthropology, archaeology, or heritage conservation, as part of graduate study, or part of training programs for professionals most likely to need such preparation. At the very least it will facilitate communications between INAH personnel and other social actors, and it may avoid serious problems for INAH staff, the communities, and archaeological sites.

Nevertheless, on reviewing the program of graduate study at INAH's National School of Conservation, Restoration, and Museography, one sees it is very difficult to include anthropology or sociology courses which prepare students for a reality which will be a constant of professional practice. The experience of recent years has been focused on urban aspects and on conservation planning for monumental architecture—which represents a clear advance over earlier, strictly technical topics—(Diaz Berrio 1985, 1986). But it is still a long way from a systematic approach to the social elements and concerns shaping the day-to-day setting of heritage conservation planning and management.

The National Institute of Anthropology and History as the official institution of conservation archaeology

The purpose of creating a single institution which concentrates control over exploration, conservation, and dissemination related to the archaeological and historical heritage of Mexico reflects the context of nationalization of significant natural and cultural resources which was the central political doctrine at the end of the 1930s. This policy characterized the presidency of Lazaro Cardenas, a period which also saw the nationalization of electricity and petroleum, among other resources. In addition it was consistent with a long tradition, dating from the colonial period, of centralizing administrative functions and authority to assure compliance with the wishes of national leaders.

Through the creation of the National Institute of Anthropology and History via a law dated 31 December 1938, to go into effect 3 February 1939 (Olive Negrete 1995: 33), the federal government took absolute control of the management and fate of cultural resources. The law reflected a long national experience in legislating the protection of archaeological and historical monuments (Arrillaga 1864; Lombardo 1988; Olive Negrete 1995). In practice this avoided the possibility that state, municipal, or local governments could issue permits to explore or loot archaeological sites, or that they could otherwise have decision power over the use of historical or archaeological monuments. Theoretically this avoided the "official" looting to which sites in the maya area had been subjected. In addition the federal government reserved for itself the right to decide how monuments and sites might be used, a consideration which initially represented, in part, an educational concern. The strong educational orientation of the formation of INAH can be seen in its location within the Secretary of Education. Specifically, the original functions of INAH were:

A: Exploration of the archaeological zones of the country;
B: The oversight, conservation, and restoration of archaeological, historical, and artistic properties of the country, together with all objects found therein;
C: Scientific and artistic research related to archaeology, history of Mexico, anthropology, and ethnography, particularly of the indigenous population;
D: Publication of materials related to research, exploration, and related activities (Olive Negrete 1995).

Although federal law reserved these functions to INAH, one concern was to encourage collaboration by state and local government for the purpose of research, protection, and dissemination of cultural heritage. With this in mind INAH early created regional centers in Jalisco, Puebla, Veracruz, and Yucatan. Regional museums were located in Guadalajars, Michoacan, Oaxaca, Queretaro, San Luis Potosi, and Villahermosa. A recent institutional history of INAH (Olive Negrete 1995) details its development and people taking key roles across time. Its focus reflects the centralized character of INAH, with its substantive functions concentrated in Mexico City (Figure 1). The regional centers were long so small they were little more than small appendices of the central INAH bureaucracy.

The original bureaus, like the contemporary directorates (at the time this text was written there were four—Archaeology, Historic Monuments, Museums, and Research—but post-1996 reorganizations of INAH have more than doubled this number), were located in different INAH buildings in the center of Mexico City. The professional and academic life of INAH likewise was concentrated in the city. At first, to respond to urgent calls advising of destruction or looting anywhere in the country it was necessary to send someone working in Mexico City. Similarly, to carry out research the team arrived from Mexico City, worked, and finally returned to its point of origin. The "normal" depository for archaeological finds would be the National Museum, in keeping with the substantive functions of research, protection, and dissemination of the archaeological heritage. Although the expansion of INAH's representation across Mexico through the creation of state offices means much of the protection and conservation activity has been decentralized, INAH's central administration in Mexico City still exerts strong influence over research through the project approval process and budget control.

Today archaeology is managed as one of the most important areas of the INAH, and there are those who consider it the "public face" of the Institute vis-a-vis national and international publics. Internally it is organized in pyramidal fashion with vertical decision-making. For example, the Directorate of Pre-Columbian Monuments might have under its responsibility the Department of Prehistory, which in turn would have the laboratories of geology, soils, or paleobotany. Over time the inevitable reorganizations have merged some units, created others, and redistributed functions and responsibilities. In the 1960s the Archaeological Salvage Section was created, but given its workload and significance eventually it was raised to a sub-directorate. Restoration of Cultural Heritage has also moved upward on the organization chart (Garcia Barcena 1995: 130). And there is the need for administrative structures and processes to handle the day-to-day flow of work: laboratories to run, public programming, conservation and maintenance of areas open to the public, reporting and documentation, planning, and all the other tasks. In the end the entire management structure depends on and is expected to serve the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historical Monuments and Zones (INAH 1980) and the Organic Law of INAH (INAH 1980), and their respective regulations.

Coordination and oversight of all archaeological projects carried out in Mexico, whether by INAH archaeologists, archaeologists from other institutions (e.g.,National Autonomous University of Mexico, University of Veracruz), or by foreign archaeologists engaged in research must pass through the Council of Archaeology. This is an advisory panel with academic and technical functions charged with establishing norms applicable to all archaeological research in the country (Garcia Barcena 1995). Before research begins all projects must receive Council approval, and on-going projects require periodic and final reports. Without Council support archaeological research is virtually impossible.

Today the Directorate for Archaeology provides INAH's overall policy and administrative guidance for the field. In turn it is divided into sub-directorates by specialties: Archaeological Studies, Underwater Archaeology, Academic Services, Public Registry, and Salvage Archaeology (Figure 2). The functions supported by these offices are those with operational implications at the state level, and the expectation is that the sub-directorates provide advice, support, and guidance when solicited. This top-down flow reinforces the general idea the INAH centers at the state level are fundamentally executors of decisions made at higher levels.

At the very base of the organizational pyramid lie the 136 archaeological zones open to the public. The zones, dependent on their respective state offices of INAH, are "…one of the principal means to make public the archaeological heritage and also to preserve it"

(Garcia Barcena 1995: 135). Projects for research, conservation, maintenance, or dissemination in a zone most be approved by the Council of Archaeology in terms of their substance, while budget approval must come from the Directorate of Archaeology and the Administrative Secretary. The archaeological zones collect admissions fees paid by visitors but turn them over to the Secretary of Finance, which then redistributes such income in the form of salaries to INAH workers or to finance projects. Unfortunately this arrangement does not always guarantee that a zone generating income will receive the minimum necessary for its operations and cleaning during the year.

Given the demographic growth and other changes in the country the original structure and operational arrangements of INAH were no longer adequate to deal with new circumstances, and in the 1970s it was decided to expand the number of regional offices. At first the expectation was that each office would serve several states, but in 1992 it was decided each state would have its INAH center, and that is the arrangement in effect today. INAH's Oaxaca Center was created in 1972 as the Oaxaca Regional Center, with specific responsibility to address problems of conservation in the archaeological zones and in the historic district of the city of Oaxaca. Today INAH Oaxaca is the second largest state office in Mexico, with approximately fifty permanent staff and about the same number on temporary or fixed-term contracts. Under certain circumstances, such as the Monte Alban Special Project, the workforce may grow substantially as staff are added for the duration of the funding.

Although a center of major importance in the country because of the remains of a mosaic of pre-Columbian cultures, INAH has in Oaxaca only eight permanent archaeologists to look after and catalog the nearly 10,000 archaeological sites in the state. This includes maintaining in good condition the 12 archaeological zones open to the public, carrying out research projects around Oaxaca, disseminating information about Oaxaca archaeology with the goal of building public awareness, providing sporadic curation service to the Regional Museum of Oaxaca, reviewing proposed infrastructure or public works projects to be carried out by other agencies to make sure they do not damage archaeological resources, and above all, responding to reports of destruction or looting as well as carry out salvage archaeology around the state, something necessary on a daily basis. The only practical strategy to address as much as possible has been through short, focused projects distributed among the archaeologists based on interest and skills, attending only the most urgent and necessary projects. Anything less urgent is repeatedly postponed, which includes, of course, any sistematically planned academic research.

Government archaeologists as a social group

As noted at the beginning of this study, a principal concern of the research is to identify individuals or social groups affecting in some way the archaeological resources of the country. For obvious reasons one of the most influential groups are government archaeologists, that is, the archaeologists working for INAH. It is worth remembering that except for a handful of academic archaeologists employed in a few universities, all the archaeologists working professionally in Mexico do so through INAH, which makes membership in this group so important.

Some interviews with archaeologists of the INAH Oaxaca Center provide us with points of reference regarding different spheres of activity in relationship to archaeological heritage. First, it is important to note that patterns of behavior and attitude are not uniform. One group has a strong orientation toward the union which speaks for professional employees and is very attentive to professional matters as well as personnel issues. Collective concerns and a high value attached to solidarity mean individual preferences are subsumed by group norms. This group tends to be critical of projects seen as facilitating exploitation of archaeological heritage for the tourist trade. A second group tends to be less likely to participate in the union, more individualistic, and more inclined to address projects driven by government policy. In general archaeologists favoring this perspective seek pragmatic accomodation with projects offering funding, status, and opportunities to pursue personal agendas.

Second, the archaeologists feel themselves isolated from others in anthropology, to the point of having almost no academic contact with the social anthropologists, ethnographers, ethnohistorians, and linguists working in the same center. This estrangement has two sources. One has to do with different allocations of time, as archaeological heritage conservation keeps them in the field 70 percent of the time. The second source is that the archaeologists of the Oaxaca Center consider the other specialists—most of whom hold a masters or doctorate—as belonging to a different social class.

There is some irony in the fact that despite this separation from the anthropologists, ethnographers, and others they see themselves using ethnographic methods and understanding which come not from books but from experience. Negotiating agreements for heritage protection implies close contact with municipal authorities and other community leaders, and also requires managing conflict, or searching for ways to avoid it. But there is no systematic sharing of skills and knowledge which might make their responsibilities easier to manage or draw other specialists into this challenging topic.

Third, in general the archaeologists report significant difficulties in staying current with the profession or enhancing their academic preparation. They may spend up to 30 percent of their time reading at home as the library at the INAH Oaxaca Center, which at one time was the most complete library regarding research on the state, has degenerated to a semi-public consulting center for high school students. The collection has been pilfered to the point where it is almost useless to search for specialized material. Most of the archaeologists do not read English or any other foreign language. They have little contact with the foreign scholars who come to Oaxaca for summer research. In part this is due to a sense that much of the research is not germaine to community concerns, and in part to an apparent lack of interest on the part of foreigners regarding interaction with local archaeologists.

The Oaxaca Center does not have an ongoing program of professional development, and the archaeologists have not been able to create an atmosphere which encourages the personal or institutional investment. There is little general or theoretical discussion. Fortunately there are a number of research centers and universities in Oaxaca, so the most interested are afforded opportunities to participate in academic and professional exchange with people sharing some, although not all, of the same interests. In general terms the academic context of archaeological heritage conservation in Oaxaca is truly worrisome. Without denying the tendency for interviewees to be sensitive to the difficulties challenging them, we need to note a high percentage of archaeologists from across the country, and especially from the state offices, share these concerns.

It is evident that when talking about archaeological remains there exist a multiplicity of conceptualizations at several historic, economic, and social levels and that these will define the attitudes of different social actors. As an example, for a high level official of the federal government in Mexico City and for a Zapotec peasant the same archaeological object will have completely different meanings. There exists a comparable discontinuity between the Spanish conquistador who sought only to extract material riches from Indian monuments and then destroy them, and the contemporary protector of cultural heritage who defends to the bitter end the continuity and authenticity of the archaeological monument against any agent which could damage or alter it.

Field experience in the practice of conservation archaeology reveals a substantial range of interpretation as to the significance and value of archaeological sites. These are grounded in the nature of the appropriation different social groups make of archaeological materials as different resources. Thus, the archaeological site which for an academic is a research site for a tourist guide is a source of livelihood, for a campesino a field to cultivate, and for a newly-arrived resident in a community the only place to establish a homesite. The physical spaces archaeological zones occupy, therefore, are defined in different manners by different social groups. In this sense the interpretation may range from archaeological site to tourist center, place of employment, tillable ground, community lands, ejidos, sources of construction materials, infrastructure right-of-way, private property, and "the only piece of land" certain social sectors may ever own.

Archaeological Zones as Collective Resources

The broadest argument for the defense and protection of the archaeological heritage is that it forms part of a universal heritage given its significance for human history in general. The most relevant sites for understanding this history, and whose disappearance would be an irreparable loss for the entire world, are enrolled on the World Heritage List (UNESCO 1978). This List, a tangible result of the UNESCO Convention of 1972, seeks to avoid the disappearance of such sites and to conserve the most significant legacy of past civilizations, and the most inspiring of natural landscapes (UNESCO 1978). It is, of course, a high distinction for any site to be included on this universal listing, which by 1987 had reached 288 sites and has grown considerably in recent years.

Monte Alban has had World Heritage Site status since its declaration by UNESCO in 1987. Its importance, both historical and as an archaeological monument, was decided by the designated bodies (INAH, ICOMOS) through its nomination for World Heritage status via a proposal and supporting documentation prepared in 1984 (Archaeology Section Archives, INAH CRO). This distinction indicates the importance and great interest the site enjoys at the international level. At the national level it is considered one of the most significant and attractive sites in Mexico due to its impressive monumental architecture and spectacular location. It attracted a noteworthy list of 19th century European and American travelers, e.g., Eduard Muhlenfordt (1830), Juan Bautista Carriedo (1833), Johan von Muller (1857), Desire Charney (1884), and William Henry Holmes (1895), whose descriptions and graphics even today serve as useful academic references (Robles 1993: 70).

At the local level Monte Alban constitutes one of the great sources of pride for the heirs of the Zapotec culture. Although it is obvious the mestizo culture which prevails in the Valley of Oaxaca today lost its direct cultural relation with Monte Alban, the monumental quality of the site represents a tangible sample of a splendid past that must have been better. From this pride springs a certain effusive display among Oaxacans at the level of culture and politics; the slogan "Oaxaca: Heritage of Humanity" equally serves to give a particular touch to high level political discourse and to promote some form of business. But this is not true in terms of individual behavior, where despite a recognition archaeological resources are valuable and important, they are also nothing more than a piece of tillable land or a place to build living quarters, even where not permitted.

Mitla is the representative site of the postclassic period in the Valley of Oaxaca, with its most distinctive cluster of buildings corresponding to the period Monte Alban V (Caso, Bernal, and Acosta 1967; Kowalewski, et al, 1989). In a sense it bridges part of the period between the decline of Monte Alban and the arrival of the Spanish. Mitla's original configuration has been amply described (Alvarez 1900; Batres 1908; Muhlenfordt 1984; Holmes 1895; Caso 1936; Bernal 1956; Magadan 1984; Robles and Moreira 1990). In general terms it has been characterized as a city-state whose five groups or clusters of monumental buildings represent at least two periods of use, with two (South Group and Adobe Group) corresponding to early classic or Monte Alban IIIB, and three corresponding to Monte Alban V or what Alfonso Caso labelled the "Mixtec" period (the Arroyo, Columns, and North Groups).These monumental clusters constitute tangible evidence that a significant Zapotec community lived there at the time the Spaniards arrived, and they amazed Europeans such as Alonso de Canseco, Francisco de Burgoa, Francisco de Ajofrin, and Jose Antonio Gay (Magadan 1984: 65).

The pre-Columbian monuments of Mitla have a worldwide fame especially because of the aesthetic beauty of the architecture and ornamentation of the more recent or postclassic clusters. The group known as the Hall of the Columns has been the particular focus of millions of visitors such the beginning of the nineteenth century. The presence of friezes and tableros consisting of diverse geometric motifs assembled from tiny pieces of stone which contrast in the most complementary manner with enormous monolithic elements weighing several tons forming the lintels and columns, supports and burial chambers, have been among the visited tourist attractions in Oaxaca.

Monte Alban and Mitla as Themes in the Fields of Archaeology and Restoration

These are the two most important archaeological sites in the state of Oaxaca for two reasons. First…as mentioned previously…they are the reference points for key phases in Oaxacan archaeology and as such have served as the basis for defining cultural sequences (Caso 1932, 1938, 1939, 1967; Paddock 1966; Blanton 1978). Second, they are representative of cultural resources of the region. For these reasons they are considered by archaeologists as the two sites representative of the Classic and Postclassic periods in the Valley of Oaxaca.

Both sites stirred interest because of the monumental character of their architecture. Mitla was the focus of the first effort at restoration and exploration on the American continent, undertaken between 1897 and 1902 by Leopoldo Batres, who was the official archeologist of the long dictatorial regime of Porfirio Diaz. In terms of restoration Batres dedicated himself to reconstruct, with license, the most impressive monumental sites, among them Mitla, Teotihuacan, and Xochicalco. His exploration style made use of excessive and brutal methods as tools of "archaeological excavation" (Schavelson 1990: 64). The objectives of Batres—consistent with the politics of the time—were to justify the exploitation of the indigenous population by showing the monuments as a requiem for dead, long-past cultures lacking connections to the present. Even so we need to recognize that with him is born the practice of restoration of archaeological monuments in Mexico and on the continent (Schavelson 1990: 48), a practice by all means novel, with the merit of having opened the field of the discipline in the context of Mexican science during this period.

Equally important was the exploration and restoration of Monte Alban carried out between 1930 and 1958 by Alfonso Caso. This defines the second grand moment in Mexican archaeology and restoration known as the "Golden Age", to which I have referred previously. This period is known for the careful weighing of archaeological data collected in a systematic manner, a practice which permitted Caso to propose a fine chronology for Monte Alban which continues in use to this day (Caso 1967). At the level of restoration the practice of monumental reconstruction continued, but now with more of a socialist vision which implied returning the pre-Columbian past to the community for its educational benefit. In this sense Caso and his team put a lot of emphasis in leaving clearly differentiated the original finds and the reconstructed segments, an effort which today permits us to "read" correctly the architecture of the buildings.

Description of Monte Alban

This is the most important archaeological zone in Oaxaca and represents the central focus in the interpretation and development of the ancient Oaxacans. In brief, Monte Alban is a pre-Columbian city which was built and occupied from about 500 B.C. to approximately 750 A.D. It has been described as an urban-ceremonial complex dispersed across in clusters across the tops of hills; the Main Plaza, Atzompa, El Gallo, Little Monte Alban and Mogollito (Blanton 1978: 3). This description is based on the extensive field survey Blanton coordinated in 1971 to define with greater precision the size of the site, documenting that around the areas mentioned there are a series of residential and cultivation terraces, and these are interpreted as the basis of the economy and food production for the population. Blanton and his team located 2073 terraces in an area of 6.5 square kilometers (Blanton 1987: 7).

The areas of monumental construction of palaces and terraces which form Monte Alban are located at the tops of the hills, while the terraces represent areas of daily peasant and artisan life. Monte Alban is the obligatory reference point when discussing ceremonial centers in Oaxaca, as it is related directly in period, form, and style with the ceremonial center at Teotihuacan. This site has been interpreted as the center of religious, political, and economic power for the Oaxacan region, in which there existed a firmly established social differentiation (Acosta 1965; Bernal 1965; Caso and Bernal 1965; Blanton 1978; Flannery and Marcus 1976; Paddock 1966). Its principal academic importance resides in the fact that its long history of human occupation permitted the establishment of a ceramic sequence in five periods classified as I, II, IIIa, IIIb, IV, and V (Caso 1965), the same which to the present day structures the chronological studies of the area. Winter (1989) defines Monte Alban as the first ceremonial center and eventually the largest in Oaxaca.

The first archaeological research projects at Monte Alban were carried out by Alfonso Caso as of 1931, concentrating on the main plaza. These early explorations defined the area and facilitated the reconstruction of temples and palaces for purposes narrated earlier. Its impressive monumental character has made the main plaza the object of admiration of generations of scholars and ordinary visitors. Various travelers in the 19th century left descriptions of the appearance of the monuments in this part of the site but little comment about the rest, which as the less striking were always treated as having a secondary status. This fact has had its consequences to the present, especially when attempting to conserve the site with a modern integrated perspective.

In contrast, the most recent criterion for determining the boundaries of the Monte Alban site was that developed by the Blanton team on the basis of the obvious presence of residential and farming terraces, including a band several hundred meters wide surveyed to determine the presence of archaeological materials (Blanton 1978: 15) (Figure 3). This version of the site's area served as the basis both for its official boundary-setting (SRPMZA) and for its inclusion in the World Heritage List (UNESCO 1987). While the focus of the research and the reconstruction of the monumental character of the main plaza is obvious to the visitor or local resident, the questions asked and the techniques used by Blanton are far less so. As we will see, the same qualities which link the observations of early visitors and more recent generations of research archaeologists, i.e, the monumentality of the main plaza, make it more difficult to appreciate the contributions and significance of new approaches to site assessment.

Description of Mitla

Although its location in the Tlacolula Valley shows human habitation since the prehistoric period (Flannery 1983), this pre-Columbian community is the representative site of Monte Alban V in the chronology of the Oaxaca Valley (Caso 1967; Blanton et al 1982). The orginal configuration of the city during this later period has been described in a number of the works mentioned earlier. The five monumental groups of Mitla constitute tangible evidence of a central urban core which we know, based on recent research (Kowaleski et al 1989; Robles and Moreira 1990; Robles 1994), was a part of a large city with well-defined areas of activity. The pre-Columbian residential areas were located south of the monumental clusters, along both sides of the river. Today what were once major zones of human habitation and daily life are completely covered by the modern houses of contemporary Zapotec residents.

Beyond this urban center one finds the fortresses, or the defensive walls which crown some of the hills surrounding the city. To date three of these have been documented (Robles 1989). Another significant activity in the area outside the city were the quarries and workshops for stone used in construction. To date eight such sites have been located, some several miles from where the stone was later used. We now need to see pre-Columbian Mitla as a fortified city located on the edge of the Oaxaca Valley, with a strong commercial and political influence over the surrounding area and even to more distant points (Robles 1994: 7). Thus recent findings alter in a definitive way the earlier view of the monumental core of Mitla as its sole focus. This now must give way to a more complex and complete version of a pre-Columbian city (Figures 4 and 5).

The other reality of Mitla as a human settlement stems from the vestiges of the colonial period. This historical period has been amply described in recent works by authors such as Robles, et al, 1987; Magadan 1984; and Robles and Moreira, 1990, whose discussions have been based on the analysis of historic documents and physical evidence compiled through observation and archaeological techniques. This research shows us the nature of the colonial period in Mitla as of the 16th century, with the Conquest imposed on a living community cruelly subjugated by Spanish rule. It was forced to destroy its religious buildings to give legitimacy, space, and importance to new construction by the Catholic religion (Robles and Moreira 1990: 54). The physical result of this imposition is demonstrated by buildings such as the church of San Pablo, which was constructed on a pre-Columbian palace of the North Group, and the Chapel of the Calvary, erected on the summit of the principal platform of the Adobe Group.

The historical experience is clearly evident in the urban fabric of the modern community, where pre-Columbian, colonial, and contemporary architecture create a complex challenge for interpretation. Confronted by this overlapping of different historical periods, the boundary-setting for the archaeological zone used as its criterion the delimitation of monumental areas by following the layout of current urban streets, an issue to be addressed in the next chapter (SRPMZA 1993).

Archaeological Zones as Tourism Resources

The result of the two principal periods of monumental reconstruction has been that today the archaeological zones treated in this fashion form part of the system of tourist resources of the country, along with other cultural and natural attractions such as historic centers, ethnic elements or "folklore", artistic events, beaches, or forests. After World War II the tourism phenomenon acquired a positive feedback, that is, owing to improvements in transportation and other technologies the tourist flow grew substantially, motivating governments to address it as part of economic growth. Resources such as archaeological zones which had filled a function of reinforcing national values and identity in Mexico became sources of income for the state, which sells the opportunity to enjoy them like any other commodity (Schavelson 1990: 224).

There are no systematic studies which reflect the development of a tourist presence in the archaeological zones which interest us, as on the one hand it is not a central concern for INAH, and on the other those responsible for managing national tourism are very confident of a continuing and growing success of archaeology as a tourist resource. To date there are no publications on the subject with trustworthy data, primarily because the personnel charged with keeping these data are the INAH custodial staff, for whom this is one more task in the daily routine and for which they have received no specific training. There are entire days with high tourist flow owing to free admission—Sundays and holidays archaeological zones and museums are free of charge—so the custodians prefer to close the ticket booth and shift their activities to security and supervision of key points. The result is an entire day without data on visitor flow. The same happens when available blocks of tickets are exhausted; the custodians close the ticket counter and provide free entry to the zone. It was not until 1994 that Monte Alban had an administrator to oversee these aspects of income and management, and not until 1995 in Mitla.

One would expect respective agencies at the federal and state levels would establish mechanisms for collection and analysis of data to track use of archaeological zones and what they need for effective operation. Nevertheless, the reality is that the Secretary of Tourism Development depends on and trusts the data collected by INAH, as incomplete as these are. In practice there is little systematic study of tourism, as the operating assumption seems to be that the visitor flow will continue regardless of circumstances and the degree of attention given to it. And to the extent archaeological zone management responds more to the changing winds of policy direction from Mexico City and the preferences of top policy-makers, rather than being based on data analysis, then there is no point in wasting scarce resources on an information process which will not be used.

From different sources we can make some estimates of visitor flow to the two zones, taking into account certain constraints on data reliability. To the factors mentioned above one must add an admissions policy which provides free entry to archaeological zones for students, teachers, children, and senior citizens. Sunday no-one pays an admissions charge, not even foreign tourists. In September, 1929, 220 visitors are reported for Mitla and 38 for Monte Alban, while in May, 1931, the respective figures were 65 visitors to Mitla and 304 to Monte Alban (Schavelson 1990: 122). In May, 1994, Monte Alban received 4497 recorded visitors, and in September of the same year 7722 visitors (Archives of the Monte Alban Archaeological Zone 1994). By the end of the 1990s in peak periods more visitors arrived at Monte Alban in a single day than in an entire year six decades earlier. In global terms Monte Alban received more than 300,000 visitors in 1995, while Mitla received about 200,000(Administrative Archives, INAH CRO).

These figures give us an idea as how the flow of visitors has grown across time, And with that flow the significance of revenue generated, given that each visitor to Monte Alban pays an entry fee of twenty pesos, while visitors to Mitla pay twelve. The increasing revenues help to explain a growing official interest in closer attention to these figures. There are limited data in the files of INAH's Oaxaca Regional Center which show changes in visitation over time (Figures 6 and 7).

The growth in visitor numbers and revenues notwithstanding, as archaeological zones are part of the federal government INAH until 1998 had no authority to manage revenues directly. Income from entrance fees is channeled to the Secretary of Revenues to form part of the national budget. Although in 1995 Monte Alban generated more than 4.5 million pesos and Mitla nearly 2 million pesos, at times the Oaxaca Regional Center lacked funds for even minimal maintenance. While this policy is understandable from some perspectives, at the practical level it means the archaeological resources used by tourism have to absorb without maintenance the degradation—many times irreversible—caused by such use.

It is equally important to point out that in spite of the noteworthy growth in tourism, and that its promotion has become an important part of government policy vis-a-vis INAH and the Secretary of Tourism, with few exceptions there is little long-range planning for conservation. A few sites such as Cacaxtla or the Templo Mayor have received some of the infrastructure needed to reduce degradation caused by constant use, e.g., walkways and railings, but these are the exceptions. The result is that while more visitors generate more income they also generate greater deterioration through increased use of the original architectural elements such as floors, stairs, walls, or tombs, yet there is little recognition of this in the allocation of funds and human resources. For 1995 at Monte Alban, with the 4.5 million pesos in revenue mentioned ealier, the budget for conservation and research was 50,000 pesos, and in Mitla for the same year it was 5000 pesos.

Tourist visitation at Monte Alban centers on the Main Plaza and nearby structures, an area of a few hectares, and it is to this sector that maintenance and conservation resources flow. The other monumental sites such as Cerro El Gallo, Atzompa, and others have no specific priority and do not even receive regular security checks against looting and vandalism. As a consequence tourists receive an exceptionally limited notion of the site. In Mitla tourism concentrates around the Hall of the Columns, a space of less than a hectare, which receives the full brunt of increasing visitor traffic on its original and delicate elements.

Perhaps the most significant effect is that the average resident of the state and of communities surrounding these sites see in INAH's management behavior and budgetary practices confirmation of their own perceptions that the archaeological zones in reality consist of nothing more than the monumental structures. INAH's claims to have a protective responsibility over the archaeological resources of a larger area seem inconsistent with how it behaves, making such claims appear illogical, perverse, or grounded in darker motives. One might think that archaeological sites not open to the public are at least spared the deterioration caused by tourist visitation. But the reality is that the lack of attention signals an absence of institutional commitment, and contributes to the invasion or destruction of sites not included in plans for tourism development. Thus the critical dilemma is that increasing visitor use may speed deterioration of sites because it is not mitigated by increased conservation, but an absence of visitors encourages other abuse and a perception such sites are unimportant.

Archaeological Zones as Community Economic Resources

Within Mexican national territory it would be difficult to find a piece of land without an owner, or which is not under the jurisdiction of an individual or an institution. For this reason, in discovering or rediscovering archaeological sites archaeologists are also discovering property systems and land use rights associated with the places those sites are found. Clusters of monumental structures, public spaces, and areas of everyday or domestic use need to be understood in terms of their relationships to each other and to the places which surround them. Nevertheless, once abandoned, whether previously monumental structures, modest dwellings, or cultivated fields, their previous value and significance may largely disappear with the subsequent arrival of new owners or users. These then adapt, displace, or ignore the vestiges of previous use.

We know that the residential and agricultural areas of pre-Columbian Mitla and Monte Alban began to have new uses in the colonial period, if not before. The founding of San Juan Chapultepec as a "Pueblo be Indios" (Indian community) on the lower slopes of southeast Monte Alban dates back to 1523, at the very beginning of the colonial period (Taylor 1990: 159). There exists a map from 1760 which clearly shows this settlement on the slope leading up to the pre-Columbian city. In the case of Mitla the history is similar, as with the construction of the colonial religious structures on the pre-Columbian palaces and temples (Robles, et al, 1987; Robles and Moreira 1990) the latter lost their sacred character. Buildings were destroyed and their spaces began to serve other uses. In the middle of the nineteenth century the pre-Columbian buildings were still outside the community (Magadan 1984: 195). But the boundary the river posed for urban growth lasted only until the end of the century, when urban sprawl began to pass this natural barrier to expand toward the monumental zone, as may be seen in a map made by Batres in 1900 (Figure 9).

For the contemporary communities surrounding both sites the monumental and lesser spaces are totally susceptible to some use, whether this is for cultivation, residence, grazing, extraction of materials, or some other use. For this reason those responsible for managing collective tenure systems began to divide these spaces into communal lands, ejidos, or even private property on some occasions. For both sites the presence of nearby human settlements poised a latent threat in that some day population growth or new uses would generate increased pressures on the land. And in fact a variety of information sources, from aerial photographs, old maps, and ground surveys, show this is what has happened.

Contemporary Settlements in Archaeological Zones

Monte Alban: The areas which surround the monumental structures, and even sometimes spaces within them, as within the Main Plaza, were used from the colonial period, if not before, for agricultural purposes. Communities such as santa Maria Atzompa, Hacienda Montoya, San Martin Mexicapam, Santa Maria Xoxocotlan, Arrazola, San Pedro Ixtlahuaca, Los Audelo y Tiracoz, and even the city of Oaxaca, took pieces for use at different moments. Collectively this generated intensive use of the archaeological areas for agricultural activities and grazing, with at least the possibility of invasion for reasons of urban growth.

In 1931, when Alfonso Caso initiated his explorations, he proceeded to arrange the expropriation of the monumental zone we know today as the Main Plaza, at that time considered ejidal lands of Xoxocotlan and San Martin Mexicapam, which used them for cultivation. This boundary and expropriation today we recognize as very limited, representing less than 10 percent of the area covered by the ancient city. But at the time it probably unimaginable that urban growth would someday create problems for the site. Photographs from the 1940s show the slopes of Monte Alban dedicated to cultivation, the access road opened by Caso, and no signs of human habitation (Figure 10). An unpublished map by the Institute of Geography prepared in 1948 (Figure 11) shows how the urban development of the city of Oaxaca was still some distance from the natural boundary of the Rio Atoyac, which also defined the lowest limits of the terraced area of Monte Alban.

At the beginning of the 1970s the urban invasion of the east slopes of Monte Alban began, a result of the growth of the city of Oaxaca and the multiplication of migration movements which characterize recent years (Rees 199l). At first settlements in the area were of very poor quality construction, without papers of any kind, characteristic of squatter settlements and lost cities (Butterworth 1973). Stopping this type of construction was a constant concern for INAH's Oaxaca office, which constantly sent archaeologists to stop construction, prepare assessments, and present complaints for destruction of cultural heritage to federal judicial authorities. During his survey in 1971 Blanton commented on the difficulty his team had to define the boundaries of the site in areas where the impact of urban growth fell on the archaeological area, as with new settlements such as "May 3rd" in Xoxocotlan (Blanton 1978:19).

Although in 1974 there were still significant parcels of cultivated land on the banks of the Rio Atoyac as well as on the lower slopes of the hills of Atzompa and Monte Alban (Figure 12), these were under increasing pressure. By 1982 urban spawl had begun to envelop parts of Monte Alban, as indicated in a map prepared by INEGI (Figure 13). By 1995 the settlements around Monte Alban had multiplied and formalized (Figure 14). On the slopes one finds squatter settlements, new neighborhoods without urban services, formal government subdivisions, with a wide range of types of housing construction for middle class families grouped in more established neighborhoods. The settlements have now moved beyond the protective boundary line established by presidential decree as an Archaeological Monuments Zone on the basis of the study carried out by INAH in 1992 (SEDESOL 1996: 4).

Those settlements now on the fringes of the archaeological zone include 3 neighborhoods and 2 subdivisions on communal lands on San Martin Mexicapam; 5 neighborhoods on communal lands in San Juan Chapulterpec; 6 neighborhoods on communal lands of Xoxocotlan; 1 neighborhood on the ejido of Arrazola; 1 agencia municipal of Atzompa; 6 neighborhoods on the ejido and communal lands of Atzompa; and 1 neighborhood on communal lands of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca (SEDESOL 1996: 4). In addition there are 3 open air trash dumps, one of which is just south of the archaeological zone boundary and the other two in nearby neighborhoods. Looting and intentional destruction of archaeological remains have been identified in Xoxocotlan, the hill at Atzompa, and other sites at dispersed locations (SEDESOL 1996). Overgrazing and overcutting affect 60 percent of the land within the official boundary, particularly on the lands of Xoxocotlan, Atzompa, and the hill of el Gallo.

It is clear the areas surrounding Monte Alban are heavily used by local residents for a range of purposes, and for recent arrivals may be their only alternative to have the security of their own roof. The official boundary-setting of INAH carried out in 1992 took into account those settlements which were found to be "formalized" as of that date, for which reason on the east slope the boundary line was adjusted in many cases, byond the walls of existing houses or along streets which marked the limits of urban growth (Paredes 1992).

Mitla: In 1984 Marcelo Magadan conducted exhaustive research on the urban evolution of Mitla beginning in 1930, the year of the first urban survey of the community (Magadan 1984: 199-209). Between 1930 and 1964 the pattern for growth was, in descending order; south, northwest, east, and northeast (Magadan 1984: 199) (Figures 15 and 16). In 1974 (Figure 17) growth was relatively balanced in all directions with a slightly higher tendency toward the south and southeast owing to the presence of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (Magadan 1984: 200). By 1980 (Figure 18) the tendency was to the east, west, and north, while in 1983 (Figure 19) the growth was primarily to the west and north (Magadan 1984: 200). From the 1930s to the early 1970s it appears growth moved toward the main road from the city of Oaxaca to the Mixe region, but for the past generation it has focused on the archaeological zone.

After the early 1980s the pattern for growth in Mitla has been to fill empty space and to grow to the north, where it has materially "choked" the pre-Columbian and colonial monuments (Figure 20). In 1993 the official boundary-setting had to be laid out following the perimeters of city lots and streets, leaving within the protective zone a substantial built environment, and much construction underway. Today the growth toward the north appears to be an uncontrollable fact (Figure 21) , as is the subdivision of original house tracts for distribution at the family level. The first phenomenon distorts the landscape and original setting of the pre-Columbian and colonial structures, while the second principally damages the architectural integrity of houses from different periods. Adding the two together creates a dynamic of irreversible degeneration of cultural resources in Mitla.

As in the case of Monte Alban, the urban growth pattern of Mitla responds primarily to the stimulus of economic resources, as the majority of the population lives from the tourism generated by the archaeological zone.

Conflict in Archaeological Preservation

As noted in the short case presented in the first chapter, archaeological practice and heritage preservation in these contexts are potential causes of social conflicts which may appear in a wide range of situations and in a variety of forms. Since the creation of the Oaxaca Regional Center in 1972, and even before, there were acts of resistance by some communities opposed to archaeologists carrying out their institutional work. Here "resistance" follows Scott's usage, as he includes whatever act by members of a subordinate class to mitigate or subvert demands (services, taxes, rents) made by a superior class, among which one can include government (Scott 1985: 20).

Probably the most concrete example of such resistance to archaeological practice in the state of Oaxaca is the dramatic, ongoing conflict in Zaachila, which sometimes has reached the point of fomenting disturbances which degenerate into jailing of the archaeologists, threats of lynching or other forms of death threats directed to the archaeologists, pushing, verbal abuse, and other threats. For example, during the exploration of burial sites in the 1960s it was necessary to request the continuing presence of the Mexican army (Gallegos y Romano, personal communication). On a personal note, I was involved in one of these disturbances in 1980, when a group of archaeologists sought to secure rubbings of designs on stelae abandoned in a park in Zaachila. A furious crowd gathered, disputing our right to carry out the project, threatened us physically, and in the end the mayor jailed us as the only way to save us from serious harm. As INAH has extended its presence in the state and sought to carry out more systematic documentation of archaeological sites, community resistance has become the dominant factor in Zaachila's relationship with the institution.

The conflict which emerges as INAH seeks to carry out specific protection of the archaeological heritage in such circumstances can assume a variety of forms, and these can be grouped in two broad categories for analysis:

1. direct opposition or resistance, with an overtly negative stance; and
indirect or discrete opposition, dissembling, delay, lack of cooperation
2. Open opposition or resistance to archaeological conservation is readily identified through the aggressively negative posture adopted by community actors. In turn this takes two forms. The first of these is the "tumulto", or disturbance, which in serious cases becomes a riot. Violent, spontaneous encounters, as between two communities in conflict over a tract of land, are characteristic of rural life in Oaxaca (Dennis 1990: 142). On repeated occasions archaeologists have found themselves on the verge of such disturbances in communities whose residents interpret surveys, materials samples, test pits, or other activities as abuse of institutional authority, or the preparations for same. This response is particularly likely in reaction to projects intended for public spaces, e.g., streets, churches, plazas, or community lands.

In a typical disturbance members of the community assemble rapidly in response to a frantic ringing of the church bell. These assemblies manifest a form of social equality in that there is no formal leadership, nor is any deference given to elected authority. Rumor and allegation, in the social context of the anonymity of the crowd, gives way to arguments, insults, shouting, and ungrounded claims based on variants of "everyone knows" or "we've heard". Rarely is there a disposition to listen to the archaeologist«s explanation, and the lack of group leadership means there is no-one with whom to negotiate. Even respecting the intervention of community leadership, as in the Zaachila example mentioned earlier, is op The goals of the disturbance are to intimidate the target into ceasing work and to leave the community, and to persuade INAH the organizational cost of persisting with a plan or project is too high to be worthwhile.

Disturbances are more likely where there exists a strong sense of community solidarity, a tradition of opposition to outside intervention, or prior negative experience (from the community's perspective) with INAH or other institutional actors. Mitla is a good example, and there were disturbances over archaeological conservation activities in Mitla in 1985, 1987, and 1993. Xoxocotlan has responded in a similar fashion in 1992 and 1994 to INAH's boundary-setting projects at Monte Alban.

In some cases local residents resort to blocking access to sites or threatening archaeologists seeking to enter private lands, ejidos, or other property. In Mitla, where specific locations of the site are surrounded by houses or difficult of access, residents may simply refuse to cooperate. In Xoxocotlan, in disputes over archaeological zone boundaries and destruction of archaeological remains, members of the ejido threatened to kill INAH personnel who attempted to enter ejido lands (resident of Xoxocotlan, personal communication). A different form of blockage has to do with verbal communication. This is a common strategy among indigenous groups in Oaxaca, where a significant segment of the rural population still speak indigenous languages. Local residents or authorities will suddenly forget how to speak Spanish, or shift to an indigenous language to hide discussions of strategy or to coordinate responses. In Mitla it is common for municipal officials to shift to Zapotec to complicate communications or to ridicule INAH personnel.

In some cases resistance may come not from the entire community but from a specific group of actors affected by an INAH decision or activity, e.g., ejido members or people living in a given location. Such groups may insist INAH negotiate with them directly, even appearing in large numbers without notice at the Oaxaca Regional Office as a means of pressuring administrative staff. Some groups may look for strategic allies, including sympathetic political figures or members of the press. This type of resistance is most common around Monte Alban, where there is little cross-group communication and not all members of a community may feel affected by INAH decisions. This kind of group resistance is less directed at personal confrontation and threat, but rather places emphasis on public embarrassment and making INAH appear inept at problem-solving.

The second category of resistance techniques focuses on wearing down INAH through delay, misdirection, and other techniques rather than challenging it through confrontation. The central objective is to discourage those who propose or seek to implement some form of change in community life (Scott 1985: 278). Rejection is rarely explicit but tempered through prior conditions which cannot be met or through decision-making mechanisms which never function as needed. These techniques generally seek to block agreements on boundary-setting, excavations, or other activities where INAH personnel are attempting to deal with a number of different projects simultaneously against externally-imposed deadlines and expectations, so delays and frustration may divert INAH to seek more pliable cases. Some of the more common techniques include:

1. Resistance to formalizing agreements: On many occasions in Milta as well as in the communities around Monte Alban, after hours of discussion with community representatives—including in assemblies—all parties have arrived at an agreement regarding an INAH project, but at the moment when this should be signed, giving it legal status, local authorities refuse to do so. They argue these should be good faith agreements, and that they do not have the right to bind future officials. In Mitla in 1990, after more than three hours of discussions with local officials and the community assembly regarding concrete actions for environmental improvements, agreement was reached and it was time to sign documents. The mayor argued that he could not bind the community with his signature, that the entire council should sign, and that if one would not sign no-one would. Of course someone had a reservation and would not sign, so the final step was never taken, even though it appeared there was community consensus on the issue.

2. The power of the "community": Another technique is to tell INAH representatives that the final decision on an issue should be made by the "community". This is a universally-accepted argument which made be made by almost anyone in any occasion. When there is no agreement with local officials INAH archaeologists may be told the authorities will do what the "community" wants. This is not necessarily a lesson in democracy, as this is an actor without a defined personality, and there is no defined process for reaching agreement. In referring to the "community" this means passing the decision to a large community meeting which generally begins hours after it is called, with an unclear agenda and no clear standards for participation. Frequently no-one acts as leader, and differing opinions are shouted out anonymously. No vote is taken, outcomes may be unclear, there is no way to assure a binding agreement, and those in disagreement are free to argue the "community" did not decide to follow a specific course of action. A novice in such settings will shift from expectations that a "community" decision will produce an outcome to frustration no-one is responsible. An experienced archaeologist, on hearing the community will decide, immediately abandons hope of success.

3. Evasion: On many occasions in Mitla and Monte Alban there are agreements between local officials and INAH archaeologists to meet for the purpose of taking an agreement on a given matter. Such meetings may be in the field, at INAH offices, or even in the municipal offices. If it is a matter of some delicacy or likely to lead to awkward arrangements, local officials do not appear, even if they agreed to shortly before. On many occasions this response is seen as less confrontational than a direct refusal or rejection. A similar mechanism is to come to a verbal agreement, and then when the moment comes to honor it to refuse to do so on the grounds there is a misunderstanding or circumstances have changed. This technique is commonly used by both municipal officials in Mitla and those around Monte Alban.

4. Tell half-truths: It is common for local authorities residents alike to carefully manage information shared with INAH archaeologists to attain the outcomes they prefer. Dennis notes the tendency to "tell contradictory but equally true " stories (Dennis 1990: 23), leaving the listener to figure out some plausible version. He couches his comments in the context of inter-village land conflicts, where each side tailors the story to best support its position, but his observation holds in other contexts as well. Concealing or distorting information avoids confrontation but makes analysis that much more difficult, and reinforces a hope that the archaeologist and INAH will just go away.

It is important to note these techniques for resisting institutional action are not reserved for INAH but may be used in any case where communities feel the need to resist external authority. And these techniques are rarely used in isolation, but rather appear in conjuction. For example, local officials may insist it is not necessary to sign an agreement to carry out an activity, then refuse carry it out because there is no formal endorsement of it. Learning to recognize and respond to resistance techniques is a combination of experience and knowing the actors.

This study recognizes some of the primary factors generating resistance to archaeological heritage protection at the sites which interest us. There are essentially four different sources of conflict:

1. Issues related to official boundary-setting for archaeological zones, which in turn are seen by communities as intrusions into their land and power;
2. The continuing community disposition to encourage conflicts over land tenure, which means to enter into tensions where the State appears as an enemy;
3. The organization and behavior on idviduals and social groups as dynamic factors of conservation or distruction of archaeological resources; and
4. The defense of land use rights, even those which alter the integrity of the archaeological sites.

The following chapters explore more specifically those components of social dynamics present in the general context of archaeolgical conservation.

Setting Archaeological Zone Boundaries

In Mexico the official boundaries defining archaeological zones become critical elements in protecting the remains of pre-Columbian cultures. "Boundary-setting…is a process by which one or more pieces of evidence of pre-Columbian cultures are protected, and is carried out through a topographic survey which establishes boundary markers in the field and locates them on a map of the zone with landmarks of key relevance " (Sanchez Caero 1995: 187). These, under the authority granted by the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Monuments in its articles 38 and 39, chapter IV (INAH 1980), are decisions of the National Institute of Anthropology and History, whose archaeological experts carry out field surveys and provide the technical boundaries of the site in question.

By establishing the perimeter of a site one automatically defines a geographic space containing the remains from one or more pre-Columbian cultures, and this space then may be considered for official proclamation as an Archaeological Monument Zone via a presidential decree, under federal jurisdiction, in accordance with article 37, chapter IV, of the law cited above. To achieve a presidential declaration requires the preparation of a substantial technical file which presents the arguments for the case. In turn this means carrying out the fieldwork necessary to identify the boundaries of the site and to carry out the technical topographic work. This phase of the process is usually carried out by one or more archaeologists familiar with the site and/or the region, and by special surveyors from INAH's Sub-directorate of the Public Registry of Archaeological Monuments and Zones (SRPMZA).It also requires calculation of the number of hectares affected by the survey, and a scientific study which explains the cultural importance of the site.

With regard to the technical and scientific criteria used to suggest the boundaries of the archaeological zones, to date and despite ample experience in the subject, the SRPMZA of INAH has not prepared official guidelines to establish boundaries (manuals summarizing procedures, general guidelines and exceptions, or other documentation). Each site is considered as a unique case and its concerns are dealt with on a individual basis. It is in specific materials in the technical files which normally accompany the official boundary-setting process that the technical staff who are normally a part of this process take advantage of circumstances to suggest reasons and criteria for placement of of the boundary markers establishing protection for the area.

In the mid-1990s the union to which the research staff of INAH belong sought to articulate staff perspectives with regard to protection of cultural heritage. A number of worthwhile points came out, including the importance of realistic and readily-understood criteria for boundary-setting, sensitivity to the breadth of topics which might form part of the technical file, e.g., studies of the natural environment or of relevant human settlements, and the necessity to revisit critical factors in international documents such as the Charter of Athens and the Guidelines of Quito (Sanchez 1995: 192). The Guidelines support the idea that boundaries should be based on a system of zones which recognize:

1. A Rigorous Protection Zone, corresponding to the highest concentration of structural or environmental elements;
an Intermediate Protection Zone, with a greater degree of tolerance; and
2. an Urban Landscape Protection Zone, facilitating integration of the same with the larger landscape (Sanchez 1995).

He goes on to comment:

Factors meriting consideration in archaeological zone protection include the archaeological remains, the natural environment surrounding the zone, the relationship of modern settlements in historic context, plus resolutions of land tenure and land use, and finally the agreement among archaeologists regarding the parameters to be applied in setting boundaries (Sanchez 1995: 194).

Between 1980 and 1990 there are several examples of attempts to implement these criteria, as in the cases of boundary-setting at Teotihuacan, Cholula, Chichen Itza, and the extensive zone of Puuc in the Yucatan. Nevertheless, in none of these cases was it possible to develop a strong relationship between the planning proposals, the political commitment among all actors necessary for effective regulation, and much less an anthropological study which would have permitted an evaluation with some degree of certainty of potential social problems the process of boundary-setting would face. The result in each one of these cases is that within a few years of boundary-setting protected areas are invaded for housing, by street vendors, for the installation of tourist services, or urban infrastructure, all authorized or tolerated by different local, municipal, state, and even federal agencies.

Monte Alban

The archaeological zone of Monte Alban is probably the best example in Mexico of the evolution of critera for protecting archaeological resources. As of 1926, even before the initiation of the archaeological project directed by Alfonso Caso, there were some early notions of boundary-setting for the site. Caso fixed the boundaries of the core area of Monte Alban, taking as criteria the presence of obvious monumental architecture in the Central Plaza, the presence of tombs on terraces adjacent to the plaza, and the palaces or temples themselves, with the resulting map published in his book Zapotec Stelae (Caso 1928: Figure 22). Clearly advanced for its time, this map provides a topographic rendering of the site and configuration of the monuments within it. It is the first time an archaeological team includes topographic experts to generate a clear image of the coverage, volumes, and proportions of the structures, even if only of the central plaza. Equally, it is the first time that an archaeologist worries about providing a site with effective protection, arranging through judicial contacts its declaration of the area surveyed as a Federal Zone.

Today Caso's boundary appears insufficient to us and unrealistic given the urban problems of Monte Alban. Nevertheless, his methodology is sufficiently rigorous and complete to give his project a character not only of archaeological research, but as one which provides the basis of legal protection once its cultural importance was demonstrated. And one needs to remember that the importance attached to domestic architecture in archaeology is hardly consistent with the monumental focus dominating the golden age of Mexican archaeology; it is a relatively recent import from the United States received through the influence of processual archaeology during the 1970s (Bender 1987; Winter 1972, among others).

Changes in archaeological thinking and in land use patterns around Monte Alban triggered consideration of altering the boundaries of the zone, and in October, 1976, the Directorate of the Public Registry of Zones and Monuments sent Eduardo Contreras Sánchez to carry out a survey "…to clarify the boundaries of the Archaeological Zone and its boundaries with the lands of the municipality of San Martin Mexicapam". In his report Contreras mentions that in 1972 the archaeological zone had been mapped with the purpose of better marking it for its protection, as

"…every day it is being invaded by people who have established new neighborhoods such as Monte Alban, Riveras del Atoyac, Lazaro Cardenas, and others on the north and east slopes of the hill. The invasion grows daily and the boundary lines which mark the zone have had to in some places pass between the streets and the houses of these neighborhoods to impede continuing invasion ." (Contreras 1976: Archives of CRO INAH)".
In the same report he states that as a consequence of decisions made at higher administrative levels the map made in 1972 did not include "..boundary monuments or markers which indicate the area so limited, as it has not been officially declared a Federal Zone, " and that the total area covers perhaps 1140 hectares. The 1976 project included verifying or confirming the area affected by San Martin Mexicapam via a new survey and boundary scheme. The resulting map was adopted as the "Monte Alban Federal Zone" by the Secretary of Agrarian Reform, even without the formal declaration which gives it legal validity, and it served as the basis of information for the Regional Development Plans under elaboration at the time by the municipalities bounding Oaxaca (Figure 23).

In November, 1976, the Oaxaca Regional Center initiated a proposal for a new boundary study of Monte Alban, this time with the research support of Mark Winter and execution by topographic engineer Francisco Cordero. This boundary study was ordered personally by President Luis Echeverria Alvarez on a visit to Oaxaca, as during his visit to Monte Alban INAH officials alerted him to the issue of the invasion of archaeological lands (Manuel Esparza, personal communication, 1995).

On this occasion the criterion was to include as parts of the archaeological zone the three monumental areas of the Main Plaza, Cerro del Gallo, y Atzompa. On the map these areas appear as three islands linked only by "bridges" (Figure 24). These areas with monumental architecture had considerable buffer around them, including the more obvious parts of dwelling and agricultural terraces. Toward San Juan Chapultepec there is a curious band of monumental structures which looks almost like another island, but which does not include terraces. The boundaries north and south of the Plaza are indicated by the big stone marker known as "La Mona" on the lands of Xoxocotlan, and by the tract known as "Seven Deer."

Analysis shows it quite clear that this boundary-setting obeyed the criterion of protecting only the monumental architecture, trying to avoid conflict with the issue of invasions by the new neighborhoods. Rather than a true attempt to protect the archaeological zone as an archaeological city, these boundaries were intended to avoid irritating the local population by taking the open spaces. In effect the criterion separated the technical assessment of INAH from the social issues involved at the expense of the integrity of the site . The boundaries encompassed a total area of 939 hectares, divided among the Main Plaza (698 hectares), Cerro del Gallo (24 hectares), and 2l7 hectares at Atzompa, a total area even smaller than the 1972 boundary-setting which Contreras mentions (Archaeology Section, Archive of INAH CRO).

Another obvious question about this project was the lack of attention to the relationships among volume, space, and function, considerations absent in the proposal. It is worth mentioning that by the date of this boundary-setting there existed a map produced (as of 1975) by Blanton which defines the outline of the pre-Columbian city from an anthropological perspective. It makes quite evident the presence of dwelling and cultivation terraces and above all their link to the centers of monumental architecture. Nevertheless it is clear this information did not influence the official boundaries of the site.

In December, 1984, there was yet another boundary-setting, this time under the auspices of the Department of Public Registry and under the technical supervision of Mark Winter of the Oaxaca Regional Center. This time the general criterion was to trace a boundary enveloping all the component elements of Monte Alban, taking into account all the area covered with archaeological remains as identified by Blanton (Nalda 1984, Archive of the INAH CRO). To accomplish this there was an outer boundary which includes the clusters of monumental architecture and all the dwelling and cultivation terraces, and three internal boundaries around the main clusters (Figure 25). The areas between the outer and inner boundaries had the status of archaeological and ecological reserves, as it was hoped to declare the site simultaneously an archaeological zone and national park (Nalda 1984, Archive of the INAH CRO). These proposed boundaries constitute a substantial advance in terms of site conceptualization and place Monte Alban at the forefront of thinking in Mexico by creating both ecological reserves and reserves for archaeological excavation in the future.

The purpose of this boundary-setting was to support a proposal before UNESCO to add to the list of World Heritage Sites a monumental area consisting of Monte Alban and the city of Oaxaca. This proposal specifically sought to protect as ample a setting as possible, building on the concept of cultural continuity. It included Monte Alban as an archaeological city stretching from 500 B.C. until 750 A.D. under the Zapotecs, and the city of Oaxaca in its colonial appearance starting in the sixteenth century. In effect this evoked the creation of a mestizo population through the fusion of the Spanish and Zapotecs. In this proposal, finally approved by UNESCO in 1985, one finds a marriage of concepts and criteria for conservation which at the time were completely novel to Mexican practice. On the one hand the holistic criterion which archaeological remains around the concept of an urban unit, without making distinctions between"monumental" and "minor", was new. In addition, to include in a single proposal the spaces of two cities with different cultural origins (pre-Columbian and Spanish colonial) but overlapping in a shared space, represented an important presentation of cultural continuity. In spite of all the positive qualities of this boundary-setting, it did not turn out to be the version used by INAH in setting official boundaries or in the definition as a Zone of Archaeological Monuments. Nor, in the end, were its technical materials utilized to define a strategy which would deter further invasions by the new neighborhoods surrounding Monte Alban.

The most recent effort to establish the boundaries of the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban was that of 1992, carried out by the Sub-directorate of the Public Registry of Archaeological Zones and Monuments under the technical supervision of Blanca Paredes Gudiño. This boundary-setting was essentially a revision of that of 1984, as that had now suffered invasions in several sectors, especially on the west and southwest slopes (Figure 26). "…it was necessary to propose a boundary revision in a way which permits protection of the greatest part of the archaeological remains and at the same time leaves out those plots which are "supposedly private" (Paredes 1992, Archives of INAH CRO). This boundary revision required a general walking survey by staff of the Public Registry and by municipal and ejido officials to identify boundary markers in related to the properties affected (Paredes 1992, Archives of INAH CRO).

In the area north and east of Atzompa two boundary markers were relocated to exclude some small buildings and houses made of metal sheeting. On the northwest side of Atzompa and west of El Gallo, a sector which belongs to San Pedro Ixtlahuaca, there was no problem because the lands are under cultivation. To the west of Monte Alban the mayor of Xoxocotlan and the representative of its Communal Lands Committee removed two markers, while on the south side, which is ejido land, reports that near marker 39 the sons of an ejidatario wanted to subdivide and sell the land for construction led to a recommendation for increased surveillance. On ejido lands to the south of Monte Alban there was some significant shifting of markers given the extensive urban invasion of the area. Approximately 15 additional markers were laid out to provide maximum protection to the tract known as "El Paraguito", as this had begun to be invaded by public services such as sports fields, a chapel, and part of a new school. On the east slope of Monte Alban, in San Martin Mexicapam and San Juan Chapultepec, the boundary shifted, "…passing the location of the boundary markers behind the well-established construction complete with streets, electricity, and other services (Paredes 1992, Archives of INAH CRO). Lastly, markers 13 to 15 were routed around new structures (Paredes 1992, Archives of INAH CRO).

The obvious criterion in redefining the boundaries was to update the perimeter of 1984, excluding post-1984 construction. Here one can see very clearly the issue of urban growth on the east side of Monte Alban; if each time a new boundary is established and new construction permitted to penetrate, then the line shifts again to exclude new construction all one has accomplished is a staged compression of the archaeological zone, eventually ending with the space originally surveyed by Caso. One purpose of the new survey was to create an updated technical file in support of a presidential declaration of protection for the archaeological zone, while a second was to try to placate the local population by ceding some small areas having archaeological remains but already heavily invaded. The first objective was successful in 1993 when an official decree was published via which Monte Alban was officially recognized as an archaeological zone having a legal definition (Diario Oficial, 7 de diciembre de 1993). But the second objective failed, as with each day the population within the boundary increases, challenging the legal authority of INAH.

The total area included within the boundary line is 2,078 hectares. The sector centered on Atzompa consists of 378 hectares, the Cerro del Gallo is 32 hectares, and the central part of Monte Alban is 1,035 hectares, with the remainder connecting and buffer areas. That is, the area theoretically protected is almost double the largest previous zone, that surveyed in 1972 by Contreras.

According to the report prepared by Blanca Paredes, the archaeologist in charge of the project, to carry out the various tasks associated with boundary-setting INAH contacted in writing the municipal authorities, ejido officers, and members of the Common Lands Committees of each community around Monte Alban, plus all the state and federal agencies whose activities touch on land use, tenure, and regulation, soliciting their cooperation (Archives of INAH CRO, 17 de julio de 1992). Paredes reports that in several instances the same people contacted accompanied the topographic crew to locate the boundary markers (Paredes 1992, in Archives of INAH CRO).

Nevertheless, a month later, on August 5th, with work on boundary-setting in full swing, there was a major meeting of members of various neighborhoods along the south and southeastern boundary of the archaeological zone to comment on the on-going project. The smallholders of the area around "El Paraguito", plus residents of Insurgentes, Santa Cruz, Santa Elena, y Xoxocotlan, "…expressed their disagreement for the manner is which they had found out about the situation and the steps being taken by INAH, that is, moving the markers from their "original" position, and thereby affecting smallholders and part of the campus of the school 'Monte Alban' (Extra de Oaxaca, 7 de agosto de 1992:8A) Other residents stated: "we are here to express our disagreement about the way the Anthropology commission is putting up boundary markers which affect land legally donated for the construction of the school" (Extra de Oaxaca, 7 de agosto de 1992:8A). Even the same officials who had accompanied the official boundary team on its rounds now spoke against the process:

"the current problem, declared the representative of the Common Lands Committee of Xoxocotlan, is disagreement over the placement of boundary markers by INAH and which we cannot support, as we were invited in a hasty, disorganized manner and had to participate because it interested me to see what was happening and to know what was happening to the boundary markers" (Extra de Oaxaca, 7 de agosto de 1992:8 A).

This collective testimony communicates a sense of the way many of those who saw themselves affected by the new boundaries felt about the process and implications. Although INAH officials tried on a number of occasions to explain the boundary lines of the archaeological zone in no way affects ownership of the land, the general opinion about this was: "when INAH or anyone else in the world puts markers on boundary lines it means that is a tract controlled and directed, and from then on it is INAH which gives the orders, (deciding) where you can build and where not, whether you can sell, plow, or build a house" (Extra de Oaxaca, 7 de agosto de 1992:8A). This was especially irksome to people who see themselves as having ancestral rights to land which cannot be abridged by apparently capricious policy implementation or the illegitimate whims of bureaucrats in Mexico City, rights confirmed by "…(a map of Xoxocotlan) from the 1500s which shows Monte Alban belongs to it, and that it stretches to San Juan Chapultepec, San Martin Mexicapam, San Pedro, Cuilapan, Jalpan, San Agustin de las Juntas y San Antonio de la Cal" (Extra de Oaxaca, 7 de agosto de 1992:8A).

Information on such reactions and demonstrations by local residents appear as an annex to the report of Blanca Paredes, but never receives the same degree of attention and analysis as shown the technical data which confirm the presence of archaeological remains. No-one seems to grasp that no matter how detailed and expert the technical file supporting a presidential decree, the political authorities which make such decisions are highly sensitive to the concerns and reactions of the local communities, and failure to consider that may leave excellent professional work sitting unused on a shelf.

Mitla

The only official boundary-setting carried out at the Archaeological Zone of Mitla took place in 1985 by technical staff from the SRPMZA-INAH under the supervision of Nelly Robles Garcia (Figure 27) (Archaeological Section Archive, INAH CRO).

By now it should be clear that the nature of the urban setting of this archaeological zone is such that a key issue is the loss of all sense of the original spatial relations between the monumental structures and residential areas. This cancels any possibility of understanding the logic and organization of this important pre-Columbian site through simple observation. The official technical file for Mitla assembled by SRPMZA emphasizes:

> The archaeological site of Mitla presents a special set of issues, the most difficult of which is that urban sprawl has divided and invaded practically every corner of the site…in effect dividing it into 5 areas with archaeological remains…it is not now possible to have an intergrated perspective on the site, as instead what one finds is 5 segments bounded by modern streets, with small pieces of unoccupied land which consist of the structures themselves and adjoining spaces which serve as future areas for research (Monzon en SRPMZA 1991: 8-9).

It is worth noting that it was William R. Holmes who in 1895 described and in effect formalized the conceptualization of the archaeological zone of Mitla on the basis of its clusters of monumental structures (Holmes 1897).This was the defining criterion for conservation programs on the part of INAH for nearly a century. It continues to be the vision held by most tourists, planners, and other social actors associated with Mitla, most of whom rarely move outside the immediate confines of the Hall of the Columns and the North group. Although officially the five clusters were recognized, in reality maintenance and protection was given to just one until 1985, the year in which some preliminary activities of the proposed Mitla Project were initiated. This proposal envisioned the recovery of all five clusters with the goal of creating a more integrated appreciation of the site (Robles and Moreira 1990).

However, an assessment of all the findings in Mitla beyond the monumental structures, whether through planned research or fortuitous discovery, gives us a very different perspective on the site, where a broader view of archaeological protection and boundary-setting (Figure 28) would inevitably affect contemporary interests such as housing, commerce, cultivation, and even water supply. The first technical study, in 1982-83, proposed a broader boundary which would include the five clusters of monumental architecture with in it, each of which would in turn be contained in a more rigorously-defined space exclusively for archaeological protection (Archives of INAH CRO, 1985). In turn, this proposal in reality is a single aspect of a larger vision of the prospect for conservation of the archaeological zone in its current urban context (Robles and Moreira 1990). This larger vision implies considering the five monumental clusters within a "Mitla Monuments Zone" which recognizes the historical and cultural value not only of the pre-Columbian structures, but also the religious and domestic architecture of the colonial period as well as the vernacular architecture of today, for which reason "we define the Mitla Monuments Zone as the area where concentrations of architecture from the pre-Columbian and colonial periods still survive" Robles and Moreira 1990: 80).

The Mitla Monuments Zone consists of the following elements:

Pre-Columbian: five groups with distinctive characteristics, with three organized around patios and two based on mounds with central plazas.

Colonial: two catholic churches located on top of pre-Columbian construction; the Mitla church built on Patio C of the North group, and the chapel of the Calvary on the summit of Mound 37 of the Adobe group.

Contemporary: the urban sector which surrounds A and B, including both dwellings and the commercial facilities and infrastructure supporting tourism.

The Monuments Zone, in effect, has received architectural contributions from each historical period. To the pre-Columbian monuments were added the religious buildings of the colonial period, and more recently the growth of the community has created the existing urban complex. This means the proposed boundary of the Zone needed to respect existing streets, with the boundaries protecting the five monumental groups alining with individual street blocks within the urban framework. The spaces within the larger boundary but between the monumental clusters would be treated as the immediate context of the latter, and as such woiuld be subject to some regulation in styles of construction, height, color, signage, openings, and other urban features (Robles and Moreira 1990:80).

In conjunction with the Monuments Zone it was proposed to create a specific area for urban expansion and an ecological reserve (Robles and Moreira 1990, map P-1). In thinking about the removal of housing from the areas dedicated to the monumental clusters it was fundamental to propose where, in an orderly manner, families leaving these areas could be relocated. The general idea was to create an urban growth zone on the south side of Mitla, where there is less conflict with archaeological materials, and provide it with the appropriate urban services to reduce resistance to relocation. The ecological reserve would cover the rock outcroppings, i.e. the foothills of the Sierra Mixe, on the north side of the Monuments Zone. During the pre-Columbian period these outcroppings had both defensive and resource uses. More recently it has served as a catchment area for summer season run-off, for informal recreation, and other environmental purposes, but now is filling rapidly with new housing.

The thinking behind the original work carried out by Robles and Moreira in 1982-83 and later published by INAH in 1990 was a significant advance in conceptualizing and treating conservation issues in an archaeological zone. In 1987 the proposal received Mexico's National Prize in Salvage, Restoration, Conservation, and Dissemination of Archaeological Heritage, granted by INAH to the best study in the field. Perhaps its most important contribution has been to link issues of conservation of cultural heritage in complex settings to solutions which recognize the relationship of these issues to other urban elements and to patterns of economically attractive land use in contemporary Mitla. The principal impediment to put this into practice is that existing law makes no provision for grouping historical periods in a single monumental zone. Nor is there sensitivity to the significance of contemporary land use in solutions to heritage conservation.

In 1991 the SRPMZA-INAH finally decided to create the technical file on which to base the official boundary-setting of the Mitla Archaeological Monuments Zone. For this it accepted the boundary proposal of Robles (1985) which it describes as: "…consisting of 4 internal blocks corresponding to the groups of archaeological remains discussed (one block includes the North group and the Hall of Columns group). In addition there is a general boundary encompassing these and adjacent spaces…" (Monzon 1991: 58). Nevertheless, with respect to a proposal for a Monuments Zone it took the position that "…this is too ambitious as it includes a large number of modern properties which means that, if it is not possible to offer housing alternatives to the owners, it becomes difficult to initiate population transfers of such magnitude" (Monzon 1991: 59). Monzon approved the proposed urban growth zone and ecological reserve, but apparently did not understand the linkage between the possible relocation and the urban growth zone proposal. Finally the proposed Official Declaration of the Archaeological Monuments Zone of Mitla:

would respect the map drawn up in 1985, in the sense that it maintains the 5 blocks now mentioned; besides it should consider for fieldwork the location of the specific boundaries of each block and plan the installation of cyclone fencing as well as assigning custodians for each group…For this it would be advisable to take into account the proposals which Robles and Moreira offer with respect to internal and external planning for each monumental group, including access, green spaces, and installation of a security booth (Monzon 1991: 59).

It is fundamental to understand that with this the boundary-setting of the SRPMZA-INAH returns to the vision of defining an archaeological zone on the basis of the monumentalist criteria which prevailed in Mexican archaeology for so many decades, and that the proposal to take into account all historical periods evidently was not understood by the SRPMZA staff. Finally, Monzon's text suggests that should the plots which invade the spaces reserved for the monumental structures be acquired by INAH, "the situation of the area with respect to land use and tenure would consist of two levels, which would be:

AREA 1: Federal Property. Core area of archaeological monuments. This is a space which is owned by the national government and under the responsibility and custody of INAH. The land is not used except as necessary for protection and maintenance. Construction is prohibited.

AREA 2: Restricted Area. Land use is restricted and subject to current regulations, as well as subject to the results of archaeological excavation or expert review which INAH carries out for regulatory purposes". (Monzon 1991: 66).

Here the goal of archaeological zoning, without addressing it as such, appears obvious. And here a fundamental shortcoming of INAH, that it has neither adequate authority nor resources to implement effective protection, once again becomes apparent. The proposal of an outer boundary encompassing four internal blocks of monumental structures and intermediate spaces was finally approved, becoming the basis of the official boundary of the Archaeological Monuments Zone of Mitla, according to a decree published December 7, 1993, in the Official Diary and signed by President Carlos Salinas de Gortari. According to this decree the Archaeological Monuments Zone consists of 38.86 hectares. The official technical file, on deposit with the SRPMZA, is E14D58-20-001. The declaration includes all the monumental areas proposed previously, but provides no legal protection to non-archaeological properties (i.e., colonial and vernacular architecture) for the contextual value they offer.

In the case of creating official protection for Mitla it is very clear that the legal section of INAH does not necessarily support the more thorough proposals based on academic research in the field and which therefore offer the guarantee of some relationship to reality. In addition, one sees quite clearly how the criteria for conservation of archaeological heritage which show a steady advance at the international level disappear in a national context. For Mexico this means that the institution which has responsibility for such conservation operates with a focus providing little latitude for academically-based proposals, and for updating the preparation and professional understanding of its research and administrative staff. In this respect the policies and practices for boundary-setting in archaeological zone protection in Mexico share many characteristics with protected natural areas. Perez Gil comments in a recent article:

The traditional concepts regarding protected areas as applied in Mexico are outdated and impractical. The traditional areas have failed to protect resources and, even worse, have not been adequately appreciated by local residents or have been considered a wasted investment. Through the search for innovative approaches and through the experience and knowledge acquired, around the world there are new schools of thought and new conservation theories, and one waits for their impact on Mexican protected areas in terms of economics, legislation and regulation, management, innovative organizational restructuring, operations, priorities, planning, and design". (Perez Gil Sacido 1995: 37).

It is also important to point out that even when within INAH there have been proposals for boundary projects based on new conceptual frameworks there has been little interest on the part of the research staff. They do not see it as a topic worth studying or writing about in significant national or international journals, and thereby commenting on work carried on outside the country. On this point I am in agreement with Perez Gil in the sense that while this professional activity is not recognized with the seriousness and respect it merits, improvisational tendencies will continue and the same mistakes will continue to be made. These in turn will be very difficult to correct and those errors will have severe repercussions and irreversible effects on the natural and cultural heritage (Perez Gil Salcido 1995:38).

Equally important would be a periodic updating of the legal framework on which to base new academic approaches and to avoid in other cases what happened in Mitla. In this sense the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historical Zones and Monuments was approved in 1972, and since that time has received a single revision, in 1986, through a decree which provides for a temporary expansion of the law under which "…are protected fossil vestiges or remains of living creatures which lived within the national territory in the past, and whose study, conservation, restoration, recovery or use obeys a paleontologic interest…" (Diario Oficial, 13 de enero de 1986). This decree covers a grave gap from the past—the original law did not mention such finds—and includes the definition of new fields of archaeological research, but in no way touches the criteria for boundary-setting which concern us.

It is also urgent to note the impact on protected areas occasioned by changes in the law regarding land tenure in Mexico. Recently these changes have shown a tendency to develop at a far faster rate than the institutional programs for protecting natural and cultural heritage. This is the topic which we explore in greater detail in the following chapter.

Chapter 5: Land Tenure Issues

As established in the chapter on defining the boundaries for archaeological zones, one of the elements which must appear in a site's technical file before it can be considered is a detailed study of land tenure in the affected area, a necessity for planning a strategy for its conversion to federal property. Until now the matter usually has been addressed by a study drawn from official sources (SRA, INGEI, SEDESOL) or by a superficial field survey. The official sources can reflect boundary lines which satisfy the formal requirement of the files, yet in no way capture the complexity of different tenure systems and what they imply for the land, something which can only be understood through historical analysis and direct field observation.

Recently INAH has had to face two critical cases with respect to land tenure. The first took place in Mitla in 1994 with the planned purchase of three plots which clearly invaded the protected space of the Arroyo Group, a purchase intended to free this space of the physical and visual intrusion. To this end during the 1994 season long-sought funds for this purchase (the first time in the history of archaeological work at Mitla that funds had been made available for purchasing land) finally became available, and there was some degree of understanding with the owners to finalize the transaction (INAH 1993, technical file of the Mitla Project, in the Archive of the Archaeological Section). Nevertheless, when the moment to complete the transaction arrived it proved necessary to cancel it, as among other reasons on reviewing the relevant documents it turned out that the properties which the occupants claimed as private property in fact were communal lands and therefore ineligible for private sale. Given the circumstances, and the legal incapacity of INAH to carry out the purchases, the entity providing the funding (in this case the World Bank through the Oaxaca state government) decided to withdraw financing from the purchase.

The other, even more recent, example comes from the archaeological zone of Palenque, Chiapas. Here, in 1993, INAH built on private property a federal building (the Crafts Center) within the area considered part of the immediate surrounding of the archaeological zone. Legal staff of INAH reviewed the tenure status of the plot and apparently assumed that as the new structure was federal the land beneath it automatically acquired the same status. But the legal owner filed suit to retain the property, and on June 15, 1995, the Mexican Supreme Court ruled against INAH, requiring it to return the land to its owner, new building included, or otherwise pay a purchase price of between three and four million pesos (Proceso 1996: No. 1006:60). These examples show quite clearly the important role tenure types play in the context of INAH operations to safeguard the arqueological heritage of Mexico.

By way of general background it is important to note that in Mexico there exist four different forms of land tenure: private, federal, ejido, and communal. These types are not mutually exclusive, and all four may exist in a given community, or even a small portion of it.

Private Property is that owned by a private owner (individual or corporate) and which is legally available via commercial transactions with other prospective owners. Federal Property are those areas owned by the national government, through purchase or condemnation, generally areas whose resources are considered of national interest by law, where there are natural or cultural elements of public importance (oil, minerals, forests, beaches, water, and archaeologicial zones), or of public benefit, such as airports, highways, railroad tracks, or parks. Both of these forms of land tenure have their counterparts in other countries.

This is not true of ejido and communal lands, as these are differentiated from other tenure systems by the fact that they are in communal ownership and may not be disposed of, or at least originally it was not possible to sell them in whole or part. Such lands are controlled in a collective fashion, either by members of the community or the ejido, and members decide the organization, use, and distribution of, or in certain cases, withdrawal or disposition of, the property.

The ejido is a tract of land intended for agricultural or forest use by its members, and is a practical expression of the principle of a social right to land which sparked the Mexican Revolution of 1910 (Varley 1985: 1). The original goal was to foster economically viable self-sufficient communities, generally by providing land for cultivation. This implied, above all, an emphasis on collective benefits for all the members of the ejido, with a weight on access and use, not on the formation of private property. Land used by one member of the ejido, or ejiditario, but which has been abandoned for some reason, will be transferred to another member of the ejido with use rights, assuring in this fashion continuity in the system (Federal Agrarian Reform Law, Article 51).

The creation of the ejido system was the most important accomplishment of the Mexican Revolution. It abolished the latifundios, the landholding system during the Porfirian period at the end of the nineteenth century when more than 90 percent of the land in the country became concentrated in the hands of a small number of property owners, while 95 percent of rural families were landless (Varley 1989: 125).The existence of ejidos draws its legal legitimacy from Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution, and from the Federal Agrarian Reform Law. The Secretary of Agrarian Reform (SRA) is the federal institution with the legal responsibility to distribute lands to ejidos, to resolve disputes among them, and to oversee internal management. Given the magnitude and complexity of the ejido system as the focus of academic study there is an enormous bibliography reflecting legal, historical, or anthropological scholarship. Examples include Varley 1989; Stephen 1994; Murphy 1994; Craig 1993; Cymet 1994; and Sanderson 1984, as well as the extended research activities emerging from the Ejido Reform Research Project of the University of California or similar programs. In this section our focus will be on those aspects of ejido structure and governance where the tenure system interacts with the needs and requirements of heritage protection in the form of archaeological zones.

Unlike the ejido system, where one must be a formally enrolled member of the ejido in order to gain access to and use of ejido lands, communal lands belong to the entire community and may be used by anyone the community recognizes. And communal lands do not have an external supervising entity, such as the Secretary of Agrarian Reform, but are under the control of the communities themselves, usually through a community lands committee. These commitees may allocate plots for farming or home construction, set and oversee rules for the exploitation of communal lands resources, and decide on ways in which to use income from communal resources. The communal lands system is strongest in southern Mexico, where it traces its antecedents to the pre-Columbian land base of the indigenous population. The communal lands committees are selected by community assembles separate from municipal authorities, and in some communities the committees' control over important resources or opportunities make them more influential in community life than the local governments are.

The Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Monuments anticipates the protection of archaeological and historical monuments via a formal presidential proclamation (Federal Law, Chapter IV, article 37). These national monuments would be subject to federal jurisdiction, and in the specific case of archaeological monuments would be treated as if they are federal property, as established in the same law: "archaeological monuments and artifacts are property of the nation, and may not be sold or disposed of" (Federal Law, Chapter III, article 27). This means that as sites are considered under federal jurisdiction they have legal protection no matter what the tenure system.

Although it is understood that a presidential proclamation must be based on an INAH technical file which demonstrates conclusively the historical importance of the site in question, issues related to land tenure and use, and possible solutions in cases of possible conflicts, in practice it is the cultural importance and the physical boundaries which are taken into account in boundary-setting and subsequent proclamation. In essence the conflicts which might emerge due to the dissatisfaction of private property owners, ejidatarios, or individuals with communal land rights are considered routine matters for INAH to resolve. Nevertheless the agency lacks the legal and technical capacity to settle conflicts. At present the volume and complexity of conflicts occasioned by preservation efforts simply outstrips INAH's ability to protect sites whether or not they have been established by presidential proclamation.

Land Tenure at Monte Alban and Mitla

The land within the official boundaries of Monte Alban varies by tenure system and owner. From north to south the distribution is:

Owner	Percentage of the archaeological zone
Communal lands of Atzompa	23
Ejido lands of Atzompa	28
Private property of the Bustamante family	1
Communal lands of Mexicapam	8
Ejido lands of Mexicapam	1
Comunal lands of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca	1
Ejido lands of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca	5
Federal land (as calculated by Agrarian Reform)	10
Communal lands of San Juan Chapultepec	2
Communal lands of Xoxocotlan	10
Ejido lands of Xoxocotlan	5
Private property in Xoxocotlan	5
Ejido lands of Arrazola	2

(SEDESOL 1996; figures may not total 100 percent due to rounding)

In effect the official archaeological zone is divided among thirteen landowners representing the four tenure systems dicussed earlier. Communal lands account for 44 percent of the land within the archaeological zone's jurisdiction, followed closely by ejido land with 41 percent. Few people realize that ownership of the archaeological zone is scattered among so many entities and subject to so many interests.

Field discussions reinforce the significance of this complexity. Municipal authorities, ejido and communal lands officials, private property owners, and recent arrivals to the area surrounding the archaeological zone share a common perspective. To them the "archaeological zone" is the area defined by Alfonso Caso in 1928, as discussed earlier, and the remaining lands belong to others. Thus a common question is "why does INAH invade the lands of others", casting INAH in the same light as any other party which seeks to possess land to which it is not entitled. For example, there are boundary disputes between the ejido of Atzompa and the ejido of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca, and between communal lands of San Martin Mexicapam and private owners in Xoxocotlan. The respective land claims are quite ancient. For example, in discussing the ejido lands of Xoxocotlan and the legality of the official boundaries of Monte Alban, ejido members assert the right of possession, noting the original land grant to the community came from the king of Spain in the sixteenth century.

In fact, the only legal boundaries recognized by communities around Monte Alban are those defined by markers set at specific places by their ancestors (Figure 30).

According to Dennis "A named piece of land is a paraje.It may be a plain, a hill, a canyon, or some other indefinitely limited but generally recognized area" (Dennis 1987: 42). For members of the ejidos or communal lands systems in the communities around Monte Alban, or even for small private landowners or recent arrivals in the irregular settlements, the network of numbered markers INAH installed to identify the boundaries of the archaeological zone is an external imposition, as the only markers they recognize are those handed down from their ancestors.

In addition, as detailed in the chapter on land use, one of the key current issues is the change brought on by rapid, unplanned change, a result of the "irrationality of the nature of urban growth guided solely by real estate speculation, the absence of a metropolitan vision in urban public policies, and patron-client policies and practices with the consent of local officials" (Castañeda 1994: 174). Added to this in the immediate surroundings of Monte Alban is the illegal invasion of land by "paratroopers" (so-called because they tend to drop in overnight), creating new settlements. Murphy (1994: 210) estimates that such settlements account for 10 percent of urban land use in Oaxaca.

On the surface circumstances in Mitla appear simpler, as the Agrarian Department of the Rural Lands Registry reports there is only one form of land tenure in the archaeological zone. The archaeological zone, and the rest of urban Mitla, overlap the communal lands system (Figure 31) so ejidal and communal lands authorities make many of the distribution decisions. But long, relatively stable use patterns generate different perspectives on the part of those holding use rights. Most of the housing is treated as "private property", as each lot was provided to a single user. Across generations such public distributions are treated as the private patrimony of each family. For example, in subdividing inheritances families seek to maintain a pattern of "legality" in the form of private deeds sworn before a notary public. While this act honors the process it does not alter the fact that such land legally remains communal land, and is so recognized by the census or legal documents. Of the five clusters of monumental archaeological remains one is characterized as "the Ruins" and is the center of tourism and tourist-related services including INAH's office. Three are regarded as private property and the fifth is known locally as "Church property", as is the house where the priest lives and areas adjacent to the church building, while the area of the Crafts Market is known as "municipal property" (Figure 32).

Unfortunately none of this is very helpful from the standpoint of understanding tenure systems or developing legally defensible protection strategies, as local concepts have no validity in the larger administrative setting. For example "Ruins" is not a legal land tenure category, so in practice one does not know from that designation whether the land is communal, private, or some other category. The three clusters of monumental structures currently considered private property by Mitla residents are subject to the constraints of the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Monuments, meaning the nominal owners cannot do anything which damage the monuments' cultural, historical, or scientific value. Yet, by federal law this private property is in fact located on communal land and therefore may not be condemned or purchased by the federal government, even if it has the resources and wishes to do so. Similarly the Crafts Market sits not on municipal property but on communal land.

Of particular interest is the curious category of "Church property". In Mitla the Dominican order used its control over land to repress the indigenous population. After taking control of pre-Columbian temples and palaces it forced the local population to destroy some structures to make room and building materials for the church and other structures. The order built literally on top of earlier structures or converted them to homes, stables, or even dumps for trash and debris (Robles et al, 1986). This gave the Church an opportunity to manage certain areas in ways which made a profound impact on the population. While the Catholic Church lost the right to own land in the wake of the constitutional reforms of the 1850s, nearly 150 years later both local residents and some municipal and state documents still identify some lands as belonging to the Church (Parsons 1936, Archivo Parroquial). And the Church Committee fights any effort limiting the practice of collecting rents from "its" land in the center of the archaeological zone.

What exists in Mitla, then, is not the simple system the Rural Lands Survey suggests, but a complex land tenure system with overlapping issues and patterns of historical development. These complexities, the local context of private property, and changes in the community over the past thirty years make it almost impossible to understand the situation or to treat it on the basis of documentary materials, requiring instead time in the field to appreciate conceptual and methodological constraints. In turn it becomes almost impossible to explain to INAH personnel, much less outsiders, how the tenure system makes swift and decisive action in defense of the archaeological heritage highly unlikely.

Valuing the Land

Here it is necessary to reflect for a moment on the significance of land ownership in rural Mexico. If there is a single material value held dear to the hearts of rural Mexicans since the remote past it is the land, not in the sense of commercial or investment value, but in an almost mystical sense of place as well as the relationship between society and nature. The struggle for land, individual or collective, marks Mexican history from the conflicts between pre-Columbian indigenous groups to the Revolution and contemporary Mexico. Unlike the American notion of individual ownership or the Jeffersonian concept of the independent yeoman farmer, the Mexican tradition links people to the land through the community as an intermediary institution. Particularly in southern Mexico most of the land in a given muncipality belongs to the community, and the only way to have access to it is to belong to the community.

The pre-Columbian conception of collectively-held property was reinforced by the landholding system of the colonial period. One of the few references to the significance of the landholding system in reference to archaeology comes from the work of Manuel Gamio on the Teotihuacan Valley:

"Before the Conquest there existed in the valley, among other landholding systems, communal property, which enabled the inhabitants to subsist directly on the fruits of their labor. During the colonial period agrarian ownership declined among the indigenous population, as the Spanish displaced them and became landlords; nevertheless, due to a variety of judicious steps by the Spanish crown and dogged resistance by the indigenous population, the villages were able to conserve, at least in part, the lands belonging to them, a situation which persisted through Spanish rule and the first half of the nineteenth century" (Gamio in INI 1979: XIV).
In the case of Oaxaca Taylor observes:

"the noteworthy survival of the great landholding chieftanships after 1550 is intimately related to the strength the chiefs had acquired in the postclassic period, immediately prior to the arrival of the Spanish , and to the significant role the Valley chiefs played in the peaceful transition of the region to Spanish rule" (Taylor in Romero Frizzi 1986: 154).
Nevertheless, by the end of the colonial period socioeconomic changes apparently "…threatened and put in jeoprady the traditional role of the nobility…fragmented properties presented a myriad of problems to work or use and were extremely vulnerable to usurpation" (Taylor in Romero Frizzi 1986: 182).

The centrality of land to Mexican society during the colonial period explains the extensive archival materials on the bitter disputes over and defenses of land claims to be found in national, state, and muncipal depositories. Nor did this issue disappear with the post-Revolution agrarian reforms, as more recent work by Bartra (1972, 1974); Boege (1989), Dennis (1990); Pare (1973) and Reyna (1973) demonstrates. As coming chapters will show, access to land and control of its production not only continue to be critical concerns but bear directly on protection of archaeological heritage.

According to Dennis, conflicts over land in Oaxaca are probably the most persistent in the Zapotec portions of the state (Dennis 1990: 15). He recognizes land conflicts as a necessary element in intra-community solidarity "…villages are based not simply on control over communal lands but on active opposition to other similarly constituted communities manifested in a continual struggle for scarce resources" (Dennis 1987: 4). Dennis' work calls our attention to a series of elements in land disputes between two Zapotec communities of the Oaxaca Valley during the 1970s. Essentially his work shows a characteristic lack of will on the part of the communities to reach a definitive solution to the conflicts, so that when they become sharper through killings or a riot it is sure that that the the conflict will peak and then begin another cycle. Communities in conflict are very ready to consider these as resolved when the solution reached (generally through intervention by representatives of the state government) favors them completely. Not so the other side, who defeat leads them to pull from their archives their original maps…sometimes dating from the colonial period…and in no way will they consider the new versions as official or "permanent boundaries", but instead will declare them "provisional boundaries", assuring that the conflict remains alive as a continuing condition.

It is equally important to remember that among the maps and documents of communities there are often different versions of their boundaries, many times copies of codices, colonial maps, maps created during the distribution of land by the Secretary of Agrarian Reform, and other maps from the state tax office or other agencies. Dennis recognized three maps "…there were at least two different cognitive maps of the lands—the one held by Zautla and the one held by Mazaltepec—in addition to the version marked by government authorities as official on both villages' paper maps. The "true" cognitive map of the community lands is preserved long after the official map has changed, indicating the tenacity of village land claims" (Dennis 1987: 163).

One has to see the disagreements over archaeological zone boundaries against this backdrop. The communities affected see INAH as another neighbor invading their lands and, as the residents of Xoxocotlan and Mitla express openly, "we are willing to die", to defend what is theirs. For these communities boundary-setting is an intrusion by the federal government in their lands, and they feel highly offended that government has tried to impose on them from above the zone boundary lines. For that reason they are inclined to treat government representatives exactly the same as they would treat anyone who invades their ejidos or communal lands, that is, they are willing to enter a dynamic of conflict without end, as they will not recognize any official boundary of the "federal zone" beyond what they themselves agreed to at some moment in the past.

This disposition toward conflict was made clear during the boundary-setting of the zones under consideration. While in many cases there were official communications with the rights-holders regarding planned projects, months later these or new authorities would disclaim any knowledge of such activities. For example, in the case of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca INAH sent an official document informing community authorities of the boundary-setting process. Even though it had been signed and sealed by the head of the San Pedro ejido the year before, the general response from the community was "we do not know who that person is, we do not recognize him". In a more general sense one needs to remember that communities develop resistance strategies to deal with conflicts, with particular interest in intrusions which flow ultimately from the federal government.

Contemporary Changes in Land Tenure Legislation

In February, 1992, President Carlos Salinas de Gortari issued a series of decrees changing the legal status of some lands in Mexico (Cymet 1992: 139). He announced the New Agrarian Law, a change which reforms Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution. The principal objectives of the law are:

1. Formalizing a new relationship with the rural population through revised development policies intended to improve their economic and social welfare, create new investment and infrastructure in the countryside, and facilitate the protection and conservation of natural resources;
2. Transfer land ownership to ejidos and communities;
3. Create the foundations for new forms of economic activity in ejidos, communities, and small private holdings;
4. Alter the internal organization of ejidos and communities to make them more consistent with new forms of economic organization;
5. Make it possible for ejidos and communities to band together as groups, rural associations, or whatever form of business or civil organization necessary to improve land utilization, production, marketing, processing, or related services;
6. To sign contracts among ejidos, communities, and private interests for periods of up to thirty years, and renewable (Reyes Couterier, et al, 1992: 57).

Clearly these reforms create a framework completely different from the original concept of the ejido; the key steps move in the direction of privatizing ejidal lands and creating a market perspective for lands which until 1991 were owned through a collective and worked for the benefit of the community. To put these reforms in practice the government created the Agrarian Solicitor's Office and charged it with the reponsibility of implementing the changes in Article 27. In part this means overseeing the Program for Certification of Ejidal Rights, or PROCEDE for its acronym in Spanish. Although participating in PROCEDE is optional for each ejido, in practice the Agrarian Solicitor's Office tries to convince ejido members of the benefits of privatizing their holdings, which involves "…the preparation and delivery of the appropriate certification and titles." (Procuraduria Agraria 1993: 15).

Once the New Agrarian Law went into effect PROCEDE went to work at top speed. Representatives of the Agrarian SolicItor's Office convened assemblies of the members of each ejido, at which they outlined the process and presumed advantages of participation. If the assembly decided to participate in PROCEDE the next step was mapping and measuring the ejido, a technical operation carried out by personnel from Mexico's National Institute of Statistics, Geography, and Information, a federal agency with the reponsibility for generating census, geographic, and other types of information. Using aerial photography, topographic mapping, and other techniques, INEGI identified, located, and measured the boundaries and area of the ejido. Then, using the ejido's internal maps and instructions from the ejido assembly, the National Agrarian Registry prepared and delivered the Certificates of Tract Ownership, Certificates of Rights to Common Lands, and Titles for Urban Lots, according to the specifics of each case.

The clear connection between these new legal arrangements for ejido lands and archaeological sites in general is that all over the country there are preHispanic sites located on rural or urban ejido lands. While these lands were held collectively and not subject to sale INAH's operating relationship was with ejido authorities to avoid possible damage through agricultural or other use. But with the reforms, those sites located on lands whose rightsholders have opted for certification are now locked in a system of private property, which means they can be freely sold to the highest bidder, or in the best of cases may be incorporated into a production or marketing association dedicated to "improving use of the land" (Procuraduria Agraria 1993: 7). PROCEDE includes provisions for excluding from privatization lands with ecological significance, such as "forests and jungles", but nowhere are lands with archaeological resources reserved from privatization (Procuraduria Agraria 1993. 9), even though the Secretary of Agrarian Reform is a highly-respected member of several anthropological research organizations.

Despite sporadic efforts of INAH to be included in the survey teams to assure that archaeological resources are recognized and repected under the protection of the Federal Law on Archaeological Monuments and Zones, the truth is that speed with which PROCEDE works, its scope (there are over 27,000 ejidos in Mexico, most of which are eligible for participation), and the resources which have been put at its disposal far exceed INAH's capacity to keep up. In Oaxaca, with 784 ejidos in the state, by 1996 PROCEDE's work was well-advanced and only then was an archaeologist named to work with PROCEDE teams in the hope of identifying sites to be excluded from individual distribution. It is clear this was too little too late, as the distribution process by then was well-advanced. Monte Alban and Mitla did not escape the effects of the process as the ejidos of Atzompa, San Pedro Ixtlahuaca, and Xoxocotlan opted for certification, subdividing what had been held collectively. Mitla's ejidal lands lie outside the boundaries of the archaeological zone, but other lands with archaeological value are seriously affected. The fortress of Mitla, a fortified site overlooking the community, not only falls within ejido lands but worse, is the focus of a longstanding legal conflict between the ejidos of Mitla and Union Zapata.

It appears there is a conscious decision to leave certification of the urban ejidos until the end of the process. It is well-understood by agrarian officials that the growth of working class or middle class settlements such as those found on the slopes of Monte Alban are linked to illegal land transactions (Castañeda 1994: 174, Stephens 1994: 10; Murphy 1994: 210). It is clear they foresee higher levels of conflict or tension when the Agrarian Solicitor's Office seeks to regularize the status of land possession in the urban ejidos, given "…the relative advantage of illegal transfers—their low prices—will tend to disappear and at the same time will strengthen the formal real estate market…bringing to an end the subsidy granted by the poor of the countryside—the ejidatarios—to the poor of the city" (Castañeda 1994: 186). This implicit subsidy encourages the proliferation of irregular settlements and sprawl into the archaeological zone, but it confers an important political gain by providing a housing alternative for the poor.

Land speculators have taken advantage of the delay in PROCEDE's operations, arguing prospective purchasers should buy immediately "and build rapidly" (personal communication from Xoxocotlan resident). At present those involved in illegal sale of ejido land have an incentive to price land cheaply in order to move it, a circumstance favoring purchasers with limited resources. A lot within the Monte Alban boundary with official-looking but invalid title costs about one percent of what the same lot with legal title would cost in the upper-middle-class section of Oaxaca. Those who have paid once for a lot will resent further payments to the state to regularize their status (Murphy 1994: 218).

On the other hand, these changes in the law have provoked a renewal of old conflicts over land which the Secretary of Agrarian Reform had considered resolved, as the current members of ejidos now refuse to accept the agreements signed by their fathers or grandfathers (Stephen 1994: 10). According to Stephen, in many of the Oaxaca ejidos where PROCEDE initiated the distribution process work has been slowed or halted by internal or external conflicts over land. This problem has become so common the Agrarian Solicitor's Office coined a term "Agrarian Deferrals", cases which in theory should be resolved by the system of agrarian courts charged with resolving certain kinds of disputes (Procurduria Agraria 1993: 103). In 1996 the ejidos de Santa Maria Atzompa, San Pedro Ixtlahuaca, San Martin Mexicapam, and Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan, all of which have lands inside the Monte Alban boundary, and the ejido of Mitla, were subject to agrarian deferrals. Paradoxically, these delays are to the advantage of archaeological conservation, as while cases are subject to agrarian deferral the traditional structure remains in effect. Indeed, given the dynamics and importance of agrarian conflicts some of these cases may never be resolved.

It is important to understand that the modifications to Article 27 not only alters a set of legal frameworks, but undermines the entire basis of traditional communities in terms of their economies and internal organization. In this respect we could argue that the issues of destruction and commercialization of archaeological sites which so concern archaeologists, e.g., for reasons of access and conservation, in reality are modest losses compared to a changing reality which implies the total loss of a traditional way of life in the Mexican countryside.

Chapter 6: Issues in Land Use

One of the critical elements in site destruction in terms of the general setting (surrounding ecosystems and landscapes), structures (buildings in general or specific architectural components), or the deterioration of non-tangible attributes (cultural atmosphere, respect for history or tradition) has been the variety of land uses to which the sites of Monte Alban and Mitla have been subjected. Data from the archives at the INAH regional office in Oaxaca do not always capture this variety, as such data are not considered strictly "scientific" by archaeologists. These are more likely to become background material in the legal archives. Nevertheless, the analysis of land use for agricultural, touristic, or commercial purposes, for informal peddling, for mature, planned, or spontaneous housing purposes, for the infrastructure necessary to support such uses, or for other purposes enables us to understand the complexity of interests in the land base of these two sites.

On an average day the Oaxaca regional office receives from one to three communications regarding land use issues. Some may be applications from the owners of lands or houses located on the periphery or within an archaeological zone, soliciting permission to build or to expand existing construction according to relevant INAH criteria. Others may be notifications by INAH personnel regarding construction or other unauthorized land use. Still others may be applications from agencies responsible for infrastructure development requesting authorization to proceed with planned construction. In this sense archaeologists invest a great amount of their work time in the field attending applications or complaints and subsequently handling the documentation necessary to authorize or suspend someone else's project. The range of uses to which the two sites have been subject offers a sample of the ways in which the regulations governing land use have outstripped completely the technical, legal, and human capacity of the institution charged with responsibility for protecting the archaeological heritage.

One would think that as the lead agency in cultural resources preservation INAH would faithfully observe the best professional practice in site protection. Nevertheless analysis of land use, and above all those uses associated with tourist infrastructure, lead us to the conclusion that the agency lacks formal preparation as well as technical capacity and political commitment to approve only those projects truly compatible with the task of preservation.

It is important to note that over the past twenty years the tendency in land use at both sites has been a gradual shift from agricultural use toward housing, tourist and commercial services, and infrastructure. This tendency demonstrates the interests of the individuals and groups most closely linked to the sites and the forces which encourage societal interests in them, i.e., overwhelmingly that of commercial exploitation.

Land Use in the Environs of Monte Alban and Mitla

1. Agriculture

If there existed a single general land use at Monte Alban prior to its discovery it was agriculture. In photographs taken shortly before exploration of the main plaza one can see clearly how the soil of the sunken area of the plaza as well as the tops of some of the mounds and platforms had been prepared to serve as cropland. During the 1930s, as we have seen, the city of Oaxaca was still far from jumping the natural boundary of the Atoyac River, and the communities surrounding the present archaeological zone were still small settlements.

Agriculture at Monte Alban has always been seasonal on thin, steep soils, with the exception of a few topographically favorable areas which in many cases coincide with the monumental structures. During the pre-Columbian era the problem of slope eroison was resolved by building terraces to facilitate cultivation, as these retained sufficient soil and moisture to assure adequate and predictable production. In more recent times farmers have concentrated their efforts on areas with better, deeper soils for farming, practically abandoning the hillsides where a substantial investment of labor was no guarantee of production.

Traditional agricultural practices, i.e., seasonal, manual cultivation, has been compatible with the archaeological zone, as they did not affect the deeper soil strata. With the initiation of exploration at Monte Alban only the central plaza was declared off-limits to farming, resulting in an agricultural landscape surrounding the zone which provided continued protection. But even so these practices began to have an effect on archaeological resources, as in the twenty years after exploration began at Monte Alban farmers working nearby lands uncovered a number of pre-Columbian tombs in the process of plowing or other minor excavation related to agriculture. In general, however, for many years they maintained a stable, uniform land use surrounding the zone.

Unfortunately over time agricultural activity on the slopes of Monte Alban has gradually declined, and is now limited to those areas offering the best soils and moisture. On the other hand the urban spread of the city of Oaxaca has to an alarming degree displaced agriculture in favor of residential use, or under the best of circumstances to lands being left idle. In Santa Maria Atzompa agriculture is still practiced in small isolated patches on the middle and lower slopes of the Cerro de Atzompa, around the Cerro del Gallo, to a small degree in the Cañada, and on a few plots on the middle slopes of Monte Alban, where they overlay an area with a high density of archaeological remains. Atzompa's agricultural lands within the Monte Alban boundary amount to about 5 percent of its total supply (Figure 33). To the west agricultural use by San Pedro Ixtlahuaca is much higher, with about 35 percent of of its seasonal agricultural land within the boundary (Figure 34). Its location on the west side of Monte Alban makes it less subject to the urban uses found on the east side adjacent to the city of Oaxaca.

In the municipality of Xoxocatlan agriculture is in sharp decline, as ejido lands are subdivided and sold for residential use. There is still some modest production on communal lands and a few private parcels. In general terms about 15 percent of Xoxocatlan's land within the boundary are still farmed, but this use diminishes almost daily through subdivision and the formation of new urban neighborhoods (Figure 35). In the city of Oaxaca the only remaining agriculture adjacent to Monte Alban is on small plots in San Martin Mexicapam. About 25 percent of this agricultural land lies inside the archaeological zone boundary, and much of it is rich in artifacts (Figure 36). A generation ago agriculture was an important feature of the Monte Alban landscape, but it has now given way to less compatible uses.

In the case of Mitla, agriculture within the boundary of the archaeological zone has been a minor element in a variety of economic activities undertaken within urban households. That is, traditionally part of the compound of each home has been used to plant corn, beans, squash, herbs, flowers and fruit trees, essentially complementing craft production and/or commercial activities. In spite of an arid landscape consisting largely of abandoned agricultural lands surrounding the urban part of contemporary Mitla, Parsons tells us how in 1931 Mitla was still self-sufficient in the production of corn, beans, and squash, with fields of peas, alfalfa, maguey, castor beans, and cactus such as nopal and pitaya raised for human use (Parsons 1936: 51). Even then, however, most cultivation took place on lands more distant from the archaeological zone, on the riverbanks where farmers planted alfalfa, carrizo, and early corn, or on some distant hillsides where there were some modest small-scale irrigation systems. In town household plots, usually under the care of women or children, made small contributions to the family economy. Today older informants estimate that less than 25 percent of the household plots which existed in 1975 are still in production.

Currently agriculture has a minimal importance among the economic activities of the community. Within the archaeological zone less than one percent of the land is still considered agricultural, and most of that is idle (Figure 37). Little land is cultivated, except by a few older men still willing to work it for the pittance it produces. Males in the work force find employment in commerce and services, as laborers, or they "go north", a term locally understood to mean they go to the United States as undocumented workers or, more likely, they go to Puerto Vallarta or Mazatlan to sell handicrafts on the beach.

It is clear that in a relatively short time agricultural activity around these two archaeological zones has essentially collapsed. Changes in land use or its abandonment attenuates the sense of connection or identification its previous users might have had with the surroundings of the archaeological zones. On the other hand, it also means that for most alternative uses the owner is likely to seek authorization for construction which requires deeper penetration of the subsoil, thereby increasing the potential for damaging archaeological remains.

2. Grazing

In addition to cultivation there is also a long tradition of grazing in the Oaxaca Valley. The communities surrounding Monte Alban generally supplement their economies based on agriculture and unskilled labor with goats and cows, as the three hills which make up the Monte Alban complex provide an attractive landscape for such livestock to graze. Herds of cows and goats from at least ten settlements surrounding the archaeological site graze there on a regular basis. Intensive grazing promotes deforestation and consequently erosion, as the livestock consume the young shoots of emerging vegetation. During the mid-1990s two seasons of intensive reforestation intended to revive the landscape and create green barriers to invasion of the archaeological zone have failed due to overgrazing.

In 1994, as part of the Monte Alban Special Project, a sub-project intended to attack the ecological deterioration of the site sought to foster what was dubbed the "Green Wall" (Peralta 1994). The objective was to reforest first the boundary areas and then toward the interior of the zone. The initial phase of the project involved close contact with the surrounding communities including polling, cultivating local influentials and officials, working groups, and community assemblies. In addition to INAH the collaborating agencies were SEDESOL, SEDAF, PROFEPA, Reforma Agraria, and the city of Oaxaca's Bureau of Municipal Ecology. Taking San Juan Chapultepec as an example, this joint effort in May and June, 1994, produced a green barrier stretching more than 1000 yards with approximately 1550 maguey plants, 1280 pines, 400 casuarinas, 150 guajes and 150 guamuchiles (Peralta 1994:16). A report dated 23 July 1994 indicated more than 1000 each of magueys and pines had been destroyed, and in September, 1994, Peralta concluded "it is worth noting 30 percent of the plantings has survived, but the majority have been devoured" (Peralta 1994: 17).

Later that same year, as the Monte Alban Special Project came to a close, another attempt, this time led by SEDESOL, sought to reforest areas of Atzompa and San Martin Mexicapam. This project also sought to work through the local communities and with the assistance of the Mexican army, but the results were the same. Oaxaca's Bureau of Municipal Ecology made an effort to reach agreements with livestock owners to avoid grazing the reforested areas, and subsequently established sanctions for the owners of goats found there, but no method proved effective in controlling further deforestation (Peralta 1994: 14). As the urbanized area expands and grazing lands become more scarce, pressures for using Monte Alban intensify rather than decline.

The area inside Mitla's archaeological zone is different, as being almost completely urbanized grazing is not an issue. But this is not true on the intermediate slopes of the mountains to the north or northeast, where abundant herds of goats and some cattle graze. These areas clearly show accelerated desertification caused at least in part by overgrazing. The slopes are Mitla's communal lands, outside any jurisdiction or oversight by INAH, and the community has not addressed the issue. As flocks may be tended by the children or elderly and represent a means of diversifying household incomes, there would be widespread reluctance to adopt protective strategies without assurance that everyone would be required to support them.

While grazing does not appear to cause direct damage in either archaeological zone, the erosion which seems inevitable does affect archaeological remains. And a lamentable side effect is that grazing appears to contribute to looting. Many of the tombs looted on the west slopes of Monte Alban appear to be the work of goatherders, as in the time they are nominally looking after the goats they may also search for and excavate tombs. Similarly, in Mitla on two occasions archaeologists have had to engage in salvage archaeology on semi-looted tombs reported by "curious" goatherders (Robles 1989 and 1995, unpublished reports, Archives INAH CRO). Thus uncontrolled grazing may have two negative effects on archaeological sites.

3. Exploitation of Forest and Other Resources

Another important agent contributing to the deterioration of Monte Alban's environment has been the indiscriminate extraction of the tree species known as Copal or Copalillo, once found extensively on the hillsides of the site. Since 1986 herders and artisans from communities such as Arrazola and San Martin Tilcajete have based an important part of their economies on craft production of "alebrijes", fanciful, brightly painted wooden sculptures which often take advantage of the natural shapes of these species (Barbash 1993). With success in the national and international markets local sculptors demanded more and more copal, as the shapes and workability of copal made it especially attractive as a raw material. Exploitation of the stands of copal on Monte Alban, Cerro del Gallo and Cerro de Atzompa began in the late 1980s, completely wiping out the species in the area. Efforts to reforest with copal led to cutting of even the smallest shoots for sculptures, and today the artisans must truck in copal from more distant communities. Neither the governmental agencies charged with environmental protection nor the communities themselves have addressed this issue, much less the sculptors who never replanted a single tree to replace the material they cut.

Other species of native vegetation have been heavily exploited, above all those which may be used as firewood. As population concentrations have grown larger and closer to Monte Alban the number of people who seek to collect firewood also grows, and rapid increases in the price of bottled cooking gas makes firewood even more important for many households. Unfortunately no plant inventory of Monte Alban exists, making it impossible to know what other species may be used or overexploited by surrounding populations, but in general exploitation is growing. The observable outcome is that increasingly the zone shows signs of ecological deterioration and erosion affecting archaeological resources.

Although the extraction of mineral resources is minimal, it has had considerable importance in the Cañada, where flagstone is extracted for architectural projects around the city. In 1995 Atzompa's municipal authorities provided large quantitiies of flagstone to the city of Oaxaca for ornamental street paving in the historic district. The flagstone was extracted by heavy machinery, in the process creating a series of terraces quickly appropriated as housing sites by people invading the boundaries of Monte Alban. The municipal authorities of Atzompa and Oaxaca collaborated in facilitating this invasion through the apparent understanding that the flagstone would be removed in such a way as to prepare the site for residential use. Thus resources which make up the setting for one heritage site are removed for the beautification of another heritage site, and in the process expose the first to a double degradation by damaging the natural landscape and contributing to irregular invasion. This led Winter to observe "There is a contradictory policy for the two components of the World Heritage Site, in that it supports the destruction of part of Monte Alban to "improve" the appearance of the city of Oaxaca" (Winter 1996, Archaeology Section Archives, INAH CRO).

Grazing and resource extraction takes place in areas otherwise unused or with natural vegetation, without regard for land tenure or existing deterioration. For example we see that 80 percent of Atzompa's lands within Monte Alban's boundaries may be considered unused, 2/3 of which is either completely deforested or in the process of degradation. For the city of Oaxaca 70 percent of the lands within the boundary are unused, but 80 percent of those lands should be considered degraded. For San Pedro Ixtlahuaca the figures as 65 percent unused with 2/3 degraded, and for Xoxocatlan 80 percent of the lands are unused with about 50 percent degraded. While to the casual observer who thinks of Monte Alban strictly in terms of its Central Plaza the rest of the zone may appear to be an attractive protected area, the reality is that it has been suffering a complex degradation which governments not only appear to be incapable of stopping, but which they sometimes foster.

In 1931 Parsons listed as one of the economic activities of Mitla the sale of house beams cut from its forests (Parsons 1931: plate VII). Sixty-five years later these forests had disappeared, wiped out by overcutting. Ironically most of the large trees found in Mitla today are in house patios or public spaces, places where they are protected from depredation. The only extractive activity still practiced is the mining of pink limestone for foundations, walls, or facades. This resource is exploited on communal lands by municipal authorities in the name of the community, either to be used in public works or sold to individuals. Although the quarry site lies outside the archaeological zone it is on the path to the Mitla Fortress, a massive rock outcropping used by prehispanic residents as a defensive stronghold against raiders and invaders. The ever-expanding quarry creates a major crater as a visual and physical interruption in the connection of the two cultural resources.

In Mitla the local population also long practiced a kind of "archaeological mining", or the intensive appropriation and reuse of materials from old buildings and platforms for new construction. This, while not strictly exploitation of natural resources, in essence treated pre-Columbian buildings as a source of building materials as a readily-accessible alternative to the quarry mentioned above. Its effect was to further damage structures and greatly reduce their volume. Recovering some of these materials, house by house, to reincorporate them in the-Columbian walls, is a challenge which Batres discusses in his reports of work at Mitla at the start of the twentieth century (Batres 1908).

4. Residential Use

Modern human settlements represent a relatively recent use of the lower slopes of the east and southeast fronts of Monte Alban. The conversion of this land to residential use springs from the gradual expansion of the urban core to the west and southwest in the 1960s. At that time public transportation barely reached San Juan Chapultepec, but it gave some access to this area. These early settlements on the fringe of the archaeological zone consisted of clusters of poor shacks, but over time they became more substantial as individual investment, public infrastructure, and political organization converted them into "colonias". In Higgins' words "colonias are not legal subdivisions which are part of the structure of the city, but represent an unplanned growth of the same" (Higgins 1974: 27).

At present we can see two types of human settlements around the slopes of Monte Alban. One of these is the aforementioned "colonia" (Butterworth 1973; Higgins 1974; Murphy and Stepick 1991). This form emerged on the periphery of the city around 1940, coinciding with new routes of communication and patterns of urban growth which created a scarcity of and higher cost for urban housing (Butterworth 1973: 212). Initially constructed of discarded, recycled, or low-cost materials…used posts and beams, corrugated cardboard, scraps of wood, or sheets of tin used to prepare food or soft drink containers. Such sheets often have printing or other quality imperfections which make them unacceptable for their intended use, so they enter the low cost housing materials market. They find ready acceptance for temporary construction, and therefore appear around the archaeological zone.

Colonias tend to follow a basic developmental pattern. Once about ten families have settled in a given spot household heads gather to demand the basic services of water and electricity. In the meantime they live in wretched conditions: without electricity, on dirt streets with no sanitation or sewers, walking long distances to find potable water. The irregular status of the settlement means they have no direct access to public transport or services such as vaccination campaigns and other health programs. During a second phase, which may take years to emerge, residents begin to pressure for other services: schools, sewage, transportation, paved streets. Higgins labels these "mature colonias" (Higgins 1974) and notes they usually are associated with a process of housing improvements such as concrete roofs, brick walls, and more sturdy construction. Even so these improvements basically reflect do-it-yourself construction without regard to formal plans or regulations.

Another component in colonia development is the land speculator. These individuals gain access to ejido or communal lands committees, and through corruption or pressure, arrange to have lands to which they have no legal right transferred to them for resale to families looking for homesites on the urban periphery. During a field survey in November, 1995, it was possible to identify plots, usually 200 square meters, for sale at 3000, 5000, or 8000 pesos under conditions where no legal titles to the land were available to the seller. Such plots, often with dubious or fabricated titles, are common elements in colonia formation. After the official declaration of Monte Alban boundaries in 1994 the occupation of land speculator became popular in the neighboring communities. Not only private manipulators but municipal presidents, vice-presidents, and treasurers as well as ejidal and communal lands committee members entered the speculation game.

As for the families who create the colonias, it is obvious that one commonality is that they are poor migrants arriving from elsewhere. Nevertheless they are not all peasants from rural indigenous communities who have come to the city in search of work, as was the case in 1878 (Yescas Peralta 1958: 779). Today the majority are families from towns across the state (Rees, et al 1991) who have lived as renters for some time in the city of Oaxaca. Having accumulated some capital (Butterworth 1973: 220) and finding the cost of housing in the city center prohibitive, they opt to move to a nearby suburban area where they can purchase a low-cost lot and have the possibility of a home through owner-built construction. Land on the slopes of Monte Alban fits this need, for as ejidal or communal lands no longer in use those holding the use rights prefer to subdivide and sell parcels cheaply to low-income people who will not demand formal title.

While there has been no formal socioeconomic study of the Monte Alban "colonias", systematic observation suggests some common denominators:

an apathy related to a sense of rootlessness and commitment to a new neighborhood where everyone is from outside and feels little connection to the local community;

social problems such as under-employment, alcoholism and substance abuse, poor sanitary and health conditions, and threats of violence; and

a lack of confidence in governmental institutions.

Monte Alban Colonias, by Municipality (Figure 38)

Atzompa	
(north side)	(south side or Cañada)
Forestal	La Cañada
Guelaguetza	Ampliación La Cañada
Ampliacion Guelaguetza	Loma Grande
Ejidal Santa Maria	Agencia Monte Alban
La Ilusion	
Oxaca de Juarez	
(San Martin Mexicapam)	(San Juan Chapultepec)
Hidalgo	El Progreso
Moctezuma	El Coquito
Monte Alban	La Cuevita
Carlos Salinas de Gortari	El Rosario Santa Ana
Xoxocotlan	
Del Valle	Insurgentes
Emiliano Zapata	El Chapulin
El Paraguito	Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz
Santa Elena	Lomas de San Javier

The second type of settlement found around Monte Alban is the official "subdivision" financed by governmental sources, principally the state government of Oaxaca through its Oaxaca Housing Institute (IVO for its initials in Spanish). These subdivisions have been located the the state government on lands it has acquired at low cost via purchase from private owners or through agreements with the Communal Lands Committees of various municipalities. The construction of official "subdivisions" stems from a strong housing demand by lower-level salaried employees, particularly those who work for the state or federal governments or for businesses in the service or commercial sectors whose employees have access to benefits through one of the governmental programs for citizen welfare, such as IMSS or ISSSTE. In one of the sharper policy conflicts over Monte Alban, the state government has consciously settled hundreds of families in an area where the federal government restricts land use because of proximity to the archaeological zone. At its best this conflict suggests a lack of communication between the two levels of government and a failure to understand the impact of development plans associated with urban growth on the archaeological zone. Another perspective is that even while the state government spends increasing amounts to promote tourism in Oaxaca, it at the same time opts for politically comfortable choices which ironically place in jeoprady its premier tourist attraction.

Each subdivision comes complete with services: electricity, water, sewers, paved streets, minimal green spaces or parks, police protection, and access to schools and transportation. Individual houses contain the basic spaces for a modern middle-class family: living room/dining room, kitchen, bathroom, two or three bedrooms, a small service area and a small yard or carport. The materials of which these houses are constructed are not high quality; they barely meet acceptable construction standards for the city of Oaxaca. Nevertheless they receive blanket approval or through petty corruption standards are ignored, e.g., third class concrete block in used in wall construction or steel framing is of poor quality. The low quality notwithstanding, these projects may be the only alternative for a lower income salaried worker to have an adequate home. The right to purchase one of these homes is decided via a raffle, and the employee winning the right to buy feels truly fortunate to have an opportunity to begin to form a personal estate.

At this writing there are six official subdivisions on the east slopes of Monte Alban: Colinas de Monte Alban, Montoya, Montoya IVO, Los Alamos IVO, Jardin de las Lomas IVO, y Los Alamos INFONAVIT. In scale they range from the 540 units at Colins de Monte Alban to the 2148 houses the Montoya-Los Alamos complex projects when fully built out (Figure 39). The large size represents an aggressive urban intrusion into the natural or cultivated setting the archaeological zone long enjoyed. The continuity of the mountain environment now suffers a violent interruption by modern materials. The population concentration attracts stores and services, which in turn attract additional population to the area, increasing the pressure on the archaeological zone. As will be evident in the chapter on social groups, the arrival of new homeowners whose presence in the subdivision derives from winning a raffle means most lack even a minimal cultural identification with the adjacent archaeological zone. In turn its conservation or existence has little meaning for them.

At present the percentage of the archaeological zone covered by housing is minimal. Approximately ten percent of the lands belonging to Atzompa and Xoxocotlan within the archaeological zone are devoted to housing, a figure which declines to two percent in the case of the city of Oaxaca and less than one percent for the lands of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca. The concern is the rate at which urban uses are beginning to take hold on the periphery of the archaeological zone. We have now seen the impact of such changes in the chapter on boundary definition, as the 1992 modification of the site boundary is attributable primarily to land settlements and invasions overrunning the 1986 boundary. It is evident the urban growth of the city of Oaxaca has found on the slopes of Monte Alban, though both planned and unplanned development, a means of providing relatively low cost housing sites. Development plans which recognize the areas INAH seeks to protect have proven totally ineffective in controlling urban sprawl as they lack any meaningful regulatory capability. Prepared without the participation and commitment of the communities, none of the affected parties feels an obligation to enforce them, and they become rarely-consulted additions to the municipal archives.

In this sense modern housing has become part of the landscape on the east slopes of Monte Alban and in the Cañada. Modern settlements fundamentally alter the landscape which bounded the pre-Columbian city and which should be preserved as an integral part of the site. They also alter the environment substantially by representing important sources of pollution from trash, excrement, noise, gases and structures, pollution completely alien to the history and ambience of an archaeological monument. Finally, the residential construction and excavation for installation of services implies a series of excavations in the sub-soil which inevitably put at risk a high proportion of the archaeological remains to be found there. Each trench opened as part of a new foundation potentially represents destruction of the archaeological record. The INAH regional office in Oaxaca issued a finding opposing the construction at Montoya once its magnitude was known (Robles and Zarate 1984: Archaeology Section Archives, CRO-INAH). But once the state government has decided on its plans and investment priorities it is extremely difficult to convince the government to back off.

In practice this destruction can reach rather dramatic levels, as in the case of the section known as "el Paraguito" in Xoxocotlan, where the new settlement completely destroyed a pre-Columbian plaza surrounded by three mounds. This became the site for a chapel and for the soccer field of a nearby school. Each day portions of the mounds disappeared to make way for new housing. An INAH custodian sent to gather data on the destruction was threatened with machetes until he left the settlement (Oliveros, personal communication, 1995).

In terms of residential use of lands in and adjacent to archaeolgoical monuments, Mitla has a far longer history than Monte Alban, as reported in an earlier study (Robles and Moreira 1990: 77). One consequence is that since the colonial era a traditional Zapotec community has surrounded and encroached upon the prinicipal platforms and monumental structures. For this reason Mitla offers us lessons on both the processes of encroachment and the difficulties occasioned by the lack of a timely and appropriate response.

At the time Parsons conducted her research Mitla was divided into six barrios or neighborhoods: San Salvador, San Pablo (sometimes called Peñasco), La Soledad, La Resurreccion, La Asuncion, and El Centro (or Rosario). The area known locally as "the ruins" (the North and Columns groups) was located on the northern side of San Pablo (Parsons 1936: 6-7), as was the Arroyo group. Parsons' map of house locations (Parsons 1936: Map II) shows us urban use had spread as far as the Columns and North groups, but only in the form of some isolated houses on the west side toward the priest's house (5 houses reported), the same number near the Arroyo group, and a somewhat higher density near the Columns group....24 houses. Around the Adobe group, in the Barrio of the Resurreccion, Parsons reports five houses, and four more around the South group in the Barrio of El Rosario.

A 1975 aerial photo reveals more extensive settlement to the north of the North group, with approximately twelve houses, and the same number appears around the Adobe group. The Arroyo group shows fourteen, and the South group has fifteen houses. Only the area near the group of the Columns remained stable, with approximately twenty houses (Cia. Mexicana Aerofoto 1975). The growth since 1975 has been both increasing density in plot use and penetration of the legal boundaries of the archaeological zone. The mountain slope on the north side of the community, an area which does not even appear on Parsons' map, by the mid-1990s held forty houses, and the flat space between the North group and the mountain....still vacant in 1975....has become thickly settled.

Around the Columns group family compounds are also undergoing subdivision, and in the Arroyo group a chaotic dispersal of households invades the space around the monumental structures themselves, as the fourteen properties reported in 1975 experience subdivision. The fifteen properties around the South group also have been subdivided, and the Adobe group now shares its space with a school as well as houses. By the mid-1990s approximately 80 percent of the space within the official archaeological boundary of Mitla is in fact used for residential purposes. In reality its use may be far more intrusive and destructive, as many households combine residential use with spaces to sell crafts or for commercial purposes such as restaurants, services, or shop rental. As most of the lands in Mitla are in communal tenure, invasions or alterations of the archaeological zone reflect a lack of sensitivity on the part of the local populations as well as of the officials charged with managing land use. Officials generally are far more attentive to the possibility of economic gain through tourism from lands surrounding the archaeological zone than to the significance of their protection.

Much of this increasing density is attributable to subdivision of family compounds via gifts or inheritance. In 1975 what was one property near the North group today has been subdivided among seven owners, children of the original householder. This phenomenon of subdivision is recent but widespread. While precise data on the size of the original parcels allocated by the community to families seeking a place to establish a household are not available, sources such as Parsons' map suggest they had an area of 800 to 1000 square meters. As population increased in recent decades a lack of disposable land near major commercial arteries stimulated subdivision of large compounds to house maturing extended families and their enterprises. This means that near the archaeological zone there is an increasing concentration of population, with the consequent problems of competition for land use, pollution, or land invasion.

In addition, within the community the concept of "Ruinas" (the archaeological zone) is interpreted as meaning solely the group of the Columns. As a consequence some of the other groups, i.e., the Arroyo and South groups, have been distributed among prospective land users, while the North and Adobe groups have been interpreted as church land. Thus efforts to recover these groups for incorporation into a broader interpretation of the archaeological zone means battling with the households who currently control them, and who may wish to remove them in order to use the space they occupy or to take advantage of the building materials they contain.

Another recent complication is the enthusiasm for "remodelling" houses surrounding the monuments. If by the beginning of the 1970s the archaeological sites were being invaded, the housing surrounding them at least maintained the character of traditional Zapotec construction: rectangular rooms constructed of adobe or stone with neither plastering or windows, roofs of palm or tile over a wood frame, and dirt floors. Simpler houses might be built of carrizo and adobe, with straw roofs and fences of live organ cactus, as described by Parson in the 1930s. Parsons reported only three houses two stories tall (Parsons1936: 23). Thus the setting of the pre-Columbian monumental architecture maintained a largely authentic tone. But beginning in the 1970s there has been a shift toward "modern" construction, housing made of concrete block, with cement floors, doors and windows of iron, concrete roof, the use or abuse of aluminum and glass, and enormous walls of concrete block with large steel gates to permit passage of cargo trucks. While this construction facilitates status competition it also requires demolition of older structures and walls of adobe. The result is a brutal attack on the authenticity and arquitectural tradition of a Zapotec community.

In Mitla as in Monte Alban we can see that the nature of housing issues tends to define the physical surroundings of the archeological zones. Although federal law grants INAH the power to halt and sanction unauthorized work on archaeological land (INAH 1980), INAH lacks the practical capacity to halt urban sprawl threatening Monte Alban, much less control land use and construction abuses in Mitla. In part this is attributable to the reality that application of the law depends on the INAH bureaucracy, whose Legal Department is staffed by attorneys who consistently demonstrate a lack of experience and professional preparation in defence of cultural resources. Enforcement of the law also depends on the resources of the federal Attorney General, whose personnel are always busy with priority assignments (such as anti-narcotics operations) or searching for guerrillas, and have little time to allocate to an institution dedicated to culture.

Nevertheless there is another element to INAH with a significant negative impact on institutional performance in resource protection, and that is the lack of preparation among INAH archaeologists for evaluating construction permit requests according to best professional practice. A clear case of this can be seen in the permit granted to a landowner to construct the foundations of his new house within one of the pre-Columbian houses in the Arroyo group (Winter 1979 Archaeology Section Archive, INAH CRO). It demonstrated the archaeologist granting the permit did not know the site and had no sense of the relationship between the scale of the site and the projected construction (Figure 40).

In a broader context the fundamental problem springs from a lack of awareness of or identification with a series of values gradually disappearing when confronted by expressions of the modern world, whether in the marginal neighborhoods on the slopes of Monte Alban or in a community in the throes of commercialization such as Mitla. This disappearance leaves archaeological sites and their surroundings increasing vulnerable to actions, attitudes, and circumstances which threaten their existence. The irony, of course, is at the same time it is the modern world which seeks to make use of cultural resources as economic resources, and by permitting their abuse, vandalism, and destruction it reduces its capacity to sustain the day-to-day livelihoods and grand development projects dependent on tourism.

5. Service Infrastructure

Upon the formation of new settlements the provision of urban infrastructure becomes a significant concern for the responsible local authorities, as they are most directly affected by emerging demands and pressures. As will be evident in the chapter on social groups, once consolidated as an identifiable settlement the struggle for public services commences.

In the cases of Monte Alban and Mitla what is striking evident is

1. the complete absence of coordination between and among federal and state agencies which supply services, and
2. the lack of attention to INAH's formal responsibilities in relation to cultural resources protection and land use regulation in the buffer zones.

Services such as water, electricity, sewage, schools, sports facilities, or street pavement stem from the political pressure organized groups bring to bear on local officials. Thus an organized group may present a request for electrification, or water, and at first nothing happens; there is no response whatsoever. Nevertheless, after a few months the same group has learned the most effective way to present its case (which might be in association with other such settlements, or through the auspices or an intermediary organization, or even an elected official) and how to trade its political support to those who will work on the group's behalf, even if this means ignoring the responsibilities and representations of INAH.

This pattern of behavior, repeated time and time again, reveals two important factors in understanding the dilemmas of cultural resources protection. First, each agency is more inclined to respond to political pressures applied by external groups than it is to coordinate actions with other agencies. Despite claims of centralization in Mexican government there is very little effort to assure policy coordination or that agencies do not create problems for each other. Furthermore, state agencies are most attentive to what they hear from the governor, and the fact this may be inconsistent with federal policy is of less and less importance. Remember that federal policy presumably stresses protection for Monte Alban, and that did not stop the Oaxaca Housing Institute from putting thousands of units of public housing on Monte Alban, some of it only a few meters from the archaeological zone boundary. Second, INAH receives little attention and support because the Secretary of Education, as the cabinet officer responsible for INAH, has shown little interest in defending its responsibilities and priorities. INAH's leadership understands that effective performance means not embroiling the agency in conflictual circumstances likely to generate irate or perplexed calls from the Secretary's office. It also means that other agencies can carry out agendas which satisfy their constituencies even when this means ignoring or overriding INAH's formal responsibilities.

Consequently the spread of human settlement inside the archaeological zone boundary receives support from public agencies which extend their services without regard for the legality of such settlement. Almost all of the irregular settlements on Monte Alban have received electricity this way; in the mid-1990s Nueva Santa Maria de Atzompa aggressively lobbied, demanded, and threatened the Federal Electricity Commission to secure electrification. The Commission's internal policy states that as soon as a new urban population center includes a certain number of households it will begin to extend service, the rules, requirements, and responsibilities of other agencies notwithstanding. The Commission's actions both make the settlement a more attractive place to live, thereby encouraging further growth, and legitimize the demand-making process.

Providing water is the responsibility of the National Water Commission, and its criteria for installation of service has been overwhelming technical. In the case of Monte Alban it installed tanks for water distribution on the east slopes of Monte Alban right at the archaeological zone boundary, arguing that due to the gravity feed system no-one would settle uphill from the tanks. Nevertheless settlement has continued up past the tanks, and in the region of Xoxocotlan now is inside the Monte Alban boundary. The agency overlooked the fact that people recently arrived in irregular settlements are accustomed to do without piped water, and are accustomed to carry it long distances. In practice the tanks served to attract a high number of additional users and now are inadequate to meet the demands upon them.

The provision of schools follows much the same pattern, although here the focus of demands is a state rather than federal agency. Schools are a particularly important service from the standpoint of consolidating and legitimizing new settlements. Thus in some of the areas where INAH has struggled mightily to protect archaeological remains the IEEPO arrives to install primary schools at the behest of the new settlers. As in the case of the Federal Electrification Commission the IEEPO uses a formula to assess when a school should be built, but it also responds to political pressures and demands, providing schools without regard as to whether the land is archaeological, ejido, or communal. A walking inspection of Paraquito in Xoxocotlan and the canyon dividing Monte Alban from the Cerro de Monte Alban showed new schools in both places, located literally on the remains of pre-Columbian archaeological materials.

The installation of sewers generally falls to a combined project supported by local or state agencies and by the settlement itself through organized voluntary labor or tequio. The cost, complexity, and time required for a successful sewage project means these are most likely to be carried out in the "mature" settlements or in the subdivisions planned for this service. In new settlements the tendency is to defecate in the open air and to channel grey water into the streets, creating problems of pollution and disease. Infrastructure such as churches, markets, and sports facilities are more likely to be the result of small, persistent groups of interested people. Such projects may receive technical support, a loan of heavy equipment, or other assistance, and as all involve disturbing the soil all create the risk of disturbing subsurface remains.

In general terms one can say that efforts to provide infrastructure in an effort to solve the pressing problems of existing subdivisions or irregular settlements result in the arrival of additional residents drawn by access to services. The lack of planning and coordination among local, state, and national agencies means there is little opportunity to address long-term issues, as services tend to be provided in response immediate political demands. Unfortunately the short-term perspective and tendency to be reactive rather than proactive proves to generate even more chaos as well as further damage the integrity of the archaeological zone.

The substantial growth of tourism in Mitla over the past two decades, and the relative prosperity due at least in part to an expanding commerce in artisanry, generated a demand for attention to the community's infrastructure needs. From 1972 to 1982 the community gradually extended a sewage system along the principal streets of the center, in the process uncovering a number of burials and other evidence of pre-Columbian occupation of the site. While it was possible to carry out some salvage archaeology on the spot (Galan 1972 and Paddock 1983, in the Archives of the Archaeology Section of the CRO), in other cases residents opposed such work (Robles 1980, in the Archives of the Archaeology Section of the CRO). In 1990 the municipality paved a large number of streets in the center, ignoring INAH proposals for a work plan which would have permitted archaeological testing before opportunities disappeared under slabs of cement. The South group was closely invested with pavement, barring archaeologists from determining its original size before house lots parcelled it out. Expansion of the water system and drilling of additional wells followed the same pattern of lack of coordination.

Mitla is well-served by the Federal Electrification Commission; lines reach all parts of the community and the CFE has a local office to attend to needs and problems. However, lines and posts have been placed without regard to the cultural landscape and in ways which intrude on the quality of the experience the visitor will have. And the combination of electricity and disposable incomes means Mitla's rooftops are sprouting an increasing number of parabolic antennas, often those large two and three story block and concrete houses replacing the more traditional adobe homes. As with electric lines and posts the placement of these infringes on the visual landscape, creating a cumulative effect which cannot help but detract from the archaeological monuments.

Historically Mitla's schools were in the center or along the main highway which passes to the southwest of the archaeological site. But with the growing population to the north of the site there were increasing demands for a more accessible primary school. Finally school agency officials and the local government selected a site acceptable to them and to the local population, a site which infringes on the western portion of the Adobe group. The location makes it attractive for young families to continue settling in the area north of the archaeological zone, increasing the population density there. This is an increasing problem because the topography leads both sewage and summer storm run-off to channel through the archaeological zone, and in the mid-1990s a substantial retaining wall had to be built to protect parts of the Arroyo group from eroding away. But the most significant problem with the school location is that the decision by public bodies to site the school overlapping the Adobe group is that it legitimizes intrusions by others. After all, if protecting the site is so important why does government abuse it?

As this section suggests, one of the most significant dilemmas for cultural resources protection is the inability of INAH to use either formal authority or informal persuasion to generate cooperation from other agencies. Ironically, many local residents attribute damage done to sites under these circumstances as INAH's responsibility, even when it is has not participated in decisions or actions. In Mitla residents and businesses along the primary tourist circuit break through the pavement to make water or drainage connections, or to make repairs. They then leave the street broken and with holes on the understanding that it is up to INAH to correct the damage. That this posture is both self-serving and factually incorrect has no effect on the criticism INAH receives when holes go unfilled and tourists trip on the excavation debris.

At both sites the issue of urban infrastructure creates enormous headaches for effective protection. INAH lacks the authority, resources, and institutional capacity to shape infrastructure development. Agencies with this responsibility have little to gain by trying to resist pressures to provide infrastructure, even when they are aware doing so may damage sites physically or visually. Yet the provision of service infrastructure serves as a magnet for population and commerce. But in the end the central problem is not those seeking services, it is the lack of sensitivity among those charged with providing them. Unfortunately the tendency has been to treat INAH as a lightning rod, channelling criticism and unhappiness to an agency ill-prepared to address the developmental issues before it.

6. Visitor Infrastructure

Facilities supporting tourism constitute an important source of degradation at Monte Alban and Mitla. The former is especially affected by the high volume of visitor use and its tendency to concentrate in a few specific periods each year, a concentration reinforced by patterns of tourist promotion. What is striking is that this promotion, and the tourism associated with it, does not link in any sistematic, long-term fashion to facilities planning or service provision.

Until 1973 Monte Alban's visitor infrastructure consisted of the access road designed and built as part of Alfonso Caso's archaeological project of the 1930s, a modest ticket booth at the entrance to the Main Plaza, and some adjacent parking. The ticket booth and parking rested on pre-Columbian structures then unexcavated. In 1973 INAH initiated some planned facilities, as INAH staff in Oaxaca defined a space on the northeast edge of the North Platform, 80 meters south of the façade of Building X as the site of the "Tourist Center of Monte Alban". There is no record of any salvage archaeology being taken before construction. In 1976 this facility was expanded. On this occasion salvage archaeology preparing the way for construction revealed that:

"at the northeast corner of the building walls were discovered running north and south as well as east and west which apparently correspond to rooms…ceramic materials such as roughly-made drinking vessels of different sizes fabricated from a brown clay, and plates with conical sides made from gray clay, some with incisions on the border…fragments of human bone, one of which was part of a jaw. On the western side of the Tourist Center an excavation was opened as part of a cistern to supply water for the building. During this three north-south walls of rough, unfaced stones were found. Roughly a meter apart, the walls apparently served to retain the fill of the pre-Columbian terrace on which the Tourist Center was built. A north-south trench was opened to lay pipe which would carry sewage from an underground tank on the west side of the building. Parts of east-west walls, perhaps part of a room, were found… (Hernandez Diaz 1976: 1-2).

This report reflects the quality of archaeological remains located below the tourist services building, remains never studied through intensive excavation but only by archaeological salvage test pits. The parking lot was also relocated on the basis of studies by archaeologists from INAH's Oaxaca Regional Center, placing it just east of the Tourist Center. Taken together, these service projects affected in whole or part three significant platforms…numbers 24, 35, and 28…identified by Richard Blanton in his surface survey (Blanton 1978, Plano Arqueologico y Topografico, cuadrante N4 E10).

The Tourist Center, covering 383 square meters, included a small exhibit area, a restaurant with kitchen and services, three concession spaces, lavatories, storage space, and lobby. The construction itself was carried out with funding from the State Tourist Office (Archaeology Section Archives, INAH: CRO 1976). Once opened this space proved inadequate to meet growing visitor demand. In addition there was a need to create a site museum as a response to the decision to move some of the original carved stones from exposed locations around the central plaza, where they were exposed to the elements, to a protected space. Expansion was to cover an additional 240 square meters on the east and northeast sides of the existing building, further covering platforms 24 and 25.

In preparation for the expansion archaeologists opened 21 stratographic pits at points dictated by the structural needs of the project. Among the most notable finds were the foundations of a number of dwellings, walls, stucco floors, a diversity of ceramics, and objects made from human bone, or as reported at the time:

The most important finds were the architectural features uncovered by these excavations, as they reveal the remains of two platforms, perhaps the access to the central plaza of Monte Alban. One of the platforms includes a wall of large worked stones to a depth of 3.76 meters, 19 meters in length…elements of the upper cornice were still in place. The largest part of the archaeologicalmaterials were ceramic potsherds…of gray clay with incised decorations…as well as potsherds of brown clay with painted designs, plus some orange potsherds and other pieces of rough clay…a limited amount of lithic material…shaped obsidian blades and chips…worked flint…dispersed fragments of bone and shell (Osorio Linares 1981: INAH CRO Archives).

In the end the museum expansion planned for 1981 was never carried out, as with the approaching end of President Jose Lopez Portillo's administration the necessary resources were channeled elsewhere, a common practice in the last year of a presidential term. But with the arrival of President Miguel de la Madrid (1982-1988) INAH adopted a policy of expanding basic and information services for visitors. The Tourist Centers were redefined as Cultural and Tourist Service Units. Located within archaeological zones, these modern units would include a variety of visitor services, giving high priority to site museums. At Monte Alban this policy resulted in the remodelling of the existing structure to meet the new service expectations. It was expanded by 30 percent to house four concession stands, restaurant, lavatories, ticket office, storage, and a site museum featuring the stelae withdrawn from the central plaza for protection from the elements. The remodelled building sought to include elements of style compatible with the site, reducing somewhat the visual impact of the new building and the massiveness of its entryway.

The new construction was carried out with a minimal salvage effort, which confirmed the existence of important walls and floors, probably the remains of substantial pre-Columbian dwellings. Anticipating an increase in the number of visitors the parking lot was relocated, placing it on Blanton's Platform 1434 (Blanton 1978 Plano Arqueologico y Topografico). Uneven spots in the platform were filled to provide a level surface. No salvage archaeology was carried out in the parking area, nor were test pits dug.

With increased visitation and greater popular recognition, Monte Alban has been subject to a number of proposals for enhanced use which imply greater strain on extant infrastructure or its augmentation. While these proposals vary, and some have been carried through to completion and others not, what they have in common is a vision of Monte Alban which goes beyond a cultural, scientific, or educational focus, treating it instead as a resource to be exploited for different kinds of gain. In turn this means more aggressive use of the zone with little attention to or concern for the conservation of its physical elements such as structures or subsurface remains, or to its archaeological significance and authenticity. An assessment of some of these proposals follows.

Light and Sound Show: In October, 1980, The INAH Regional Center in Oaxaca received a proposal from the Tourism Office of the state government in Oaxaca for installation of a light and sound program at Monte Alban. While there is no information in the archives of the Oaxaca Regional Center regarding the technical specifications of the project one assumes it is similar to shows of this type elsewhere in Mexico and the world. INAH's response was negative, explaining to the public that this system would involve significant physical damage to the site as a consequence of excavation for the electrical infrastructure, as was evident at other sites (Periodico Imparcial, October 18, 1980). Furthermore the text, written by a novelist, displayed a odd prose evidently the product of the imagination of someone with no appreciation of archaelogical data nor the pre-Columbian history of Oaxaca. Its fanciful presentation of Monte Alban's founding, complete with a Zapotec version of a Greek chorus, appeared to be more interested in taking advantage of the spectacular effects of sound and light than in educating the public.

Although the state government had already created the organization expected to carry out the show, INAH officially rejected both the installation and the text. Nevertheless, in May, 1988, the proposal reappeared with the support of the State Office of Tourist Development, citing two objectives:

1. Preserve and disseminate Oaxaca«s historical and cultural heritage, and
2. Generate economic and social benefits for the state.(INAH CRO Archives)

Faced with a tacit acceptance of the project by senior administrators in INAH's Oaxaca office, the professional staff in Oaxaca most involved in preservation (three archaeologists, one architect, and one anthropologist), who opposed the project on grounds of damage to the integrity of the site, prepared a file on potential impacts. (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 23 June 1988). A copy of the file was sent to the Mexican branch of ICOMOS, which expressed its concerns to the Director General of INAH. A particular concern was the inadvisability of authorizing such a project without prior preparation of an integral site conservation and management plan necessary to evaluate the impact of infrastructure development. Not only would it be important to take into account the infrastructure needed to perform the show, but also to attend to and control the spectators (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 28 June 1988).

With the dissemination of this file the light and sound project was for all practical purposes cancelled. Its sponsors in the Department of Tourist Development were more upset at the rejection of a tourism promotion proposal whose installation threatened serious physical damage and the deterioration of intangible values than they were convinced by the arguments in favor of site conservation. This attitude foreshadowed the grave damage committed by the same department to the archaeological site at Hierve el Agua several years later, where its promotion of a tourist attraction at the expense of site conservation was successful.

Political Theater: In October, 1985, the zone was used to stage an act of political theater for President Miguel de la Madrid, obligingly authorized by INAH's central office in Mexico City. This spectacle, planned and carried out by the state government, occasioned a variety of pressures and stresses on the site, but even more important was that it revived an old practice of making political use of archaeological sites around the country. For weeks prior to the event the government political party, the PRI, made use of its neighborhood organizations to send groups from the settlements around Monte Alban to clean and weed the main plaza. Each Sunday groups of around one thousand people (above all women, children, and the elderly) commanded by their organizational leaders arrived to carry out the "clean-up." A serious problem emerged given the enthusiastic but inexpert techniques employed, which ranged from flaying away with machetes (marring and scarring the stonework) to pulling up plants roots and all, bringing with them pieces of the original flooring, stones, and other materials. Overall supervision was precarious, as it fell on a group of 10 to 13 archaeologists, architects, anthropologists, and restorers, who obviously could not control each inexpert worker.

The day of the visit it was the responsibility of the Department of Public Works to oversee the installation of temporary sanitary services, first aid posts, security, refreshment stands, and protective awnings, and to arrange parking for the buses which would bring participants to the event. To accomplish these tasks all manner of nails, spikes, stakes, posts, and other supports were driven into the pre-Columbian walls or floors. Temporary parking was placed on pre-Columbian buildings and terraces. On some terraces and fields near the zone under cultivation at the time the standing crops were purchased and then plowed under by heavy machinery brought in to level parking, although doing so threatened subsurface deposits. The only concern was to have in place all the infrastructure necessary to support the complexities of the official program.

The president arrived at the central plaza of Monte Alban, together with his entourage, aboard five helicopters, landing between the South Platform and Building J (Figure 41). The vibration from the noise shook loose materials from the structures, and gusts from the rotors sent metal trash barrels flying through the air, bashing them against the buildings. The state governor offered a formal welcome to the president on the north Platform, which had been decorated profusely with flags, banners, flowers, and indigenous costumes (Figure 42). In the central plaza groups were organized to present exotic pseudo-indigenous dances, gymnastic routines, and musical performances; it is estimated that at the height of the event the plaza held about 7000 people. The show lasted about three hours, and the most critical moment was the mass departure, as the number of buses surpassed all the calculations for traffic flow. Another consideration was the enormous amount of garbage produced before and during the event by all in attendance. This was left for INAH staff to retrieve and truck to the city dump.

In the case of this political show it is obvious that the site suffered more damage than benefit, because in addition to the accumulated deterioration attributable to the inept clean-up before the event or the thousands of little holes caused by nails and stakes, what weighs heavily in the balance is the intangible deterioration. The abuse and lack of respect for the integrity of historic monuments is the outcome of projects like this, aggravated by the status and responsibility of those involved in decision-making. In effect one has the highest authorities in the country and state not only carrying out a show which denigrates important values, but which violates the laws governing protection of cultural heritage and demonstrates their sense of impunity, leaving others to assess the losses.

Total Eclipse of the Sun, 1991: In July, 199l, there was a total eclipse of the sun passing almost directly over Oaxaca. The state government, sensing a good opportunity, organized through its cultural program a pseudo-mystical observation of the eclipse at Monte Alban, including presentations of modern dance, hastily-invented folklore, and music blasted through great amplifiers to "…capture in all of its grandeur a great natural phenomenon within an eminent cultural setting" (Palacios, Jose, personal communication). Thus the Central Plaza was once again converted to a stage, receiving about 5000 people who climbed the structures and platforms in great groups to observe the eclipse. They required services such as restrooms, food, soft drinks, and others to be temporarily installed on the site, while musicians and dancers executed numbers which certainly had nothing to do with the history of the site, nor with the authentic traditional dances of Oaxaca, nor had much to recommend them in terms of artistic quality (Figures 43 and 44). For this show the state government's cultural program charged a special fee over and above entry to the site, a fee which passed to its coffers, leaving Monte Alban with the trash, damage, misuse of its facilities, and general discredit.

Access Highway Salvage Project, 1991: In 1991, on the basis of an agreement with the federal secretary of Communications and Transport, the state government of Oaxaca built a new access highway to the Plaza of Monte Alban. The original concept was to open up a circuit taking the tourist to different places within and near the archaeological zone (Cerro de Gallo, Atzompa) and to have traffic move in a single direction, as the access road built in the era of Alfonso Caso (1930) is too narrow for easy movement of modern tourist buses.

Given that the project implied road cuts within the archaeological zone as well as excavation and leveling, the state government asked INAH to help avoid damage to the site. The local INAH administration moved accordingly to address areas likely to be affected. At no time did it consider stopping or modifying the project, prohibiting the use of machinery in sensitive areas, or using INAH's authority over projects undertaken in archaeological zones. Salvage archaeology was carried out in several affected areas with differing levels of archaeological interest. There was no systematic planning of activities to provide some theoretical or methodological framework to affected areas.

The highway was to start at the Oaxaca Institute of Technology, to the northeast of the archaeological zone, and head southwest and uphill, passing to the east of the hills of Atzompa and el Gallo, before rejoining the last stretch of the old highway a few meters from the boundary marker known as "La Mona". This meant construction of a new highway approximately 4.79 kilomters long, and widening the last 1.27 kilometers of the old highway to the parking lot at the archaeological zone, for a total distance of just over 6 kilometers (Gonzalez Licon 1992: 128). Along the route salvage archaeology was to concentrate on four areas most vulnerable to destruction by heavy machinery: Pitayo, Highway, Primary Parking, East Parking.

In the Pitayo area two dwelling units were excavated, one of them located on the terrace designated 508 by Blanton (Gonzalez Licon 1992: 128). It included six rooms distributed around a patio, a tomb on its north side, five burials, and an offering of human skulls associated with female figurines. The ceramics chronology locates the earliest occupation in Monte Alban IIIa, continuing to Monte Alban V. The other unit, with two burials, showed evidence of remodelling across time. Its earliest use dated from Monte Alban II, and continued to Monte Alban V (Gonzales Licon 1992: 129). The area designated "Highway" yielded three dwellings, below whose floors were found six tombs, five of which were intact, and one of which yielded a skeleton showing evidence of trepanning. There was also an oven for firing ceramics. The dwellings ranged from Monte Alban II to IV (Gonzales Licon 1992: 129). Here excavation affected Blanton's terraces 98, 459, and 497. In Primary Parking four dwellings were found on terraces 99, 102, 103, and 104. East Parking produced two dwellings, on terraces 29 and 30 (Figure 45).

In total archaeologists reported salvage excavations yielded 11 dwellings, 16 tombs, 86 human burials, and approximately 300 complete pieces of ceramics, stone, obsidian, shell, jade, and bone (Gonzalez Licon, 1992: 133). Nevertheless what is neither published nor mentioned in the reports is the real extent to which the highway affected the site. The road itself followed a pre-Columbian track until it crossed the pre-Columbian defensive double wall (Figure 46). In the process it damaged part of the wall, portions of a pre-Columbian road, agricultural and residential terraces on the middle slopes, and residential terraces approaching the north side of the Plaza, all cut, crushed, scrapped, or exposed by heavy machinery. Much of the destruction was readily apparent, even to the untutored eye. Following Blanton's numbering system the new road affected terraces 508, 556, 558, 561, 563, 566, 568, 572, 581, 590, 592, 603, 1136, and 1138, in addition to the defensive wall. Widening the old road affected Blanton's terraces 29, 30, 40 99, 158, 452, 455, 459, 460, 461, 475, 476, 496, 497, 498, and 901, plus Area 5. Given the density of archaeological remains on the north slope it would have been almost impossible to carry out the project without some damage, but neither do there appear to have been exceptional efforts to respect the vulnerability of the site.

Less obvious but more important, however, is the effect the road has on the integrity of the archaeological zone. Aligning the highway along the slopes of Atzompa and El Gallo effectively divides the archaeological zone, violating the principle of integrity in the protection of the zone (Figures 47 and 48). In addition, given the social considerations specific to this site, the introduction of a new access road into the area encourages both planned and unplanned human settlement. The north side of Monte Alban was reasonably well-preserved until 1991, in large part due to the lack of regular access to the area. As soon as access improved sales and purchases of land—legal and illegal—began, and by the mid-1990s one could see private homes, government subdivisions, and irregular settlements. The authorization of a service considered to be a "tourist benefit" has turned out to be a significant threat to prospects for site conservation.

National Archaeological Fund, 1992-94: During the administration of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari federal policy related to archaeology included the creation of the National Archaeological Fund. The Fund was the source of financing what came to be known in the period 1992-1994 as the Special Archaeological Projects, with substantial federal investment for 14 selected sites chosen by the senior administration of INAH. In turn its criterion for selection presumably favored sites covered by the Convention for the Protection of World Natural and Cultural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO in 1972 and which Mexico signed in 1984 (Garcia Barcena 1994: 7). The purpose of these projects was to comply with the obligations accepted by countries interested in assuring their heritage had adequate legal protection and were properly managed (Garcia Barrena 1994: 7). Monte Alban, among the sites which had been declared World Heritage, was favored by this project with a special budget of nearly $4,000,000.00.

Although to public opinion the Special Projects were presented primarily as academic projects supporting salvage and protection, through "an organizational model which includes new operational techniques and novel forms of institutional articulation which combine the tasks of conservation and teaching, linking these with dissemination and museography" (INAH 1993: 1), the reality is that for Monte Alban the project was in effect a substantial investment to open new archaeological areas of interest to tourists and new commercial opportunities. Project goals included:

- "Conduct research to improve the attractiveness of the zone…and to increase knowledge about the site."
- "Map the zone…"
- "Build infrastructure, including expansion and remodeling of the Monte Alban museum, expand parking, and build a laboratory and storage facility for ceramics…"
- "Protect the zone through a presidential declaration and establishing agreements with municipalities and links to federal agencies."
- "Train personnel in archaeology."
- "Publicize activities and results of the project in a variety of media…" (Winter 1994: 1).

With regard to tourist infrastructure, the Monte Alban Special Project included remodelling the old Cultural and Tourist Services Unit into a modern Archaeological Museum of Monte Alban. The museum was expanded by 50 percent in its existing location, extending the building over the platforms previously mentioned. There is no record of any salvage archaeology. It became necessary once again to think about alternatives for parking during peak periods. This time it was decided to augment parking to the east of the access road, slightly south of the museum. This new area affects Blanton's platforms 99, 102, and 103 (Blanton 1978 Plano Arqueologico y Topografico). This area had been subject to salvage archaeology during the construction of the new access road.

Selections from salvage archaeology reports give a sense of what lies beneath the space destined to be a parking lot:

"Tomb 9 measures 6 meters in length by a meter to 1.3 meters in width, of rectangular form, with a forechamber and niches…This tomb has a mixed roof; the principal chamber has an angled vault while the forechamber is flat…Inside the tomb there was a large quantity of human bones…three skulls…long bones, ribs, 2 jaws, backbones…In the south niche we found a pelvis, shoulder bone, ribs, and other bone fragments…In the northwest corner there were two skulls with red paint, joints, and backbones.In the center of the tomb there was another skull…at the entrance to the forechamber we encountered three ceramic dog faces and pieces of conch shell…at the entrance we found ceramics, a piece of jade, fragments of shell…

South side (dwelling C). We could not identify a single room…This side is one of those most affected by the passage of heavy machinery, which left exposed to the air storage pit 6 and burial 33.

Structure D. Does not show the traditional pattern of a dwelling…It is a structure occupied between 200 and 500 AD…With a principal orientation north-south. This structure shows rooms, a patio, stucco floors, and a possible mica floor…in the patio there is an altar oriented toward Tomb 12…The complex Plaza-1 is an open area with an architectural style suggesting civil or public use. Given its dimensions it also might have been a market…" (Martinez Lopez 1992, Archives INAH CRO).

As in the past, today cars and tourist buses, heavy as they are, are parked on structures, dwellings, floors, tombs and offerings. The difference is today we know the archaeological value of the finds beneath the parking lot, and in spite of this tourist services continue to be valued more highly than the cultural remains these finds represent. There is no institutional support for handling visitor flow in ways which would reduce parking pressures in these locations.

With regard to the specific responsibilities for conservation and site protection under the Monte Alban Special Project, it is clear INAH preferred to carry out the project with personnel untrained in the field of architectural restoration, responding more to the aforementioned goal of opening areas to tourism than to integral site conservation. As of this writing there is no report of how many buildings were reconstructed, but one can see on the site various examples of "neopre-Columbian" architecture, that is, reconstructions based on the imagination and not on research data. The result is a lamentable loss not only of archaeological data but of carrying out future restoration on the basis of accepted international principles. These include use of techniques which permit the reversibility of restoration, a prohibition on the use of concrete, and avoiding the reconstruction of archeological architecture, all based on the Italian Charter on Restoration (1931), the Charter of Venecia (1964), and the First Technical Consultation on Conservation of the Cultural Heritage of Mexico (1974).

The formal presidential proclamation of Monte Alban as a federally protected area, a process initiated several years previously, provided symbolic support for the archaeological zone. Unfortunately this support was little more than symbolic, as the agreements with municipalities and other federal agencies, both necessary for inter-institutional cooperation, were never signed. This is particularly important because it is through their development and enforcement powers that much of INAH's control over land use within its boundaries actually takes place. Lacking these agreements and vigorous support from senior agency administrators the field office at Monte Alban has few policy instruments at its disposal, and its effectiveness in protecting the zone depends largely on the ability of its personnel to persuade others to act for the benefit of cultural heritage.

Although this project was justified as heritage conservation, in practice it was managed as an expansion of tourist infrastructure, with its central focus the reconstruction of numerous structures for the enjoyment of mass tourism. From its origin it lacked a professional vision oriented toward an integral understanding of site conservation in this specific context, such as:

The preparation of an overall project document which displayed not only a sense of the activities to be undertaken but a sense of programming and priorities;
A background file documenting previous restoration projects and their significance for the zone in the early 1990s;
The creation of a professional team experienced in different aspects of architectural restoration.
This third point is particularly important. The Monte Alban Special Project had as its professional staff

an archaeologist with a doctorate but no training or experience in restoration, architecture, or related fields;
a student who had yet to complete an undergraduate degree in archaeology who wound up making many of the field decisions and acting as the laboratory chief for the project;
student working on a degree in restoration as head of restoration; and
a professor of comparative literature as coordinator for mapping
(Winter 1994: 127). In other words, the key areas of the project were under the responsibility of students who had not yet finished their degrees or by an amateur in archaeological mapping, under the direction of someone with no experience in restoration. Given the scope of work, significance of the project, and substantial budget, it seems not unreasonable to infer senior decision-makers were less concerned with attention to best professional practice in restoration than with rushing to completion a project staffed with whomever happened to be available, even if their professional preparation and qualifications were marginal.

The investment in tourist infrastructure, and its physical impact on the archaeological zone, is far greater at Monte Alban than at Mitla, where it is commerce and services related to tourism which play the dominant role. The infrastructure supporting visitors in Mitla is limited to a "Tourist Circuit", a crafts market, and a small service building for zone visitors and staff. But even this limited infrastructure shapes land use and visitor impact in significant ways, as outlined below.

The Tourist Circuit is in fact a cobblestoned access laid down by the State Tourism Department in 1980 as a means of facilitating vehicular traffic to the archaeological zone. Stretching from the central square of Mitla along the main street toward the four clusters of monumental architecture on the north side of the river, it completely circles the North and Columns groups with a roadbed sturdy enough to carry large tourist buses and the trucks which bring merchandise to the establishments around the archaeological zone (Figure 49). As it was laid down following existing streets its construction was not a physical threat to the monumental structures which make up the zone. Nevertheless it creates a significant visual incongruity, as its wide surface of cobblestones cemented in place, a material otherwise unknown in Mitla, clashes with adobe walls and dirt streets. Ironically, over time this clash has been less evident as adjacent streets have been paved with cement and adobe walls replaced by cement block. As indicated earlier, this reflects not a strategy of mitigation but an overall visual deterioration of the area surrounding the archaeological zone as architectural elements more consistent with the structural remains there have been replaced by more intrusive elements.

The most significant threat occasioned by the Tourist Circuit is not physical but conceptual, as it defines a false image of the organization of the archaeological zone. It suggests that the zone consists of the North and Columns groups, as these are the focus of its route. Only the accident that one of the external walls of the Adobe group butts against the Tourist Circuit's sidewalk creates a modest link. The cluster of structures which make up the Adobe group, while physically imposing, lie two blocks off the tourist circuit on an unpaved street and receive only a tiny fraction of the visitors dutifully following the Circuit. The South group has no linkage with the Circuit. In practice the existence of the Circuit legitimates the notion that the archaeological zone consists of those structures the Circuit serves, and that the others have minimal or no significance.

The Crafts Market is the second important component of tourist infrastructure, and it is not an accident the Tourist Circuit passes right by it. The building was constructed in 1973 to house the street vendors who had that time pursued visitors through the site. It is a monumental structure with two wings covering 2000 square meters, built of Mitla's own pink limestone with walls eight meters high. Located a scant thirty meters from the North group, its bulk competes directly with the archaeological site. The building was designed to recall pre-Columbian structures, with a blocked, monumental, enclosed appearance. Surrounding the principal entrance is an open plaza divided into smaller blocks of slightly different heights, supposedly to serve as a visually varied garden. More than twenty-five years later the garden remains to be installed, and the present effect is of an unfinished landscape occupied by scrubby plants, trash, and dogs. Adjacent to the building is a large asphalted parking lot, where vendors who have fled the Crafts Market to be closer to customers compete for space with buses and cars.

The final component of tourist infrastructure is the service building completed by INAH in 1994 just inside the north entrance and adjacent to the North group. Its location serves to channel visitors through the site in a more logical fashion, as prior to its construction visitors were more likely to enter near the famous Hall of the Columns, and many left never realizing there was more to the zone than a single structure. The building's size, height, materials, and design were intended to be compatible with the monumental structures just a few meters away (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO 1994). The only reason for locating it within the zone was to provide basic services…ticket sales, lavatories, information…to visitors. Just to the north are two modest parking lots.

Comparing the two sites, it is clear the tourist uses of Monte Alban have been been far better supported than Mitla. Paradoxically, this attention has meant, in certain way, far more government-sponsored destruction in the archaeological zone. In this specific sense Monte Alban has been overexploited without the necessary care or planning. Its distance from Oaxaca has protected Mitla from the inappropriate political and cultural uses to which Monte Alban has been subjected. Nevertheless, the limited investment in tourist infrastructure received by Mitla has, in two of the three cases, threatened rather than supported the site. The lack of attention to the quality and impact of infrastructure investment marks both sites

Commercial Use

Commercial activity within the archaeological zone at Monte Alban is very limited. Formal concessions are few: restaurant, publications, textiles, crafts, and reproductions of archaeological pieces. Concessionaires contact with INAH for the use of designated space within the services building. The actual selection process, management and oversight, and contract terms remain administrative mysteries. As they obey no formal or open system, nor is there any mechanism for rendering accounts, popular interpretations of concessions arrangements run from the benefits of friendship with key decision-makers to other kinds of relationships. While concession payments eventually come to rest in the central accounts of INAH, this information is held among a select group of administrators, and is not available to the public.

A second category of commercial activity consists of informal sales of craft goods by about 50 street vendors located along the stairs leading from the parking lots to the ticket window, and in the interior of the main plaza. The latter group is known as the "moneros", and consists of members of neighboring communities who sell home-made replicas of archaeological pieces to tourists. A more detailed discussion of the vendors follows in the chapter on social groups.

The final form of commercial activity which makes direct use of Monte Alban's service infrastructure are tourist transportation services. There is a private shuttle bus service from a downtown hotel which drops users in a parking lot, retrieving them in the same place two hours later. Tour buses arrive from other parts of Mexico, and in peak periods one might see anywhere from 8 to 15 buses in the parking lot. Many of the travel agencies in the city of Oaxaca run tours to Monte Alban, using vans and drivers who sometimes double as guides. Finally, city taxis generally are quite willing to drop off and pick up visitors, and in some cases may wait while passengers make a quick trip around the site.

If Mitla's tourist infrastructure is limited compared to Monte Alban, the volume of commercial use is far higher. The chapter on social groups explores the complexities of Mitla's commercial system in considerable detail, so here a simple illustration should suffice. The 103 original vendors located in the Crafts Market today have diversified their activities to include their original stalls in the market, the approximately 80 nominally-provisional stalls installed in the main parking lot, and the additional spaces many have at their residence. The interior of the Crafts Market is generally rather quiet, as many of the spaces serve as little more than accessible storage space. Outside, in the parking lot, the day begins with abundant movement of merchandise in vehicles, handcarts, or on the shoulder. Stalls are opened, cleaned, stocked, and readied for the arrival of the buses and cars which signal the start of the day's activities. Many tourists barely notice the Crafts Market due to the bustle of commerce and traffic in the parking lot.

The open space between the North group and the Columns group, a wide passageway open to foot traffic to and from the church and the focus of much controversy, also fills with vendors from an early hour. From an early hour vendors install stands with fruit, drinks, and food. The stands of outside vendors described in the chapter on social groups keep the same hours as the archaeological zone. The same is true of the free vendors, who sell from baskets or other containers, who have adapted to the protective fences installed by INAH by bringing hangers from which to suspend textiles on that same fence. These vendors circulate through this space, the parking lots, and if not watched by custodial personnel, will pursue tourists into the archaeological zone in search of a sale. On a normal day the area of the passageway and parking lot, perhaps 1.5 acres, will contain approximately 200 vendors, divided as described above. During peak seasons, such as Christmas, Holy Week, and the height of the summer season, this number may double. Thus in a rather compact area one has vendors, visitors, custodial personnel, and ordinary residents of Mitla competing with each other and traffic as they go about their business.

Indeed, the sale of crafts, souvenirs, and tourist services extends to other areas. Along the approximately 15 blocks of the Tourist Circuit from the center of Mitla to the archaeological zone most of the homes have opened storefront shops oriented toward the tourist trade. The walls and facades are festooned with textiles or other goods, local or from outside, giving the entrance to the archaeological zone a somewhat disorganized image largely decoupled from the local setting. Thus one finds jumbled together along both sides of the street weavings from Teotitlan del Valle, hammocks from the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, dresses from Mitla, tablecloths and jewelry from Oaxaca, leather goods from Ocotlan, and blouses, jackets, shorts, and vests from Guatemala. Perhaps 10 percent of the area within the archaeological zone has been taken over by craft sales. And for those not interested in crafts, the same part of Mitla holds 4 restaurants, 3 drugstores, 3 bakeries, 4 mezcal stores, and 8 groceries. Most of these do a significant portion of their trade with visitors or purveyors of transportation services.

The commercial activity at the two archaeological zones is inverse to the tourist infrastructure serving them. That is, at Monte Alban, where there is greater investment in infrastructure and systems for managing people and movement, the nature and volume of commerce is limited and to some degree under the oversight, if not control, of INAH. In Mitla, with minimal investment in infrastructure, commercial activity around the archaeological zone surpasses logical calculation. In this sense the experience at Mitla confirms the arguments of Parsons and Beals that the people of Mitla are traders at heart (Parsons 1936: 568; Beals 1979: 193). There is probably not a family in the community without some link to this commerce. But the intensity of a tourist-oriented economy brings more than visual disorder, it also brings environment and physical deterioration. The tremendous competition for clients or for some other gain generates an enormous pressure on the site which overwhelms and grinds down efforts at management and preservation.

In both cases commercial uses continue to grow, with the social groups involved banding together to defend the right to such use on the ground that "it is our community". Rarely do they ask whether they have the right to damage the image or physical integrity of the sites. In part this reflects the multitude of small users, with each individual convinced his or her right to draw on the potential income generated by site visitors is equal to the rights of all others doing the same, and any increment in pressure on the site is minimal and readily absorbed by the whole. The absence of any accepted governance mechanisms for the two zones reinforces this. On the contrary, if there is any adverse impact on either zone through abuse or overexploitation there is a general opinion that "it is INAH's responsibility" to repair the damage, just as "it is INAH's responsibility" to manage the traffic, provide the parking, assure visitor services, and attend to other collective needs. The authority and capacity of INAH in this respect borders on the symbolic, but it attends to many such demands each year. The entities with the formal responsibility (and quick to allege INAH oversteps its powers) for services such as managing traffic (the state government) or commerce (local government) tend to ignore the implications of overexploitation at the archaeological zones because "it is INAH's responsibility."

Issues in land use are topics rarely addressed in the standard course of study in an undergraduate archaeological program because they seem distant from the problems graduates are going to face. There is little in archaeological theory to provide a focus or conceptual foundation, and the teaching faculty themselves have little experience or interest in the subject matter. Nevertheless, daily practice confronts archaeologists with a flow of challenges and dilemmas intimately linked to land use. As a consequence recently-graduated archaeologists must address issues for which they are unprepared, and make serious mistakes in practice and judgement in dealing with the social conflicts associated with site protection and the place of INAH in the field.

At the institutional level no other entity addresses the management of land use associated with site protection, leaving INAH in the unenviable situation of appearing to be both repressive and inept in problem-solving. Nevertheless, neither inside nor outside INAH has there been a serious discussion as to whether "it is INAH's responsibility" to organize and oversee the activities which communities visit on their archaeological heritage, or whether INAH should be calling on other institutions with the necessary skills, resources, and authority. In the end there is a comfortable, tacit acceptance by all but INAH that it has the responsibility but not the authority, while they have the authority but can avoid the responsibility. To come to grips with this critical challenge archaeologists as well as INAH's administrators first need to be aware of and understand the dynamics of land use in relation to the agency mission.

Chapter 7: Social Actors in Archaeological Zones

It is possible to argue that the principal cause for the absence, inadequacy, or delay of archaeological conservation projects in Mexico is the lack of economic resources, a traditional argument for explaining inadequate development spending in the Third World. Nevertheless, field experience suggests other factors have equal or more weight in building community support for such projects. These factors in turn become significant in the formation and involvement of social groups in relation to heritage issues. Among the most important concerns:

1. the security of tenure over the land where one lives or works, with an individual or collective guarantee, independent of whether or not there are archaeological remains;
2. economic interests stemming from a view of archaeological sites as exploitable resources from the standpoint of tourist development;
3. political interests associated with the potential of these spaces as land for urban development, commercial transactions, or symbolic behavior;
4. institutional or personal interest in conserving archaeological sites within a specific organizational structure;
5. popular beliefs regarding the sacred qualities and character of the sites.

In short, efforts to conserve cultural heritage take place in the context of and must be understood with reference to interests represented by social groups with differing degrees of organization, who are inclined to defend their rights and interests. In many cases these groups find themselves in open opposition to the actions of institutions charged by law with the conservation of archaeological resources or those dedicated to the exploitation of those resources.

The organizational capacity of communities seeking to defend their customary or legal rights to ownership, possession, and use of land, as well as to defend their rights to economic exploitation of collective resources has been passed over or ignored in the preparation of "ideal" conservation projects by official experts and institutions. However, the consequence of this exclusion is that it has not been possible to secure the compliance which would make effective the presidential decrees of December 7, 1993, protecting Monte Alban and Mitla. We need to note the reason this organizational capacity tends to weigh in on the side of interests opposing conservation, protection, or rescue of cultural heritage is that such efforts tend to affect the interests enumerated above. Protecting archaeological resources generally means limiting generalized access to them and reducing individual opportunities for exploitation.

For this reason the current research takes as a methodological priority the study of organized social actors in order to under stand the nature of their interests vis-a-vis archaeological sites, levels and processes of organization, and their attitudes toward conservation, public institutions, and other factors affecting their behavior as a group. In turn this leads to the study both of groups identified with different points of view regarding conservation and of groups totally opposed or for whom conservation of archaeological heritage means nothing.

As used here the terms GROUP or SOCIAL GROUP refer a self-aware relationship of two or more people who share common goals, common motivations, some degree of interdependence, structured relationships, and mutual influence. By SOCIAL ACTOR I refer to a group which actively enters the public arena to articulate, advance, or defend group interests in relation to similar actions by others. Not all social groups are social actors but as we will see in this chapter, the shared sense that government actions create, undermine, promote, endanger, or otherwise affect group interests generates a tendency to move toward the category of "social actor", especially as groups come to understand the mechanisms and values which move decision-making. Here research centers on groups whose goals are related to the dynamics of conservation or destruction of the archaeological zones of Monte Alban and Mitla.

This is not an effort to engage in precise structural analysis or quantify patterns of behavior; at this point the primary concern is still description and plotting of groups in reference to the subject of archaeological conservation. For example, a major interest has to be their bases of power and influence, on the premise that by understanding these, either individually or in concert with other groups, we will be able to appreciate how they approach the contemporary context of archaeological heritage. Here we recognize groups as social actors according to their primary interests, keeping in mind that these interests may change over time, according to the nature of the issues, or group leadership. The analysis which follows is structured around the five concerns identified earlier, with particular attention to the first two due to their levels of development and complexity, and for their capacity to illuminate the utility of such research in fostering archaeological heritage protection.

Rights and Guarantees Related to the Land

Monte Alban: The official boundary of the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban encloses 2,078 hectares (approximately 5,278 acres) affecting five communities and five ejidos (SEDESOL 1996), of which 51 percent belongs to Santa Maria Atzompa, 25 percent to Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan, 10 percent each to San Martin Mexicapam and San Juan Chapultepec (both part of the city of Oaxaca), and 5 percent to San Pedro Ixtlahuaca. Within the zone for planning and management purposes the land is divided among four units: Plaza Principal, Atzompa, El Gallo, and a buffer area. Thus, for Monte Alban as an archaeological zone the principal concern has been to assure a presidential declaration establishing INAH's legal right to regulate land use within the official boundary. This right in turn affects the interests of social actors enumerated below, some of which are represented in Figure 50.

Authorities of Santa Maria Atzompa: This social actor represents the community of SantaMaria Atzompa, and consists of both the municipal officials and the Ejido Commission, as they form a common front when dealing with INAH on matters of the archaeological zone boundary or land use regulation. Key individudals include the mayor, vice-mayor, secretary, police chief, and four members of the Ejido Commision. This group takes a highly traditional stance in terms of protecting the collective interest of the community in its land base, whether this is communal, ejido, or private property. With respect to conservation practices within the Monte Alban Archaeological Zone, as established by the 1992 boundary, and by the presidential decree conferring official status on the protected area, this group argues "…they talk about protection, but they have not protected the sites as they should, and INAH stands out for its lack of attention to the area; in reality the sites are unprotected". The latter comment is a clear reference to the total disregard of the Atzompa unit in terms of official plans for exploration and conservation.

"The highest officials talk about the welfare of the family, but that is not true…" referring to the political slogan popularized by the PRI during the 1994 presidential campaign of Ernesto Zedillo. This reflects the lack of credibility attached to statements by senior officials, "…the decrees are made to favor the strong, not the weak…". The authorities remember discussions of a tourist circuit which would have been of benefit to Atzompa but was never carried out, noting "…at the very least they could have opened a dirt road for the benefit of the communities…" and that "…INAH has had money and nothing has come to the community; perhaps if INAH had arranged something for the community people would be more inclined to cooperate…"

This group expressed its concern for the protection of the archaeological monuments or "the ruins", as they refer to the site. This reinforces their conception of the site as restricted to the monumental architecture located on the upper parts of the ridge, and therefore provides no logical explanation for a boundary which "locks up" even the lower parts of the same. One can talk about the concept of context, residential areas, pre-Columbian cultivation areas, and other elements of a cultural landscape, but it is clear these are categories far from local value scales regarding conservation. The problem they have with the boundary-setting process is that "…they put markers where there are no ruins, and they are invading lands which belong to the community". In addition, "Blanca Paredes never called together the authorities to discuss how to define the boundary." And in their view the presidential decree "…violated the autonomy of the community." They recognize that in fact in some of the lower sections there are archaeological remains, as in the case of "Los Mogotillos" the local name for the site known to archaeologists as Tierras Largas. There archaeologists were carrying out research and local authorities permitted the site to be invaded. Nevertheless, in the eyes of village authorities "…even so there is no reason to include so much within the boundary."

The authorities of Santa Maria Atzompa consistently expressed an interest in cooperating with INAH to the extent the latter will consider the possibility of shifting "upslope" the official boundary markers, as the authorities have a clear sense as to what they are willing to accept. They are particularly attentive to critical areas where there is more interest in urban development, such as the east slope of the main hill at Atzompa and in the Cañada, the natural drainage of the hills of Atzompa and El Gallo, and now a growing settlement. The interinstitutional team and Atzompa authorities made a total of four ground surveys ranging from 30 and 40 meters above the current boundary line to as much as 200 meters above. These surveys left outside the boundary the lower slopes where there already exist growing settlements such as the Guelaguetza, Ampliacion Guelagueta, Samaritana, Ampliacion Sanmaritana, Ejido Santa Maria, la Cañada, y Ampliacion la Cañada, all inside the official boundary and all in the process of consolidation (Figures 51, 52, 53, and 54).

It is clear the first interest of this group is to assure a greater supply of land for sale to people arriving from outside the community, although obviously they do not discuss this in meetings or surveys. But officials of the Office of the Agrarian Solictor advised that the Atzompa vice-mayor for the period 1993-95 has been charged with illegal sale of ejido lands. When they assume a public role it is to assure that their interest is "to protect the heritage of the citizens of Atzompa."

Given INAH's 1995 proposal to consider some municipal boundary markers to complement the official boundaries as part of an attempt to reach agreement on boundary-setting, the authorities proposed a wide band around the hill, including lands most threatened by invasion. They even asked for another band somewhat further up the slope so "…people have someplace to pasture their animals." Nevertheless we all knew that none of the families in the new households lives a rural lifestyle, but rather are quite identified with the urban system. This group also thought it very important to continue the efforts to reforest the hillsides and suggested a good tree belt would keep people from invading these areas. But at the same time they sought to increase opportunities for grazing, even though grazing is a primary contributor to deforestation.

Neighborhood or "Colonia" Associations:

The formation of new neighborhoods, or "colonias", as addressed earlier in the chapter on land use, inevitably leads to the formation of neighborhood associations which press for the provision of government services. This holds whether the new settlement consists of families coming together in the same place having purchased lots from ejidatarios or speculators, or whether it represents a more or less organized "invasion" of a tract under the sponsorship of a group or individual. In Atzompa there are at least two such groups, the Residents' Union of Colonia Guelaguetza and the Residents of Nueva Santa Maria, although over time they will appear in other colonias as well. The purposes of these groups, to seek public services and to defend their neighborhoods against government demands, converts them into social actors. In the case of the two groups cited above, one clear concern would be to make sure they are not affected by or subject to land use controls associated with boundary setting for the archaeological zone. The recent creation of the Coordinating Committee for Agencies (an administrative sub-unit in some municipalities) and Colonias of the State of Oaxaca, an umbrella organization of neighborhood and colonia associations, reflects their significance for residents in these areas.

In turn these associations become a favorite target for political parties in Oaxaca, as the parties offer negotiating assistance with government agencies in return for votes, cooperation from association leaders on other matters, and support at campaign rallies or other public events. It is not at all uncommon to find candidates for mayor or the state legislature making campaign promises of services or cooperation in protecting association interests without taking into account the legal status of the land or its protection under federal law.

Authorities of San Pedro Ixtlahuaca: Of all of the municipalities surrounding Monte Alban, San Pedro Ixtlahuaca is the most rural. The area affected by the boundary of the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban is on the west side of the Central Plaza or Plaza Principal, and consists of ejido lands which currently are open pasture on the lower slopes and covered with brush and small trees on the upper slopes, where they abut the plaza. The upper slopes serve primarily for grazing and collecting firewood. San Pedro has a longstanding land dispute with Atzompa regarding the precise boundary of ejido lands located on El Gallo.

As in the case of Atzompa, the group consists of municipal officials and the Ejido Commission, which in the latter case added its Oversight Council, a body intended to serve as a watchdog on the Commission. A key concern of the authorities has been the possibility of signing formal agreements with the archaeological zone which provide clear protection for archaeological remains while giving the community a free hand in managing or disposing of the rest of its land. To pursue this goal the authorities were interested in field surveys and direct interviews with INAH staff (Figures 55 and 56). The head of the Oversight Council noted:

"he was born in this village and therefore knows there is disagreement with INAH because the residents are no longer permitted entry to the archaeological zone. We know the subsoil is federal property, we know and understand this, but previously we were able to cultivate fields at Loma Gorda, we grew beans there, but now we do not go there because they began to repress people. The federal police prohibited cultivating, grazing, and hunting, but we know there is a difference between protecting and prohibiting us from exercising a right which is ours."
It is worth noting the records of Oaxaca Regional Center show nothing regarding police activity or any other controls beyond those of a general nature, nor can anyone consulted at the Regional Center recall any incident which might give substance to the above comment.

Although the authorities have the responsibility of negotiating with INAH, when it comes to the substance of any agreement "…we have to inform and ask the opinion of the community; I would prefer to go to jail for my village rather betray it. We live here and have to account for our actions, we cannot simply dispose of what belongs to the community". On the contrary, they asked INAH for an accounting of land included within the boundary and an explanation as to why INAH carried out such an invasion, in order to relay the information to the community. When informed this was not an expropriation, simply a regulation of land use, the response reflected the lack of confidence in official institutions: "…they say it is not an expropriation, but we have experiences, such as the example of Huatulco, where in the end relatives of ours were run off the land. It is an example of what causes a lack of confidence among peasants, and we certainly lack confidence, but the peasant is always betrayed." The reference to Huatulco has to do with a resort community on the Oaxaca coast, where members of ejidos were dislodged from a spectacular coastal setting to make room for a fancy beach resort with a Club Med and five-star hotels.

This lack of confidence was reinforced by the presidential decree, as "…there is no document requesting permission to carry out the boundary-setting." Their view is that by not soliciting such permission the national government "…violates the rights of others; if there is no communication it is a violation of rights, even if it is the President of the Republic who does it, and those rights reside in the community." For this reason the authorities insisted a representative of INAH appear at a community assembly to explain how much land has been affected, and in what ways. Here it was clear the goal was to lure INAH into a situation where it would be at a disadvantage, as such gatherings serve primarily as opportunities for the expression of disagreement and complaints.

During the field surveys marking the boundary markers the authorities insisted on also identifying tracts of ejido land, marching the entire party through heavy thornbush, from which we emerged tired and scratched, probably with the intention of dissuading outsiders from close inspection of the land. On the extreme west side of Monte Alban is a new settlement, named Loma Grande. These lands have been sold to the new residents illegally, suggesting the view that the authorities "…cannot simply dispose of what belongs to the community" is not one universally shared.

San Francisco Javier-Lomas de San Javier or (ORINCO vs. Governing Board): Lomas de San Javier is a new settlement located on the ejido at Arrazola, within the boundary of the archaeological zone on the south side of Monte Alban, affecting boundary markers 36 and 37. When Blanca Paredes set these markers in 1992 she indicated she had excluded all housing existing in the area at the time. The problem is not simply penetration of the archaeological zone, but that there are two groups struggling for control and for decision power over land use. One of these groups is the Group of Residents of Lomas de Javier, known officially as ORINCO (Independent Organization of Residents), local people who would prefer to respect the official boundary of the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban because they want to obtain legal rights to their land. Lomas de San Javier is a recent colonia (the first residents arrived about 10 years ago), with a population drawn from Xoxocotlan as well as from other places in the state. Residents settled on ejido lands they were ceded or sold illegally. Today, with changes in Article 27 of the Constitution, they would like to finally legitimize their holdings and avoid problems with the archaeological zone.

They also want to gain more control over their lives in terms of a relationship with another group which styles itself as the "Governing Board". Members of ORINCO claim the Governing Board is appropriating lands illegally in order to sell them, and that some of these lands are within the boundary of the archaeological zone. Certainly during the filed surveys we could we the boundary markers and signs placed by INAH had been pulled up and disappeared. ORINCO charged the Governing Board with responsibility, but the Board denied it. ORINCO claims the Governing Board represents no-one but is a self-proclaimed group with an interest in manipulating and selling land, inside or outside the zone boundary. The majority of the members of the Board are not from Xoxocotlan. One is a school teacher and the other a professional woman who recently moved in. The Board apparently bases at least part of its power on its political relations with the PRI and particularly on ties to the mayor.

The formal authorities on land matters in San Francisco Javier are the municipal administrative representative and the Ejidal Commission, but these seem to have been overwhelmed by the conflict and passed responsibility for finding solutions to the mayor of Xoxocotlan. During a field survey which included the mayor he expressed surprise at the destruction of the boundary markers and said he would instruct the vice-mayor to open an exhaustive investigation and punish the guilty. In turn the vice-mayor requested the participation of the three parties to the conflict (ORINCO, the Governing Board, and INAH) to a meeting on neutral ground to discuss the boundaries of the new colonia, the boundary of the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban, and the role of the Governing Board. The result of the meeting was a generalized discussion which grew in tension between ORINCO and the Governing Board, shouted insults, and ultimately some pushing. INAH played the role of the damaged party (due to the loss of the boundary markers and signs) so at least escaped censure at the meeting.

Most of the members of ORINCO are descendents of local ejido members, either cultivate or have cultivated the soil, and have a sense of place in relation to the community. The conservation of Monte Alban has some meaning for them because the Zapotecs who built it "were their grandfathers", and because in a pragmatic sense they think there is more to be gained negotiating with INAH than in fighting with it. Simultaneously they view the Governing Board as outsiders who have come to San Francisco Javier with the intention of getting rich off the sale of lands which legitimately belong to the local ejido. The ejido and Monte Alban represent disposable real estate, nothing more. Their connections are less with the land than with the political party in power (PRI), and by working with the party in Xoxocotlan they know they have sympathetic ears and support amoing the municipal authorities there.

Ejido Commission of Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan:

In Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan the Ejido Commission consists of elected members, a secretary, and an "advisor", in effect someone from the community with no formal position but substantial influence over commission attitudes and decisions. Members of the commission arrive there with a strong sense of grievance against the federal government as the government expropriated lands of the ejido to build the Oaxaca airport and later the buffer zone around it which has become the recreational sports complex known as "El Tequio". In addition to these earlier losses for other purposes the 1992 boundary-setting took place without consultation, as Blanca Paredes (representative of the Public Registry of Archaeological Zones and Monuments of INAH) and the director of the Oaxaca Regional Center took, in the eyes of the commission, a very authoritarian and condescending tone in informing the ejido of the new boundary lines.

It appears the central issue is the 1992 expansion of the archaeological zone via two changes in boundary lines which brought the zone further south and east, a decision in the judgement of the ejido commission to be illegitimate because it was taken without consulting the affected population, and capricious because it does not correspond with their understanding of where the archaeological zone really is. While it seems clear the several revisions of the boundary over the years has produced confusion as to what is protected, the critical irritation is with the process of imposition, to wit: "If to enter a stranger's house one at least asks permission, then to dispose of the lands of an ejido there needs to be prior agreement with its representatives, and before deciding they must consult with its members…they have decided to kill INAH personnel the next time they appear with their measuring equipment." They acknowledge destroying INAH signage and boundary markers as they have no intention of respecting the 1992 boundary, especially because from their perspective on the slopes "there is nothing", meaning that for them the only significant archaeological remains are those monumental structures on the summit of Monte Alban.

Their argument is that the ejido members understand the importance of Monte Alban but that there is no reciprocity, that few members of the ejido find employment there, and as noted above, they have no voice in decisions which affect them. There are 122 families with formal ejido rights, although many of the earlier ejido members effectively subdivided their tracts among their children and in effect there are more than 300 families who see themselves as members of the ejido. Many of those families residing on ejido lands, however, are not ejido members, but outsiders who have come to Xoxocotlan because they have been offered land at low cost and easy terms. The potsherds, stone artifacts, and even low platforms they find have no significance for them.

The field survey included both INAH's boundary markers and those of the ejido. INAH's boundary overlaps the ejido by 500 to 800 meters along boundary markers 37-40, counter-clockwise. The commission and its advisors have formed a group titled the "Union of Edidatarios", and they took advantage of the field survey to affix signs to the ejido boundary markers. These signs state this is ejido property, giving the name of the tract or section. The entire area is affected to some degree by new construction or by subdivision into lots (Figures 57, 58, 59, and 60). Construction, once begun, takes place at an accelerated pace, and given the characteristics of construction may be finished in two or three days.

Moving counterclockwise along the boundary markers of both INAH and the ejido one observes significant variation in land use, soil quality, and archaeological remains. Thus not far from INAH marker 37, in the section known as "El Jaguey", a small dam which used to store water for limited irrigation now serves primarily as a source of water for animals grazing in the area or where some people go to wash clothes. In the same area mica is found on the surface. Unimportant today, in pre-Columbian times it found its way into some ceramics, and indicates this was a source of raw material for production. Further east the slopes are heavily eroded and little used. But north of INAH marker 39 soil quality improves and one finds cultivated fields. One also finds clear archaeological remains in the form of house foundations and surface deposits of ceramics. On observing these remains the commission advisors asserted they had washed downhill and had nothing to do with the location in question.

On arriving at marker 40, where the ejido ends and private landholding begins, one sees on ejido lands to the south (but within the INAH boundary) new construction, while to the north cultivation continues. The ejidal commission expects the area currently cultivated will continue to be so, but that the decision on land use will be the ejido's, not INAH's. The commission expressed the suspicion that INAH's boundary was deliberately set to the south of its earlier position to facilitate expropriation in the future, as the federal government has done in the past. Speaking as the Union of Ejidatarios they are unwilling to cede even an inch, and will not respect the presidential decree. On the contrary, they believe INAH should share with ejido commission and the ejido a percentage of income from the archaeological zone, as much of it belongs to Xoxocotlan.

Smallholders' Protective Association of Xoxocotlan: The Smallholders' Protective Association represents 704 private property owners, of whom about 200 are affected in some way by the 1992 boundary. Most are natives of Xoxocotlan and settled in the area due to its proximity to lines of communication with the city of Oaxaca. These properties have mixed use, including farming, housing, and some small businesses, and all have the appropriate legal documents proving purchase, according to the governing committee, which consists of a president, secretary, treasurer, and several advisors.

The committee expressed disagreement with the hostility manifested by the ejido commission, as in its view "…they are protecting only their own interests, not those of the ejidatarios." The committee commented the ejido commision advisors are in fact heavily involved in illegal land sales, and for that reason have no interest in supporting the archaeological zone boundary nor regulation of land use. At the same time they expressed surprise at the authoritarian and arbitrary attitude of INAH for placing boundary markers without entering into communication with them. In their view "…the lands of Monte Alban are further up the slope, bounded by areas well-known to their ancestors, and those are the true limits, not the arbitrary line federal authorities seek to impose."

A field survey with the committee reviewed their perceptions of the boundaries of the archaeological zone, without exception well upslope of the areas included in the 1992 boundary-setting. To some degree their sense of the boundary follows the edge of private smallholdings. In other places it follows natural features such as the Paredon, a rock formation approximately 5 meters high and a kilometer long about halfway up the side of Monte Alban. Or there are certain points accepted as marking the boundary, such as Juan Rosa's Cave, a natural cave in a small canyon containing a large pond where children swim and women wash clothes. The 1992 boundary-setting places this feature will inside the archaeological zone, but the smallholders contend this is an unmistakeable point marking the limits of the zone. In some places the "true" boundary simply follows the band where vegetation becomes denser and people are less likely to go. At various points it is possible to see small platforms or other signs of ancient habitation.

The Cerro del Chapulin, Cerro Pelon, and Peña del Tecolote are high hills marking the north edge of Xoxocotlan, in the middle of an area bounded by markers 42, 43, and 44 on the south side of the delimitation, and 59, 60, and 61 to the north. Here one can clearly see archaeological remains on these summits, while on the lower slopes there was intensive residential land use development. South of boundary markers 42 and 43 is Colonia Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz, characterized by its extreme poverty. This colonia has been developing on lands which were once communal , but whose residents now claim are private property, even though legally they are not. Further north there are more vestiges of low platforms and plazas. In the lower part of the cluster of housing known as El Chapulin near marker 44 there is a primary school, built clearly on archaeological remains largely destroyed by excavations unauthorized by INAH as well as by vandalism. The smallholders claim "…it is the president of the Communal Lands Committee who distributes lands which do not belong to him in return for money."

El Paraguito, located on the southeast limit of the boundary, includes an area defined by markers 45-57. It is a small tract, perhaps five hectares, sitting on a natural promotory which was used in pre-Columbian times to construct a complex of four platforms around a central plaza. Some years ago INAH authorized the construction of a chapel, and also the use of the plaza for a soccer field. It was hoped this would slow growth, but the impact of three new settlements…El Chapulin, Insurgentes, and Santa Elena…added to the corruption of the communal lands representatives, has led to a total invasion of the archaeological sector and a massive destruction of arqueological elements such as mounds, platforms, and the plaza. The field survey also revealed recent excavations to form housing platforms, indiscriminate extraction of pre-Columbian stones for construction purposes, and other damage. The smallholders` committee argued for prosecution "…as there is a difference between disagreeing with the boundary and in supporting those delinquents who destroy archaeological remains."

Comuneros of Xoxocotlan:

Moving northeast from El Paraguito one enters the communal lands of Xoxocotlan. Without a doubt this is the most critical area for the conservation of archaeological remains on the lower slopes of Monte Alban, as this is the area most accessible from and to the city of Oaxaca. Irregular settlements began along the foot of the mountain in the late 1960s , settlements which in time began to grow due to rural-urban migration and migration from the center of Oaxaca toward the outskirts. Neighborhoods began to organize as residents sought to protect their interests in the land and to press for services. Today, following INAH's boundary from south to north, one passes through Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz, Insurgentes, Santa Elena, and Emiliano Zapata (all on land belonging to Xoxocotlan); del Valle, Santa Anita, San Juanito, and Barrio "El Coquito" (San Juan Chapultepec); and Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Monte Alban, Colinas de Monte Alban, Moctezuma, and Hidalgo (all in San Martin Mexicapam).

The boundary set by INAH in the area of these colonias was intended to protect the archaeological remains found along a line immediately above the last streets in these neighborhoods as of 1992. In part this line was to halt the uncontrolled growth and in part to stop the obvious destruction of archaeological terraces found in this sector, that is, along this line the criteron for boundary-setting shifted from strictly archaeological to thinking about the implications of patterns of urban settlement. However, field surveys from boundary marker to boundary marker with representatives of the smallholders showed that along the boundary the archaeological zone had been invaded by "provisional" construction anywhere from 30 meters, i.e., a couple of homesites, to anywhere from 200 to 300 meters in critical areas. On asking residents of the area about the boundary they invariably replied "…we know where the boundary is, but this is where they sold us land, and we have the papers to prove it."

El Paraquito is important in two respects. Besides the significant destruction of archaeological materials found in the area, it serves as a watershed between Xoxocotlan and a series of irregular settlements characterized by poverty, poor public services, and a general lack of identity. Walking the streets one notices the trash, open air defecation, lack of control over domestic animals, and a general sense of a low quality of life. As the residents all arrived from somewhere else there is an absence of bonding based on familiy relations or community ties. All are neighbors by circumstance and necessity but this occasions a sense of competition and defensiveness, as the social mechanisms for decision-making or conflict resolution they may have known elsewhere are absent. Furthermore, everyone knows the land they hold was obtained in a manner less than legal, so there is always a doubt as to whether someone might appear with another set of documents to claim possession of their property.

Boundary markers 54 to 58 were placed just uphill from the water tanks built several years ago by the National Water Commission to supply this section of metropolitan Oaxaca. At that time the lands where the tanks are located was uninhabited, but the tanks attracted irregular settlements, which of course make use of the water available, although not necessarily through authorized withdrawal. Further north and east, from markers 60 to 62, the boundary line has also been penetrated by settlement. Curiously, near marker 62 there exists a small archaeological complex consisting of four platforms and a plaza used locally for pasturing goats, and about 30 meters from the site there is a large wooden cross which both the residents of Xoxocotlan and recent arrivals regard as important. Xoxocotlan has done some reforestation in the adjacent area and placed benches for those who come to the cross. As an area of public use and control it has not been invaded by irregular settlement, even though the nearest street passes scarcely 15 meters below the cross.

Markers 63 and 64 also adjoin water tanks, in this case above Santa Anita in San Juan Chapultepec. Although settlement has not passed the boundary line at this point, the area just below the line is saturated with housing and exerting pressure on it. As the slope is quite steep in this area there are no streets, just minimal paths among the houses. In the steepest parts there are improvised stairways, but these are so much a part of the landscape that someone not from the immediate area hardly knows where to walk, as it always seems as if one is on private property. At marker 66 the boundary cuts downslope to connect to the old road to Monte Alban at the historic monument known as "the foundary". The markers along here in 1992 marked the highest point in Colonia Monte Alban, but by 1995 a rough street had been cut inside the boundary and penetration begun. Between only two markers the field survey counted fifteen houses of recent construction.

The road originally cut by Alfonso Caso for access to Monte Alban divides Colonia Monte Alban into upper and lower sections (also known as Monte Alban 1 and 2), straddling the line between San Martin Mexicapam and Xoxocotlan. Here along the slope there is a natural passage known locally as Paso del Frances, which links the private and communal lands of Xoxocotlan with San Martin Mexicapam. Sections of this area are part of a permanent litigation between the two jurisdictions, complicating oversight and services. The east side of the road, which was settled earlier, shows signs of urbanization: paved streets, sewage and piped water, electricity, an occasional police presence, and and bus service. On the other side of the road, upslope, one sees a lack of services and provisional arrangements such as informal connections to water and electric lines. The residents of this area, by declaring themselves to be simply new sections of existing neighborhoods, hope the municipal or state government will extend the services now enjoyed by their downhill neighbors.

The boundary markers between Xoxocotlan and the ejido of San Martin Mexicapam, just upslope from the old road to Monte Alban, show that the the west the land is largely free of cultivation and housing, while downslope to the east omne can see increasing numbers of new houses of informal construction. The population density is still low, but as the land is more suitable for housing the colonias of Moctezuma and Hidalgo are growing gradually upslope. The west or uphill side of the road has been reforested and it remains to be seen whether the "green barrier" has any effect. It is in this area, at the marker known as "La Mona", that the communal lands of Xoxocotlan end, and Xoxocotlan authorities believe "…it is the true boundary of Monte Alban, because that is what Alfonso Caso said, and the more recent marker takes in 250 meters of land which in fact does not belong to Monte Alban."

San Martin Mexicapam Ejidal and Communal Lands Commission:

This group represents a segment of the population of San Martin Mexicapam, the boundaries of which run from the intersection of the two roads to Monte Alban to Tomb 7, on the edge of the Main Plaza, and down the hill to the wall of the Foundary, on the east side of the boundary line. It consists of 12 members, mostly under 40, elected in a community assembly. The Commission expressed a willingness to accept the federal stance on Monte Alban "…whenever San Martin Mexicapam has a role in the economic activities of the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban." Their specific expectations are that the parking areas, cafeterias, craft sales, and perhaps a new transportation service should be managed by people from San Martin, reasoning that as they were the former holders of important portions of the archaeological zone, including Tomb 7, the federal government owes them an opportunity to enjoy some gains from that fact.

It should be remembered that the area of San Martin Mexicapam facing the city of Oaxaca includes a number of irregular or informal settlements such as Hidalgo, Moctezuma, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Monte Alban, and Luis Donaldo Colosio (Figures 65 and 66), all previously mentioned. All of these are on ejidal and communal lands sold illegally by ejidatarios, clandestine speculators, and by some of the ejidal and communal lands commissioners. In this case the commission is willing to sign an agreement with INAH on protecting the boundary in turn for economic opportunities. Nevertheless, when defining themselves as representatives of San Martin Mexicapam they are in reality talking about the original nucleus of population, far from the boundary of Monte Alban. The areas adjacent to the boundary are in reality recent settlements which the Commission rarely considers, regarding them as marginal and populated by outsiders. Residents of these settlements constitute the population most likely to abuse the archaeological zone, but employment and sales opportunities there would generally be reserved for the ejidatarios and their relatives.

During the field survey of communal and ejidal lands with the Commission it was clear that given their relative youth many did not have a clear idea as to the boundaries of the lands under their responsibility. Most have some form of employment in the city of Oaxaca, and their ideas of benefits for their community are linked to commercial opportunities which might be generated by the archaeological zone. As an example, one mentioned that in San Martin Mexicapam there are a number of goldsmiths who make copies of the jewels found in Tomb 7. Nevertheless, "they cannot sell direct to the consumer, as the production is monopolized by 'Gold of Monte Alban', the jewelry store authorized by INAH to sell copies. The craftsman is marginalized, selling his product cheaply, and without recognition of his effort and artistic accomplishment". To the ejidatarios this reflects INAH's appropriation of their lands for the commercial benefit of tourist-based businesses in the center, depriving them of participation in the profits.

The San Martin Mexicapam Land Protection Committee: This group to a certain extent represents the counterpoint to Commission, which it characterizes as land speculators. Consisting primarily of older and elderly residents, this informal organization represents the interests of the more conservative people in San Martin Mexicapam. Many are campesinos convinced the lands around Monte Alban "…should continue to be cultivated to protect what is still buried there". A high percentage of the group worked on or had some relationship with the projects of Alfonso Caso, and remember "…the discoverer of Tomb 7 was Pablo Garcia, a worker from San Martin Mexicapam", a fact which they recount with pride.

The members of this committee are perfectly familiar with the boundary markers and tract locations of their community, and characterize the Ejidal Commission as "…those who take advantage by selling farmland for their own benefit…", and as people more interested in short-term political or commercial advantages than in long-term or collective gains for the community. And they are skeptical of Commission contacts with INAH on the grounds "…they are not for the benefit of Monte Alban, but to gain commercial advantages and better select the lands most vulnerable for sale or invasion". Members of this committee claimed it organized sometime ago both the advise the Commission and to call it to account when necessary. Beyond that it has other interests, such as recruitment of people from San Martin Mexicapam for work as watchmen or other support positions at Monte Alban "…because these are permanent positions". They would also like "…to see some way of creating a museum in the community to safeguard all the idols people have in their homes, which are a lot."

Their sense of identification with Monte Alban is revealed in their sentiment that "…the boundary line is approapriate because it includes everything where there are remans…" and "…the ruins should be seen as a collective cultural heritage and not as a target to be invaded by people whose behavior divides and damages San Martin Mexicapam". Nevertheless "…they should have called them to participate in the boundary-setting so everyone would have been informed and there would have been no problems."

Residents of Colinas de Monte Alban:

The subdivision of Colinas de Monte Alban is located opposite boundary marker 16 and on its north side adjoins the private property of the Bustamante family. To the west its effective boundary is the highway which goes up to Monte Alban, to the south ejidal lands of San Martin Mexicapam, and to the southeast Colonia Hidalgo. The residents of the subdivision are in large part teachers, doctors in government agencies, engineers and architects working in government, and employees of various federal agencies. In general they are professionals and have moved to the city from a range of backgrounds, or as one said "…from the Isthmus, the Mixteca, from Ixtlan, Ejutla, and Zimatlan, from Chiapas, Gunajuato, Veracruz, and the Federal District". The governing board of the residents' association consists of a president, secretary, treasurer, and two additional members. The board speaks for approximately 450 families, but the maximum number appearing at an assembly is 110. The residents are generally apathetic about the organization, and then tendency is for each family to address its problems on its own; for example, to deal with the problem of domestic break-ins people generally increase the number of dogs they own. As the people who live in the subdivision "…arrive home only to sleep…" there is little social cohesion.

The subdivision is fully serviced, with electricity, sewage, potable water, paved streets, trash collection, telephones, and police patrols. There is consensus that breaking and entering is a significant problem. The subdivision in the mid-1990s signed an agreement with the ejido of San Martin Mexicapam which led to the construction of some basketball courts there, and at times the youth of the subdivision gather there to play basketball with the youth of the ejido, almost the only contact they have with the "locals". It is clear that in time and space the relationship between the subdivision and its surroundings, including Monte Alban, is that they are different relaities. For most of the residents of Colinas de Mointe Alban the archaeological zone "…is a place where one goes to run…" rather than a place with educational significance. The problem of boundary-setting is a remote one—not because the subdivision is outside what was the pre-Columbian settlement zone—but because the boundary was drawn around the subdivsion, either from respect for the formal construction or to avoid problems with other agencies.

Socially the residents are aware their subdivision was built in a marginal area of the city of Oaxaca and San Martin Mexicapam. The state government decided to try to break the viscious circle of irregular settlements-delinquency through the formation of subdivisions by the Oaxaca Housing Institute. As noted earlier, subdivision residents are largely professionals who have been dropped into this marginal context. The social conflict which this has generated translates into house break-ins or petty violence against those favored by the government and considered rich by a population which feels its own marginality. Subdivision residents consider it dangerous to develop any kind of relationship with the others, "…even to riding in the same buses…," and develop their social life outside the area. To them the local population "…did not have the vision to develop an adequate residential setting but allowed the expansion of irregular settlements inhabited by a low class population, which in turn generates uncontrolled delinquency." The only relation they have with the local population is in its role of service provider, for it is here they acquire household help, women who wash clothes or make tortillas, or provide other services sought by a middle class suburban population.

Interviews with subdivision residents are revealing both for the different sense of engagement with the boundary setting process and for the intellectual distance from Monte Alban. On the boundary-setting process the committee commented:

"…we have no problem with the boundary, as this used to be the private property of Jaime Hamilton, and the IVO built the subdivision in two stages, first 120 houses and then 420 more. As all this is government construction there is no problem with legal title. As residents of the subdivision they were aware of the boundary-setting of 1992 but it did not affect them because they are outside the archaeological site; in the neighboring communities there was no consensus and for them there are problems."

Residents of the subdivision generally think that to generate more interest in the conservation of Monte Alban INAH needs to ally itself with agencies which can "…develop an economic product which attracts people". They also argue for more emphasis on education among the young, "…starting with popular culture, with stories in popular magazines, school workshops, contests, and other activities, working with the parents' committees, and thereby nurturing the conscience necessary for the conservation of archaeological zones". Their own behavior suggests little such conscience. When asked about their own use of Monte Alban they commented "…they do not go on trips to Monte Alban, except to exercise or run. A few people go up with their families but rarely more than once…."

One theme which appears with great consistency in popular memory and the accounts of the boundary-setting process is the arbitrary and high-handed, even authoritarian, style of the INAH representatives and professionals who participated in the 1992 revision. It leaves the impression there was little effort to work with the committees, commissions, officials, and other representatives of Monte Alban's neighbors. Yet the files in the regional office of INAH are filled with invitations, notifications, minutes of meetings, and other documentation, sometimes directed to and signed by the same people who in subsequent interviews complained of INAH's behavior. One can argue this shows the power of selective and collective memory, or the tendency to "forget" details which might call into question the story being told or one's part in it. Few commented on the apparently widespread involvement of ejidal, communal lands, and municipal authorities in illegal and fraudulent land sales. But the issue here is not to discredit testimony, it is to remind us that what is written down at one point or is a point of consensus is subject to constant revision, and to make the assumption that something is settled or fixed is to make an assumption which is both optimistic and potentially disasterous.

As the foregoing amply demonstrates, Monte Alban's status as an archaeological zone spanning several jurisdictions in a rapidly-changing environment generates space for the emergence and activities of a large number of social actors. This contrasts dramatically with Mitla, where the fact that the zone is contained within a single, more homogeneous jurisdiction reduces compexity of issues associated with land tenure and rights. On the other hand, the number and diversity of economic interests competing for access to tourism in Mitla is much greater than in Monte Alban. While the size of Monte Alban creates the potential for controversies over land issues, the very compactness of the archaeological zone in Mitla, in conjunction with the way visitors are addressed by economic actors, means that group struggles for access to the opportunities visitors imply easily intrudes into INAH's policy and management domains. This reinforces the opening argument in this chapter, i.e., INAH needs to recognize the diverse origins and interests of the groups with which it interacts in the process of heritage conservation.

Unlike Monte Alban, in Mitla the process of urban growth toward the archaeological site has a very long history (Robles and Moreira 1984; Magadan 1984). Since the colonial period, but particularly in the twentieth century, the contemporary urban settlement of Mitla has extended across the earlier site, and since the 1950s has invaded the areas of monumental archaeology (Magadan 1984: 199). Most of the land involved has been communal land with use rights ceded to families over time. Across the years the original families subdivided their lots to provide space for their childrens' households. While having no legal validity, the families formalized the division through private deeds signed in front of a notary public. Local people in effect accept these as property titles or at least treat them as such. Although the amount of land involved is modest in terms of hectares its strategic location means over the long term this means a gradual loss of control by the public sector through the Ejido and Communal Lands Committee.

Ejido and Communal Lands Committee of Mitla:

The office of Commissioner of Ejido and Communal Lands is filled through election as part of the governance system of Mitla. The commissioner, along with a team of twelve, is charged with controlling and administering the ejido and communal lands of the community for a period of three years. This position is second only to that of mayor in the hierarchy of community offices. The relationship of the committee to the archaeological zone is critical, as all the clusters of monuments whose boundaries have been officially determined sit on what are currently communal lands. During the period 1993-95 the commissioner and mayor engaged in a struggle for turf, with the former arguing the latter "…has authority over the urban area, but not the communal lands which surround it."

The commissioner took the position that addressing the problem of inappropriate use of lands immediately adjacent to the clusters of monumental structures required a process of negotiation on a case-by-case basis, that is "it is necessary to talked with those affected one by one". He agreed the land closest to the monuments needed to be vacated and offered to grant lands elsewhere to ejidatarios or to those holding communal land who accepted relocation, as long as INAH would compensate them for structures lost. Of course the problem here is that the archaeological zone in Mitla does not receive a regular budget for systematic maintenance or weeding, so it is hardly likely to receive funds to compensate communal lands users for displacement from their holdings. In commenting on ejidal lands affecting another portion of the archaeological zone (the Fortress, whose boundaries were set in a preliminary way in January, 1994), he indicated that once these boundaries were set by INAH and the Agrarian Solicitor's Office it would be urgent to place signage so indicating, as "…only by marking clearing the boundaries will people pay attention to them."

Association of Affected Parties of the Arroyo Group: In 1993 the Oaxaca state government approved a special budget allotment of $800,000 pesos for salvage and restoration work in Mitla. Given the priorities established by the Mitla Project in the 1980s and given the amount budgeted, INAH's Oaxaca Regional Center decided to begin archaeological excavation and salvage in the complex known as the Arroyo Group. Salvage of this cluster was particularly important as over the years the invasion of its immediate surroundings by residences had become a critical issue. The space itself had become a de facto dump, with the patios used as a meeting place for drunks or for other vices, and in general its destruction by a combination of factors left it vulnerable to irreversible damage in the near-term.

Once excavation, consolidation, and general recovery of the immediate environment began problems with the neighbors started. INAH's technical team decided it would be advisable to plaster the back walls of the adjoining houses, as these had generally been left bare and unfinished, giving the immediate surrounding an unkempt and disorderly appearance. Although INAH initiated discussions with neighbors to gain their permission to carry out the plastering, this provoked the ire of some. These took it upon themselves to organize against INAH, calling itself the Association of Affected Parties of the Arroyo Group (Figure 67). Among other actions this group interfered in negotiations underway with two neighbors to sign purchase contracts for house lots inside the archaeological zone boundary. Although the neighbors had agreed to sell their properties and had settled on a price, the Association pressured them not to sell and left them in such a difficult position vis-a-vis the rest of the community that the owners had to withdraw their offer. As a consequence the funds set aside for this purchase had to be returned to the state government on the grounds "…that it was not feasible to utilize them" (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO).

At the end of 1994 the Association of Affected Parties decided to join the State Federation of Agricultural, Livestock, Forest, Craft, and Marine Producers to exert greater pressure on government agencies and gain immediate attention for its claims. By joining the Federation the group automatically became part of the Democratic Campesino Union, a political bloc used to negotiating issues at a very different level, given its relationship to the government political party, the Party of the Institutionalized Revolution (PRI for its initials in Spanish). While the Federation argued its purpose was to "…stop problems before they got out of control", in fact it basically survives as an organization by taking an advocacy position for the interests of its members. Rarely does it analyze the issues of the case, instead taking the members' arguments at face value. Thus the Federation automatically joins the opposition to INAH's conservation efforts in the archaeological zone by supporting the position of the neighbors around the Arroyo Group.

A fundamental difference between social actors organized around land issues in Monte Alban and Mitla is that in the first case the ejidatarios or municipal authorities are part of an ongoing institutionalized presence, and the neighborhood or colonia associations also develop a formal structure as they mature. In contrast, in Mitla opposition groups spring up suddenly, have little initial organization, and are more visceral than policy-driven. In the case of the Association of Affected Parties the probable gains to the neighbors and their tourist-oriented enterprises clearly outstripped alleged problems, making it more difficult to understand the nature of their opposition, and therefore in a larger sense to anticipate or respond to it.

Economic Interests and Resource Exploitation

If the complexity of land-based issues and actors is a central element in understanding the dynamics of heritage conservation at Monte Alban, Mitla offers an exceptional example of the emergence and behavior of actors focused on economic interests. One can argue the transformation of Mitla from a community heavily dependent on its natural resources to sustain its agricultural base, to a community heavily dependent on its cultural resources to sustain its commercial base, is the defining economic consideration of the twentieth century. With a few exceptions Mitla has little interest in the traditional boundary disputes with its neighbors, as a few hectares of brush and rock no longer seem significant when the economic engine and sense of community identity now lie almost in its urban core. Access to visitors, not grazing land, becomes the focus of group competition.

Church Committee: At first this committee may seem an odd actor to include in a discussion on economic interests and resource exploitation, but in reality the Church Committee is one of the most important economic and political actors in Mitla. It consists of 27 members designated each year by the community (and formally named by the mayor): a president, secretary, treasurer, 8 board members, 8 alternates, and 8 messengers and assistants. Their responsibilities have to do with the management and administrative well-being of the San Pablo church, including its opening, security, maintenance, and financial viability, as well as looking after the home and office of the priest.

Until they were nationalized by the Reform Laws of the late 1850s the Catholic Church in Mitla owned numerous properties, including part of the archaeological zone. As the church building sits physically on some of the pre-Columbian structures tradition defines these and the immediately adjoining land as "church property", a tradition surviving to the present although legally inadmissible. It is in this sense that the Church Committee asserts a claim over "church property" (Figure 68) even though this brings it into conflict with agencies charged with heritage protection—in this case INAH—which the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historical Zones and Monuments designates as responsible for conservation of religious architecture as well as the archaeological zone. This committee asserts documents which it claims to have in its possession (although these have never been produced for review, purportedly due to a "lack of confidence" in the reviewers) giving it control "…of the properties of the church…" continue in effect. Parsons reports that during her research between 1929 and 1933 the church still owned property, such as the "bulls of the saint", somewhat more than 30 cows (Parsons 1936: 49) and cropland, known as the "fields of the saint", to which the population consciously made little reference to avoid their confiscation by the Governor (Parsons 1936: 55).

Today there are two fundamental problems which involve the Church Committee in archaeological conservation. The first of these is that the community expects that the committee "…carries out a project…," which is understood to mean some physical project in benefit of the church building itself, the priest's house or the chapel of the Calvary which sits atop the largest platform of the Adobe Group. Recent projects include changing the flooring of the church (1987), changing the roofing of the chapel of the Calvary (1988), changing the roofing of a portion of the priest's house (1993), and changing the flooring of the main patio of the priest's house (1994). Nevertheless, INAH is the legally responsible party for overseeing the quality and type of project carried out on historic buildings (Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Zones and Monuments, Chapter 1, Article 60), and no committee has solicited on its own INAH's authorization for its projects. As INAH then is legally obligated to suspend the work in question the community rises in protest against the federal officials who had to carry out the law.

The second problem is economic. It originates in the Church Committee's insistence that the land around the archaeological monuments is "church property", and that the committee has the right to charge rent to vendors who wish to sell on the street between the North Group and the Group of the Columns. These groups consist of the outsiders from Guerrero and Morelos who come to sell, and local vendors of fruit and ice cream. The income from such rent is a significant addition to the committee's funds for operations and projects. As the law prohibits commercial use of land in archaeological zones and INAH wishes to reduce both the visual pollution and the garbage generated by such vending, its attempts to enforce federal law predictably end in conflict. Usually the Church Committee responds by ringing the church bells summoning reinforcements and threatening violence, as in the case recounted in Chapter 1. It is significant that when the Church Committee experiences such problems it immediately seeks the support of other groups, e.g., the street vendors, vendors from the Crafts Market, or neighbors, and these respond quickly, even though occasionally they may have problems with each other in relation to other interests.

One effort to define responsibilities and areas of control between the Church Committee and INAH took place in 1987, when INAH proposed to all groups involved in craft sales as well as the Church Committee that the street between the Hall of the Columns and the church building itself by closed off through installation of a gate, which would be opened as necessary for religious celebrations, e.g., Holy Week or for the patron saint of the community. The Church Committee said nothing while the supports for the gate were built, and where a chain with a padlock were finally installed to control access. The goal was to control vehicular traffic which affected the archaeological zone with congestion, vibration, noise, and pollution. The day following its installation the chain had disappeared, and when INAH staff attempted to replace it they were attacked by the street vendors verbally and with stones. Within a few weeks the supports had been destroyed and the trees planted for landscaping purposes uprooted (Archive of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 1987).

The stance of the Church Committee has been reinforced by resident Catholic priests. At Mitla the priests have always been opposed to INAH's authority over religious buildings, although through the mechanism of the Church Committee rather than openly. In general the attitudes of the priests toward INAH have been a combination of arrogance and ignorance, and have tolerated, if not supported, community violence toward federal officials. The event of 1987, which included the use of arms, originated in a complaint by the priest to the Church Committee that the INAH staff had entered the church in order to rob it. In the mid-1990s a rotation of priests brought one more open to communication but with the same general attitude. Thus in 1994 the priest maintained the projects underway were the responsibility of the Church Committee and had nothing to do with him. However, key informants reported that the priest both proposed the renovations and was insisting in their rapid completion.

Artisans Market Artisans Association:

This group of 103 artisans (in reality, most are either middlemen or engaged in resale) are rightsholders in the Artisans Market which borders the archaeological zone to the east of the North Group and the Hall of the Columns (Figure 69). It is governed by a governing board which includes a president, a treasurer, a secretary, and 4 council members, plus an equal number of alternates. This group, which lives from incomes generated by tourism, emerged in 1976 as an outgrowth of the construction of the Artisans Market. The muncipal authorities of the time took out a 3.6 million peso loan from the Bank of PublicWorks to cover construction costs (Archives of the Archaeology Section, INAH CRO 1978). In turn the market construction was an attempt to reduce the constant movement of vendors through the archaeological zone, as by 1974 there were about 70 stalls around the market, plus the independent street vendors. By that time there was already conflict between the owners of the stalls and the independent vendors (Archives of the Archaeology Section, INAH CRO, 1978).

The relationship of this group with the archaeological zone is also defensive in the sense that it watches the actions of INAH to be sure they do not block access to the market and that they are positive in terms of location of parking lots, green spaces, or other visitor infrastructure. They want to be sure the archaeological monuments nearby are managed to their advantage, to the point where on July 15, 1977, without any authorization, they demolished 12 meters of the archaeological zone boundary wall to create a direct access to the Artisans Market. It is worth noting that on July 5th of that year the municipal authorities (who also happened to be members of the Artisans Association) requested INAH's permission to demolish the 12 meters of wall in question. Denied the authorization, on July 17th the authorities notified the general secretary of the governor's office "…it gives me satisfaction to communicate to you that on the 15th a part of the stone wall between the Archaeological Zone and the Artisans Market had been knocked down by person or persons unknown…" (Archives of the Archaeology Section, INAH CRO, 1977). This attitude suggests a certain complicity on the part of the highest officials in the community, an attitude which should not surprise us given that several mayors have been part of this group.

Finally the INAH representative in Oaxaca approved an opening in the wall "…on the grounds that it was necessary to provide a solultion to access from the zone, church, and market; considering that the boundary of the church atrium gives no evidence of being the existing wall, and considering the wall has already been opened further south…" (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 1977). The fact that the representative authorizing the opening did not consider is that the wall was built between 1888 and 1890 (a date he himself later published) as the first physical boundary to protect the palaces adjacent to the church (Esparza 1983: 57). This date, therefore, places the wall under the legal protection of the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historical Zones and Monuments in the category as a Historic Monument. In effect the authorization for demolition constitutes a federal offense committed by the INAH representative in Oaxaca.

The Artisans Association is a closed group ready to defend its market and parking area, and declares itself opposed to the street vendors "…because they engage in unfair competition…," but in reality they generally tolerate it because the vendors are their relatives or have some other relationship, e.g., godparents or sweethearts. As the group lives from the archaeological zone it understands that its good appearance and good services may translate into good better sales. Nevertheless, they are not inclined to cooperate in the maintenance of either the market or the zone; their relationship with INAH depends strictly on the moment and nature of the problem. For example, they argued the zone should offer good services, but were quite upset when INAH built bathrooms for site visitors as these would be free, while the Artisans Association had been charging as much as two pesos for the use of the market bathrooms, which were always deplorably dirty.

Another example of the difficult relationship emerged in 1986, when a group of market members, displaced by a fire in the market building, requested permission to sell temporarily in the parking lot. At first they were criticized by the Association's governing board and many members, but when these observed that those selling in the parking lot sold more and sooner than the rest, they decided to burn the building and everyone sold in the parking lot. In 1987 the state government repaired the building and pressured Artisan Association members to return to their stands inside. Nevertheless, in a few months 18 vendors had returned to sell outside in temporary booths, defying the rest and organizing a group which named itself "the 18". The rest of the association decided to leapfrog the 18 by invading the cobbled street between the Church and the Hall of the Columns…the same street the Church Committee rents to outside vendors…with more than 100 booths. The purpose was to pressure the 18 to return to the market building, and once that was accomplished the others withdrew from the archaeological zone. However, today not only the "group of 18" but the rest of the market vendors are established in the parking lot, using the market strictly as a storage unit or having double booths, having built small but permanent facilities in the parking lot.

Something worth noting in discussing the issues raised by this group is the apparent failure of the Artisans Market itself, a project approved by INAH in 1976 Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO 1976). An enclosed structure, it did not permit vendors to follow their tradition of open markets similar to the one they created on their own in the parking lot. Nor did the existence of the market do away with wandering street vendors, nor with the rivalry between these vendors and the organized group. It instead created a structure which helped to codify the relations between the two groups.

The lack of interest in heritage conservation can be found in the profoundly mercantile stance of the Association vis-a-vis INAH's concerns for authenicity or visual image. The Artisans Association, despite its name, in fact markets crafts from as close as Teotitlan del Valle and Santo Tomas Jalieza, and as far away Guatemala. Today the visitor who arrives at the Artisans Market is exposed to a marketing spectacle originating in the far corners of the country. On the other hand, craft production on a massive scale has simply reduced craft quality, once very good, as the high volume of tourism means that inevitably a substantial portion of that tourism is most concerned with price rather than artistic or production qualities.

Street Vendors:

This is the group of vendors having the longest association with the archaeological zone: Parsons reports that in 1930 there existed "…a small group of women who gathered around the tourists" (Parsons 1936: 63). At the same time this is the group which has been most involved in conflict due to its proximity to the archaeological zone (Figure 70) and for its characteristic disinterest in site protection. This means group members refuse to cooperate with federal, state, or local authorities. While this group lacks a formal structure, its approximately 50 members have developed a specific style based around a series of communication and behavioral strategies which make them particularly difficult to work with. It consists almost entirely of Zapotec women who sell products such as blouses, shirts, shawls, tablecloths, sashes, and dolls made of yarn. There are two or three young men, socially marginal as homosexuals, who have adopted the customs, sales strategies, activities, and style of the rest of the group, in one case to the point of enjoying some leadership influence. The street vendors are known for carrying their products in bamboo baskets so they can pursue tourists, and for this reason are known in Mitla as the "basket women."

On the arrival of a tour bus in Mitla, if it does not park in the parking area of the Artisans Market, it inevitably will be met by a group of basket women, who approach the tourists very directly, blocking their paths, placing merchandise in their hands, and insisting that they buy something. Their style is so aggressive the tourist may buy something almost to escape the harassment, as a refusal to buy from one vendor brings another ten following the same routine. Recently they have begun to develop skills in other languages, as besides Spanish and the Zapotec they speak with each other to mantain their secrets, it is not at all rare to see tourists surprised to hear a sales pitch in English, French, German, Italian, and even Japanese. Beyond the parking lots their primary area of activity used to be the Hall of the Columns, where they entered the buildings in pursuit of tourists, climbing or sitting on the walls for hours waiting for customers, chatting, weaving, and even sleeping.

In 1977 INAH's Oaxaca Regional Office decided to fence the area around the Columns Group, an action which forced the vendors to stay outside the sphere of federal control. They took the step of seeking judicial protection of their right to sell inside the ruins "…as we have done for many years, and as our parents and grandparents did…" (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 1978). They also wrote President Jose Luis Portillo a letter signed by 73 people asking his intervention, "…as the boundary-setting damages the interests of the street vendors" (Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 1977). A judicial injunction against INAH was denied on April 13, 1978, and with it went any hope of agreement between the vendors and INAH. The basket women then took refuge in the Church Group or North Group, a cluster which at that time was under the control of the Church Committee and without protection. There, in the meeting rooms of the pre-Columbian palaces, the women would gather to chat, weave, rest in the shade, and eat with family members who brought them food. As a consequence problems of garbage and excrement became increasingly serious, above all in the structures closest to the church.

In 1987, as part of the Mitla Project (Robles and Moreira 1987), the North Group was fenced for its protection and to enhance its visitor value. One consequence was a continuing series of personal attacks against the archaeologists in charge of the project (Robles, Archives of the Archaeological Section, INAH CRO, 1987). In the end INAH's fence permitted control, and the basket women were limited to selling their products along the street which links the North Group and the Hall of the Columns. Here the group comes into conflict with the interests of the Church Committee, the Artisans Market, other vendors, and the archaeological zone. Today the issues associated with this street represent the most complicated aspect of heritage protection in this cluster of monuments. It is clear none of the groups using the area is inclined to cooperate in land use regulation, and INAH has neither the motivation nor the legal capacity to come to grips with the consequences of enforcing the law which protects the structures and the integrity of their environment.

The basket women can be characterized as having deep roots in the community, they cooperate with the interests of the church, and their husbands attend to their responsibilities in the traditional system of offices. They are persistently aggressive toward INAH personnel and other federal employees, including physically assaulting personnel from the archaeological zone and verbally abusing local municipal officials. When asked what importance the monumental structures have for them the response was "…they really are of no interest, as they know what they need to and a single visit is sufficient". What does interest them is selling their wares, "…even if if means really going after the tourists."

Vendors from Chiapas, Guerrero, and Morelos: This heterogeneous group of vendors consists of young men from different states who come to install temporary stands selling crafts around the archaeological zone. As the Artisans Market denied them authorization to sell there these outside vendors looked for the best possible alternative, and have found it exploiting the space formed by the street dividing the Hall of the Columns and the North Group (Figure 71). There the Church Committee charges them a daily space rental of 1.5 pesos per lineal meter. It does not matter to the committee that it is charging for space over which it has no legal jurisdiction, it does not seem to matter to the outside vendors that they are paying rent to someone who has no legal right to charge it, and apparently INAH would prefer not to provoke another headache by enforcing the law, especially as it would probably be to the benefit of those who have no ties to the community and therefore are not in a position to be supportive of INAH when such support is needed.

The outside vendors are a group which grows and shrinks according to the tourist flow. During the low season, e.g., the end of February, there may be 6 to 8,but this tends to climb to 15 to 20 during the high season, e.g., at Christmas or at the Lunes del Cerro dance festival in Oaxaca in July. This group began to take shape gradually starting about 1985-86, and the majority are single men between the ages of 16 and 25 who change locations according to tourist seasons. To Mitla they come to sell crafts easy to transport and sell such as bark painting and masks from Chilpancingo, Guerrero; amber pendants from Chiapas; and pendants, necklaces, and earrings from Cuernavaca, Morelos. They sometimes bring copies of archaeological pieces made in different parts of the country, ashtrays of stone or ceramics, and sometimes ornamental objects of coral. That is, this group also consists of people who are reselling someone else's product, and their interest centers on the sale of stone, clay, or paper objects which are not really competitive with the products sold in the Artisans Market or by the basket women.

Still, there is no sympathy or friendship shown them by other groups of vendors. Even with a different product mix the Artisans Association considers them to be unfair competition similar to the basket women. As the basket women sell in the same strip but do not pay rent to the Church Committee they fear that the precedent set by outside vendors paying a rental fee may someday affect them. They also are of the opinion that outsiders should not be permitted to sell in Mitla and that the only reason the outsiders are tolerated is because they have the support of the Church Committee.

These vendors do not feel a part of Mitla, have no local friends, nor have they formed any kind of relation with Mitla women. They eat in restaurants or in the street and live for weeks in rented rooms. It is worth noting their presence has given rise to a new economic activity in Mitla, one which did not exist in the past, and that is the construction or conversion of space to rent to these traveling salesmen. Today it is increasingly common to find rooms set aside for such purposes. But their interest or involvement in Mitla does not go beyond its commercial potential, and their attention to the archaeological zone is the same.

Fruit, Ice Cream, and Food Vendors:

This is a small group of vendors who also appear seasonally along the street dividing the Hall of the Columns and North Groups. They come on large tricycle carts carrying whatever they sell: plastic cups of cut fruits sold without any form of health inspection or sanitary control, ice cream, or prepared foods. The ice cream vendors are stocked early in the morning by suppliers who arrive in their pick-up trucks, and form part of a larger network of ice cream vendors in Mitla and beyond. These same vendors sometimes sell alcoholic drinks in hot weather, disguised as cold coconuts. Some food vendors are regulars, others appear in the busy season or when a religious fiesta draws close. During religious events many people spend extended periods near the church and eat there at stands selling tostadas, tamales, empanadas, and other prepared specialties.

These vendors also pay rent to the Church Committee, and one of their more regular passtimes, together with the Church Committee, is to challenge INAH's authority over the area they rent. For example, if an INAH employee prohibits them from locating in a certain area, inevitably the following day two or more vendors will establish themselves in the same area, or a group will gather to encourage disobedience or threaten to "screw" the employee, meaning to cause the maximum number of headaches or even push or hit. This group has no hesitation in allying itself with the basket women in the face of challenges by the Artisans Association, the municipal authorities, INAH, or even tourist guides.

Guatemalan Vendors: A substantial portion of the merchandise sold in the Artisans Market as well as in individual stores today comes from Guatemala. The areas around the archaeological zone present a colorful array of textiles, from intense black to purples to brilliant yellow in garments such as jackets, vests, belts, shirts, shorts, sashes, and other items, all of Guatemalan cotton. This articles have come to displace some of the local production in Mitla, which as mentioned earlier had come to be produced in large quantities but with a notable decline in quality and autheniticity. The merchants of the Artisans Market appear to have no reservations whatever about reselling these foreign products, and once one stall bought them very quickly Guatemalan garments filled the market.

Guatemalan textiles arrive in Mitla via Guatemalan intermediaries who bring them from Guatemala. Informants interviewed in 1995 were from the Department of Huehuetenango and had arrived in Mitla after an 18-hour bus trip. The same bus brought a substantial volume of merchandise.The Guatemalans are not organized formally but arrive in groups of 2 to 6 men, usually mature and rarely accompanied by women. Their style is to come and go during the year, with trips coinciding with the changing tourist season. Estimates suggest some sixty Guatemalans are involved in this trade with Mitla. While they have friends in Mitla none has settled there, although some now have had out-of-wedlock children. Most live in furnished rooms, eat in restaurants, and pay taxes to the municipal government. Services provided to these outside merchants have begun to generate significant additional income for some Mitla families.

All the Guatemalans coming to Mitla are middlemen, not producers, which means the Guatemalan products sold to tourists in Mitla have passed through at least two intermediaries, paid a customs duty (31 percent on textiles) and Mitla taxes, and are still highly competitive with local products. Initially Guatemalan products were brought in by rented truck at night to avoid conflicts with local people, and commercial transactions are still carried out in the homes of Mitla merchants, rarely in the Artisans Market itself, to downplay the volume of merchandise involved. In one case a Guatemalan showed me a load of approximately 8 cubic meters of textiles he brought in one night. Nevertheless, he said, the vice-mayor immediately appeared at his room to charge a municipal tax. Had he refused to pay he probably would have been run out of Mitla with his merchandise. Gradually the situation has changed and possible frictions have declined, although municipal authorities continue charging a municipal tax. It is through payment of their taxes that the Guatemalans become social actors, as they have attained an officially recognized, even if informal, status within the community. At the same time, by choosing not to seek entry to the retail trade, the Guatemalans avoid friction with local vendors by not competing for sales.

Some Guatemalans see their penetration of the Mitla market as a outgrowth of the declining quality of Mitla«s own craft production "… they are of shoddy quality, which is why the Guatemalan product is successful". Others assert the armed conflict in Chiapas depressed the tourist market in San Cristobal de las Casa and Tuxtla Gutierrez, forcing them to look elsewhere for outlets. And still others suggest the difference in currency values between the Mexican peso and the Guatemalan quetzal favored the Guatemalans, although the devaluation of the peso in 1994-1995 reportedly left people in Mitla owing the Guatemalans significant sums.

As with the vendors who come to Mitla from other parts of Mexico, the Guatemalans manifest little interest in the archaeological zone. Once their merchandise is in the hands of local merchants they have little reason to mix in disputes over vendor access and Mexican law. They see the people of Mitla as looking out for themselves, perhaps somewhat inclined toward conflict, and they prefer to avoid problems. To them Mitla is a good place to sell, better than Teotitlan or Tlacolula, and selling is why they are in Mexico.

Two important points remain to be noted about economic interests in Mitla. First, those groups discussed here by no means exhaust the list of those with significant economic interests, and some of these will be addressed in the following sections. For example, the tour guides and tour companies have a very strong interest in the future of the archaeological zone. Their livelihoods in part depend on preservation of the monumental ruins as an attraction for visitors. Private store owners and suppliers of services for visitors, e.g., restaurants, also have interests not addressed here. Second, the sequential presentation of groups is somewhat misleading as these do not lead separate and independent existences. As Figure 72 shows, these overlap and interact with each other. Each group is aware of the interests and activities of the others, and sometimes they fight and at other times create alliances. Some groups, e.g., the Guatemalans, play an increasingly significant role but do not show up in Figure 72 because of how they structure that role. Others are bit players or only become important in terms of their relationship to others. That is, one has to visualize these actors not in two dimensions but in three, and then add in changes over time to fully appreciate how complex the social setting of heritage conservation in Mitla has become.

The structure of economic interests at Monte Alban is much simpler, and there is relatively little overlap and tension among interests compared to Mitla. Proximity to the site does not have the same economic implications, and physical intimidation of INAH employees is far less feasible. Affected individuals, groups, and institutions are much more likely to look for negotiated outcomes associated with the use of networks of political power and social obligation rather than overt mobilization od the local population. Specific concerns and resources of some representative economic interests are outlined below.

Private Landowners:

At Monte Alban there are two relatively small private holdings on the border of the archaeological zone. On the northeast side the property of the Bustamante family covers several hectares from the junction of the new highway with the road to Atzompa and toward the interior of the lower slope of Monte Alban. On the southeast side the Hamilton family has property surrounded by communal lands of San Martin Mexicapam, where the colonia Carlos Salinas Gortari is located. Both sets of landowners share the characteristic of being descendents of old families from the higher levels of Oaxacan society (in local terms "illustrious") who in their time were agrarian landlords but today are found within the local business sector or local and state government.

As landowners these families are inclined to defend what is theirs, and in this respect should be considered among the groups which defend their control over land as a resource. Nevertheless, they show a tendency to negotiate control of the resource, as both have sold land to the state government. The Hamilton family sold several hectares to the State Housing Institute of Oaxaca for the establishment of the housing development known as "Colinas de Monte Alban". Similarly, the Bustamantes sold to the same agency lands which became the developments known as "Los Alamos" and "Jardines de las Lomas." In neither case did the owners consider the impact which these developments would cause to the landscape of Monte Alban, as for them it was simply good and profitable business to sell the lands before any possible move by INAH to expropriate. As their properties, while not large, border the boundary in strategic locations the thought of possible expropriation certainly colors their long-term planning.

In 1995 an incident on the Bustamante family property illustrated their concern for the conservation of cultural heritage at Monte Alban. On their property along the highway but outside the boundary a pre-Columbian tomb was discovered. As it was vulnerable to looting the director of the archaeological Zone of Monte Alban sent an archaeologist to conduct archaeological salvage. The tomb included human skeletons and funeral vessels (Oliveros, personal communication). When the Bustamante brothers learned of the find they hurried to the site literally pushed the archaeologist away, informing him "…it was their property." In addition they took from him the offerings and remains he had recovered from the tomb, alleging that "…if the items were on their land, they belonged to them" (Oliveros, personal communication.

This is a clear crime under the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historical Zones and Monuments, and additionally shows both the ignorance and the lack of interest the landholders of Monte Alban have in regard to the heritage values of the site. Nevertheless, as members of the local aristocracy they take advantage of the security this provides them as well as the benefits they derive from their participation in local political circles. These property owners lose no opportunity to fault INAH for its neglect of Monte Alban and the lack of measures to control the growth and multiplication of irregular settlements along the boundary line. On the basis of the facts as presented we can see that these landowners are really worried about the possibilities of invasions which might affect these properties and want INAH to resolve the possible problem. In fact, there is nothing in the record to show there has been any effort to relieve population pressures on Monte Alban. On the contrary, sales of land to the Institute of Housing in Oaxaca aggravate the situation. It is important to note that although these private lands hold archaeologicial remains, as demonstrated by the tomb, when setting the boundaries on Monte Alban care was taken to avoid affecting private land. Such actions are the origin of comments by users of ejido and communal lands to the effect that "…they take land from the poor but not from rich landlords". In this sense we would need to review the criteria used by INAH personnel who deliberately left private lands without being touched. Even more, we should want to know who omitted to file formal charges against those responsible for the assaults against INAH research personnel.

"Moneros" or Replica Sellers: This group was formed initially by about 15 men who gathered in small groups in the Main Plaza to sell the tourists little figurines, pre-Columbian imitations, who gradually came to be known collectively by the Monte Alban security staff as "Los Moneros". These are basically small part-time farmers from Arrazola, Xoxocotlan, and San Pedro Ixtlahuaca who also specialize in the production of imitations of small pre-Columbian funeral and ceremonial objects. The key issue is that this group also serves as the cover for illegal sales of original archaeological pieces obtained by looting. Their farming and grazing on Monte Alban, especially on the west side, have provided opportunities to locate and loot tombs. The sales strategy is to stir tourist interest by offering to sell replicas at Monte Alban, but once someone's interest is stirred, to discretely invite them to their homes to see the originals. In this way they sell a small but steady volume of figurines, vessels, urns, and jewels from different pre-Columbian periods.

The relationship between the Moneros and INAH traditionally has been strained, and the archives of the Archaeology Section of the Oaxaca Regional Center contain reports by guards as to damage or looting attributed to the Moneros, or to violent confrontations when they have been ejected from the Plaza, where it is forbidden to sell. There are also copies of requests by the Center director for the collaboration of the state police in removing these wandering vendors when they overrun the Plaza. The Moneros make use of the structures at Monte Alban as places to hide their bags of "idols", to wait for tourists, or to relieve themselves. Unlike the basket women of Mitla the Moneros are neither aggressive nor inclined to team together in pressing visitors to buy something. Until 1988 this group had no formal organization to represent them nor to defend them in their relationships with the guards or with INAH personnel. Given periods of high tension with the guards and INAH administrators, and given changes in the archaeological zone to facilitate control over access and distribution, the Moneros felt increasingly restricted in opportunities to sell. This motivated them to join with other vendors located in the archaeological zone parking lot to create a formally recognized association. In November, 1988, 49 Moneros and vendors of ceramics, hats, jewelry, and other minor artesanries organized the "Union of Producers and Vendors of Monte Alban".

Today, while the number of vendors has grown, the nature of the relationship has also improved to the extent members of the association occasionally participate in voluntary programs of weeding and cleaning (Oliveros, personal communication).

Tourism:

Among the most important economic activities in the state of Oaxaca is tourism, and one of the principal resources of the tourist industry is the network of archaeological zones. These form part of a more varied network of tourist attractions such as beaches, forests, or climate, as well as cultural attractions such as historic centers, markets, and indigenous communities. Potential visitors are channeled to the archaeological zones through at least four promotional entities: at the federal level through SECTUR (Secretary of Tourism), at the state level via SEDETUR (acronym in Spanish for the Secretary of Tourism Development), through the general efforts of the State Tourism Advisory Council, and via the efforts of members of the Tourist Guides associations. Of course many visitors, both national and international visit archaeological sites not because of specific promotional efforts but due to more general awareness, as a consequence of reading in guidebooks, or simply on the recommendation of earlier visitors. But the four entities discussed here are organizational actors with specific interests in how the archaeological heritage is presented to tourists.

SECTUR and SEDTUR are essentially concerned with the promotion of archaeological zones as tourism resources through the publication of print materials, editing videos, preparing press releases, and developing informational materials in general. In a sense these agencies leave the management of tourist infrastructure in the archaeological zones to INAH, basically because there is a lack of agreement between INAH and the agencies over the ground rules of protection as established by law and INAH's internal regulations. The state and federal agencies promoting tourism presumably are concerned with data-gathering which would help to optimize existing services and assure tourism generates local income through extended stays in the state. Nevertheless there is practically no research on this subject; the only statistics which exist on the flow of visitors to each archaeological zone are those gathered by INAH based on a partial count carried out by security and administrative personnel. These statistics are from from exact as they are based on the number of tickets sold. However, in Mexico students, teachers, soldiers, and senior citizens are exempt from paying an entrance fee, and in Mitla by convention the same is true for local residents. In addition, Sundays the sites are open free of charge to everyone. Furthermore, in peak periods the guards and administrators are so busy with high priority responsibilities that there is little time to count visitors.

For this reason estimates of yearly visitation at Monte Alban range from 300,000 to 500,000, with perhaps 250,000 to Mitla. SEDETUR claims the flow of visitors to the city of Oaxaca declined from 642,661 visitors in 1989 to 408,846 visitors in 1994 (Secretaria de Desarrollo Turistico), a decline which presumably should be reflected in admissions to Monte Alban. The limited data available do not confirm this, but the more significant concern is that there are no serious and systematic data on visitor flows, so calculations and plans are made based on estimates made by amateurs, and services in the archaeological zone respond to the imagination of non-professionals in other agencies. As a simple example, most of the visitor caculations are based on hotel occupancy, but in the city of Oaxaca this is a dubious indicator because so many visitors are relatives or friends of local families who stay with those families while in the city, nevertheless visiting Monte Alban while they are in town.

At a more general level the contact both agencies have with the visiting public is limited to small information offices staffed by students. These provide printed materials and some information regarding events and services. Unfortunately most of them are unfamiliar with the archaeological sites (and other places) which interest visitors, they have little idea of travel or transportation arrangements, and they rarely speak a foreign language. In Mitla the presence of SEDETUR is limited to a map of the city of Oaxaca placed in the zone about 1990. At this site SEDETUR has had to cope with a series of restrictions INAH imposed on the construction of tourist infrastructure, as Mitla is not just an archaeological site but a historic and traditional community where such construction and services need to consider local norms. It has been easier for SEDETUR to drop attention to the zone than to enter into a professional collaboration respecting the norms required by a commitment to heritage conservation.

The State Tourism Advisory Council was formed in 1995 as a "mixed, interinstitutional body providing technical support, consulting, and advice to the Secretary of Toourism Development" (Consejo Consultivo Turistico 1995). While the Council seeks to bring together different sectors of Oaxacan society in support of its functions, in practice it consists of tourism service providers and by members of the business community interested in exploiting new or more lucrative tourist resources. As an example, given the issue of urban sprawl into the archaeological zone, the Council demanded the right to participate in the meetings of the interagency working group in 1995 which was evaluating alternatives with the argument that:

"…it is fundamental for the future of tourism in Oaxaca that the decisions taken with regard to the issues at Monte Alban reflect the feelings of ALL (emphasis in the original, NRG) those interested in its future…it is unacceptable that a closed group (meaning the interagency working group) assign itself the right to decide the future of a heritage which belongs to all." (Olvera letter to Rojas Calvo 1995).

The Council goes on to demand "…infrastructure adequate to provide quality services (Olvera letter to Rojas Calvo 1995). However, like SECTUR, it does not provide nor promote professional studies on tourism. Instead it offers two interesting documents as the basis for solutions. The first, titled "A Future for Monte Alban" (Olvera et al 1995) begins by blaming public officials for

"…apathy, neligence, and a lack of concern…for the anarchical invasion of urban sprawl adjacent to the hill of Monte Alban and even into the federal zone there…a decisive protection, restoration, and preservation of cultural heritage would bring a favorable reaction in the media…with many benefits to the battered economy of the state" (Olvera et al 1995).

The document goes on to evaluate the services available and the new road to Monte Alban, characterizing the former as toally deficient and the latter as inadequate, arguments which in the end are the basis for the proposed solution of an interinstitutional project which includes the federal, state, and local governments, INAH, SECTUR, SEDETUR, the Commission on Metropolitan Coordination, the Agrarian Solicitor's Office, and the State Tourism Advisory Council, to create a Center for Tourism and Educational Services at the intersection formed by the slopes of the hills of Atzompa and El Gallo, with a unified system of transportation, improvements to the new roadway, and the creation of a tourist circuit which would include Monte Alban-Atzompa-Arrazola-Cuilapam, "…which would extend the average tourist stay in Oaxaca by 1.5 days." (Olvera et al 1995).

The second document, developed on the basis of the first, is titled "Monte Alban in the Twenty-first century: An Integrated Plan of Protection and Preservation for the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban" (Olvera 1996). This plan elaborates a series of proposals, defines the areas allocated to transport services—it proposes a monorail to transport groups of 200-300 people—plus improved attention to tourism, roads, and an expansion of services in the neighboring communities with markets, handicraft stores, a convention center, and hotel zone. The stance and proposal of the Council clearly reflects its ignorance both of the social problems associated with Monte Alban and what is entailed in a professional analysis of tourism. It proposes to locate its Center for Tourism and Educational Services in the exact location where dozens of families are located, albeit without documents, but as we have seen clearly disposed to struggle in protection of the only assets they have. The document criticizes public officials for permitting invasions of the archaeological zone, then proposes new roads (the tourist circuit) which in a short time will promote new invasions. With this document the Council shows its real interest is looking for new ways to make money, and it seeks to accomplish this through exploitation of the archaeological zone without serious evaluation of the consequences its proposals would imply. This defines it as a new organization with clear economic objectives.

The final group involved in the topic of tourism exploitation are the tourist guides, organized in associations such as Benito Juarez Garcia Tourist Guides Association. This group, which affects both sites under study, is made up of tourist guides from the city of Oaxaca. It was founded in the mid-1970s by six taxi drivers who transported tourists and gave them explanations about what they were seeing. By the mid-1990s it had about 65 members, of whom perhaps half work full time as guides. To belong to the Association there are three requirements:

have verbal command of a foreign language;
pass the examinations approved by SECTUR, offered through tourism schools in Mexico City and which receive validation through SEDETUR; and
be able to communicate this knowledge.
Nevertheless, it is common knowledge that Association members are not professional guides but architects, doctors, engineers, travel agents, archaeologists, tourism services managers, and others who may be professionals but, on not finding employment or incomes they wish, define themselves as guides understanding the knowledge they need they can acquire informally. In practice the incomes of guides is highly seasonal. The low season in Oaxaca comes in May, June, September, and October, while the high season consists of vacation periods: summer, Christmas, Easter, long weekends, and the Day of the Dead at the beginning of November. The rest of the time there is a modest but more or less regular flow. In the mid-1990s on a good day in the high season a guide might make from 100 to 400 pesos, while an average day during the low season might produce 40 to 80 pesos. Visits in Spanish or English pay about the same, in French or German somewhat more, and in Japanese considerably more. During the slack periods many guides in fact need to find other employment, as the agencies or private clients center their requests for services on the small number who provide the most professional and consistent service.

The organized tourist guides see as competition the "free agents" and local guides. The free agents are guides who wait at the entrance to archaeological sites waiting for groups of tourists to arrive and offering their services at a low cost, sometimes less than five persos per person, for a guided tour. Sometimes they will be subcontracted by one of the organized guides if the group accompanying the guide (as in the case of a full tour bus) is too large to be handled comfortably by one person. The local guides might be described as local characters, often nearby residents, who offer their services to families or individuals promising to tell the "true history" of the site and its legends. Usually they present a vernacular history transmitted via oral tradition, and therefore for the organized guides represent a real competition in the sense that they may be attractive to the tourist who seeks a new or original explanation of the place in question.

The Guides Association has pressured SECTUR, SEDETUR, and INAH to stipulate only official guides with badges would have access to the archaeological zones. It is clear that for them the archaeological monuments are an important part of their income, but even more than the sites themselves are the services which surround them such as craft sales, sales of mezcal, or other products where the guides have standing arrangements to receive a percentage of what the group might spend. In this respect many guides prefer to take groups to Mitla, where the density of such services is far greater and vendors facing stiff competition quicker to part with a percentage, than to Monte Alban where such opportunities are few.

The guides consider the archaeological zones to be important economic resources, but they prefer they be "…left like they are now…," that is, with the current level of exploration as it is on the basis of the existing circumstances that they have arranged their tour visits, access to services, and shopping stops. If additional areas in the archaeological zone are opened to the public the time visitors stop to see it is in direct detriment to the earnings the guide would receive if that time could be spent taking tourists to a restaurant, mezcal store, or crafts shopping. In the event the guides find closed to public access part of their normal site visit they often protest strongly, as deviations force them to explain both why there is a change and to either explain new elements or give a more substantial explanation regarding what is available. Thus the guides would argue that in sites such as Mitla additional exploration and improvements in the archaeological zone might work to their detriment by forcing them to spend time in activities which do not improve their incomes. In essence the guides are most concerned about the stability and predictability of their employment, and then about keeping potential competitors at a distance and assuring comfortable and sure access to the archaeological zones.

Via this quick review we can see that despite its economic importance and significance for the archaeological zones in terms of visitor planning and management, the weight accorded to serious analysis and long-term development is minimal. Two points stand out in this respect. First, the government agencies involved show not even a minimal level of professionalism when it comes to in-depth study of tourism and its repercussions, whether of the archaeological zones in particular or the region as a whole. Second, the attitudes, values, and proposals of government agencies as well as private interests center on the possibility of near-term gains, even though a central issue is whether these sites have long-term viability. While this is not surprising, it is disturbing that even when scientific and cultural values are set aside, the most significant actors who presumably have a lot to lose are incapable of generating the kinds of research and thinking needed to address the issues laid out in this study.

Interinstitutional Coordination

The subject of interinstitutional coordination is of particular importance due to the tendency for local and state plans, programs, and interests to overlap with those of the archaeological zones. In the case of Monte Alban it is only recently that the official boundaries have been taken into account in the Urban Regulation Plans generated by the Secretary of Urban Development and Public Works (SDUCOP is the Mexican acronym) of the state government, in an effort to regulate the irregular settlements which have grown up around the archaeological zone (SDUCOP 1994).

In the 1979 Regional Urban Development Plan the SDUCOP included data on INAH's 1976 boundary-setting with a view to isolating the Archaeological Zone of Monte Alban from the impact of urban growth in metropolitan Oaxaca. Fifteen years later the new Regulatory Plan of the Metropolitan Zone of the City of Oaxaca included the official boundary zone for the same purpose (SDUCOP 1994). This last plan comments that it will be necessary to establish mechanisms for the oversight and conservation of the cultural heritage by the Commission on Metropolitan Coordination in cooperation with federal authorities, state government, and the municipal councils (SDUCOP 1994), and calls attention to the need to catalog historic or architectually-significant buildings in each community of the metropolitan area. In addition it stresses the urgency of setting the boundaries for those archaeological sites in the metropolitan areas which still did not have them SDUCOP 1994). However, these plans suffer from a complete lack of legal support on which to base their zoning proposals, making them unenforceable. So in fact they sieve only as a impressive gift for public agencies and to fatten muncipal archives. In practice the city of Oaxaca continues to be characterized by a disorderly growth on its periphery.

In Mitla the structure is much simpler as one is dealing with a single municipality. The Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Zones and Monuments confers responsibility for planning protection for archaeological momuments on municipal governments (INAH 1980). Nevertheless it is very clear that within the structure of the municipal government there exists no linkage between the local governmernt and the archaeological zone. For example, within the School Committee, one of the most important in local government, there should be someone named as liaison for events in the archaeological zone, but no-one has ever been given this responsibility. In practice it is the vice-mayor and city prosecutor who has the responsibility of resolving the problems which emerge between the site and the community.

The experience of the past twenty years has been that whenever there has been a conflict between one of the organized groups discussed earlier and INAH regarding disagreements over conservation or protection of the archaeological zone, the muncipal government bends and loses all its authority. From the mid-1980s on the municipal presidents have been extremely vulnerable to public pressure, even to direct insult in assemblies. The change in recruitment of municipal authorities from the traditional system which named people of great prestige and generally accepted by the community to one based on party elections means they have lost moral stature vis-à-vis many in the community; on the contrary, it is now to the political advantage of the opposition to undermine the capacity of the incumbents to rule in the hope of winning the following election. From the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s the mayors all came from the group controlling the Artisans Market, a group not necessarily with broad popular support.

Given the dilemmas with regard to the Archaeological Zone of Mitla, the mayors generally express an appreciation of the importance of the zone to Mitla while voicing a lack of ideas or alternatives for addressing issues of growth, vandalism, or other problems which affect it. Nor have they made any effort to open communication with or assert authority over the groups which are involved with sporadic violence toward INAH employees. Indeed, since the early 1980s the stance has been merely to receive complaints and file them, hoping in this way to avoid problems within the community which may come back to affect them in other ways, either during their terms of office or on a more personal basis afterwards. Thus even though the scale and complexity of interinstitutional cooperation is vastly different in Mitla than in metropolitan Oaxaca, in practice both sites receive only sporadic recognition by local governments and then primarily in official discourse.

INAH as an Institutional Actor

National Institute of Anthropology and History: The federal agency charged by law with protecting, studying, and disseminating information regarding elements of the archaeological heritage, INAH both benefits from and is limited by the faculties provided to it under the Federal Law on Archaeological, Artistic, and Historic Zones and Monuments. This makes it the central federal agency in reference to the two sites under consideration here. Since its founding in 1939, INAH has assumed as its most important mission the conservation of archaeological sites and zones open to the public across the country, among them Monte Alban and Mitla. The origin of the Oaxaca Regional Center in 1973 is attributable in part to a need to provide administrative coordination and support to the protection functions at both sites.

Monte Alban is considered by INAH to be the most important site in Oaxaca, and therefore has received the greatest proportion of state and federal funds for its conservation. From 1988 to 1995 approximately thirteen million pesos (approximately $4 million US) were invested in the site from diverse sources, including the Oaxaca Commission on Planning and Development, the National Archaeological Fund, and INAH's own resources (Archaeological Section Archives, INAH CRO). In 1996 INAH's presence at Monte Alban included the zone director, the museum director, an administrator, 14 daytime custodial staff and 4 night watchmen. This staff basically covered the tasks of looking after areas open to the public, providing security for the zone, managing money, and picking up the trash. It was concentrated entirely at the Main Plaza; as some parts of the zone are far away and of difficult access they were rarely visited, even though this left important sectors vulnerable to looting and vandalism, and made possible clandestine settlement. For certain services, e.g., legal support, Monte Alban is dependent on the Oaxaca Regional Center.

The increasing penetration of Monte Alban's official boundaries by urban sprawl has meant the cases of land invasion or unauthorized construction has become a constant problem, a point now made repeatedly, The archives of the Oaxaca Regional Center hold countless files of reports of invasions or construction, each dealt with individually, sometimes successfully stopping the activity by convincing the property owner, but in the majority of the cases the archaeologist simple arrtived in time to document the destruction and to prepare a repoort which only served to fatten the files in the archives. INAH has never used legal proceedings to force the demolition of authorized construction or the dismantling of provisional structures, steps which would reduce the attractiveness of and demand for ejidal and communal land as sites for new housing.

The official boundaries of Monte Alban have served basically as an internal reference identifying areas to protect, but in the practice have not served as a tool employed effectively to assist in the preparation of urban development plans for the city of Oaxaca, much less the partial development plans of each municipality overlapping the archaeological zone, and even less in decisions by municipalities and ejidos with respect to changes in land use from cultivation to lands for subdivision to house lots. At present the fundamental principle of INAH is the protection of Monte Alban with regard to the integrity of the archaeological complex and its context (Nalda, personal communication). For this purpose the 1992 boundary constitutes by itself "…a model of a technical file…," as it contemplated both the archaqeological areas as well as its natural context within an integrated boundary (Nalda, personal communication). But in reality the areas watched and attended by INAH are limited to the monumental structures in general and the Main Plaza in particular.

To accomplish the protection contemplated it is necessary to establish a strategy which guarantees new construction will be stopped and land speculation deterred. As a federal institution for INAH it is possible to establish agreements and to take joint decisions with other federal, state, and municipal governments, both to secure support for conservation plans and to look for workable solutions to the housing problem affecting the poorest segment of the urban population in the metropolitan area (Nalda, personal communication). Nevertheless, the facts show that in the last twenty years INAH has not applied its legal and political capacity to deter illegal settlements. Similarly, there has been little research in the fields of cultural protection and anthropology, which are fundamental in INAH, given the importance of the factors generating these spontaneous settlements. Attention to the social demands which naturally emerge as a result of urban growth have not been given a priority either in the actions of INAH in Oaxaca nor in its central offices.

The routine work of carrying out inspections, filing a complaint with INAH's Legal Department, and writing reports about new construction and subdivisions, all assigned to the Archaeological Section at the Oaxaca Regional Center, have only served to create for the institution an image—just as in Mitla—which represses the needy, turns a blind eye to the powerful and connected, and in the end is extremely weak with respect to execution of the law. In spite of the importance of Monte Alban, not until 1995 did it have as director an archaeologist with research credentials, and until 1997 there was no long-term conservation plan created by INAH. All of the research projects from 1995 to 1997 have been limited and adjusted to resources made available by the current federal administration. It is only after 1997 that one begins to see substantial changes in effort, organization, and resources,and even then the accomplishments have been more modest and slower than anticipated. In Mitla as of 1997 INAH is represented by nine guards, a site administrator, and an archaeologist interested in research and conservation in the zone as a matter of personal commitment. This was not always Mitla's status. Long before INAH was founded there was concern about Mitla's deterioration and lack of protection. In 1895 Leopoldo Batres reported the alarm he shared regarding the degree of destruction in the palaces with the participants in the XI International Congress of Americanists, whose "natural affliction" on hearing of this meant "…they decided to send a request to the President of Republic to the effect that the Ruins of Mitla be officially protected" (Robles and Moreira 1990: 61). For several years the Bureau of Archaeology contracted a site custodian to look after the site, and later, at the onset of excavation seasons by Alfonso Caso in 1934 and 1935, an administrator of national property was named to provide both protection and maintenance to the site.

As of 1973, with the creation of the Oaxaca Regional Center, Mitla became one of the principal sites under its responsibility. Although INAH always recognized as integral parts of the archaeological site the five clusters of monumental architecture, in reality its attention and primary conservation effort concentrated for a number of years only on the Group of the Columns, driven by the daily demands of growing tourism (Figure 73). Paradoxically this tourism was also the source of attraction of an uncontrolled growth of human settlements which spilled over the monuments. In turn this has been the source of destruction and vandalism of the pre-Columbian structures not open to the public. The attitude of INAH, to do as little as possible so as to avoid technical problems or conflicts with the community, is what led to the destruction by invasion of parcels which ought to be protected areas reserved for the archaeological monuments. In theory the use of local workers in protection of the site should be positive. But in reality it generates an array of cross-cutting loyalties and obligations due to the complex relations they have with other local groups. Sometimes it is difficult to know where they stand when conflicts erupt, because while nominally they defend the presence of INAH, on more than one occasion it has transpired that the original conflict was grounded in the institution's local employees.

In the case of Mitla, the reality of the expansion of urban sprawl toward the site and the use of the monumental clusters as commercial attractions began even prior to the Federal Law of 1972 More recently INAH's activity has been to try to respond with some regulatory authority to pre-existing conditions, e.g., regulate land use, the type of construction, and residential patterns. If these efforts are in fact those which assure that thus far the archaeological remains are still in place, they are also those which have fed the ire of those affected and encouraged a hostile community attitude toward INAH. Even though between 1988 and 1996 INAH spent about $1.9 million pesos (Archaeological Section Archives, INAH CRO) in site development and conservation, its reputation in the community is that of a repressive presence. Institutionally INAH makes little effort to demonstrate its contributions to the community, preferring to rely on occasional assertions of legal authority in dealing with the municipality or specific social actors.

One final and thorny problem for INAH in both sites is dealing with challenges presented by its own personnel, whose behavior shows a wide range of commitment to carrying out institutional responsibilities. Some show a dedication which is truly exemplary, referred to within the institution as "love of the uniform." In other cases apathy, weariness, the cross-cutting interests referred to above, or even less desirable behaviors appear. For example, some custodial staff look for ways to supplement their incomes by ignoring their reponsibilities and acting as informal guides. Others look the other way when vendors press the limits of tolerance in selling to tourists in areas where such selling is not permitted, with the expectation that at some point they will be "remembered". At somewhat higher levels the issue is not so much one of supplementing incomes by these occasional derelictions as it is a failure to act on behalf of INAH's own mission and legal responsibilities. Such failures are usually because action may well bring a spate of adverse publicity or headaches which will not sit well with those higher on the administrative ladder. Unfortunately those outside but in close contact with the institution are well aware of lapses, however infrequent they may be in the overall scheme of things, and this further undermines the claim to be acting in defense of the archaeological heritage.

Sacred Qualities

If the activities of the Church Committee in Mitla, with its aggressive pursuit of income to support its activities and equally aggressive defense of its territory represents one intersection of INAH with religious concerns, the other intersection is with a shadowy world of magical-religious practices by actors whose presence INAH encounters but who avoid overt contact. Their significance as social actors stems from a deep-seated feeling that institutional practice needs to respect their interests even if it is not made explicit in the same fashion as other groups.

In both Monte Alban and Mitla it is clear, nearly five centuries after the Conquest, vestiges of certain ancient practices and rites continue. For example, in Monte Alban in 1980, when the carvings known as the Dancers were removed to the site museum for protection from the elements, apparently recent fetish offerings with supernatural intentions were found associated with them. Whether these represent offers placed by visitors or whether people still come to the summit of Monte Alban for petitions, offerings, or other ceremonies is unknown. More recently vestiges of cleansing ceremonies have been found on top of platforms at the Cerro de Atzompa, at the north end of the archaeological zone above Atzompa, but whether they originated in the community is also unknown.

At Mitla even today people come from different parts of Oaxaca to communicate with their dead, and at both the Group or the Columns and the Adobe Group almost daily vernacular offerings of flowers, cigarettes, fetishes, and lighted candles may be found. Occasionally there is also a sacrifice in the form of small animals from outside the Oaxaca Valley. In the case of Mitla the findings are particularly interesting from the standpoint of site interpretation as the findings there appear to be more consistent with ancient rites, while in the case of Monte Alban there are sometimes hints that what one sees represents a semi-urban folk witchcraft carried for social rather than religious purposes. In general INAH employees try not to disturb such offerings, nor do they make special efforts to identify people who may be placing them. The theme and practice of such religious or magical rites in both zones is beyond the scope of this study, nor has it been the subject of research by others. Nevertheless, the remains they leave behind remind us there is a group, until now essentially anonymous, with interests in the sites far different from those discussed here. It remains for us to understand what the linkages, if any, may be with other aspects of cultural heritage associated with Mitla and Monte Alban.

While these five categories far from exhaust the groups whose presence influences the practice of archaeological heritage conservation at Monte Alban and Mitla, the importance of the array presented here is to make explicit the enormously complicated world within which such conservation must be carried out. Some groups are clearly hostile to archaeological conservation as they understand it because of the threats they believe it creates for their own interests, and in some cases they may have assessed those threats correctly. Others are largely indifferent as long as their immediate concerns are not in jeoprady. What is noteworthy is the absence of significant constiuencies which are might be considered intuitive natural supporters. Even the tourist industry, which one would expect to be a bastion of support for heritage preservation, seems more comfortable with short-term gains than with long-term opportunities. And within INAH there are differing degrees of commitment. It is difficult to convince groups outside of INAH that heritage conservation is something worth supporting if even within the ranks of the institution' s professional staff there is indifference or resignation. It is to that need for new institutional perspectives and commitment which we now turn.

Chapter 8: Social Issues and the Field of Archaeological Heritage Preservation

It is clear even without entering an exhaustive process of analysis that there are a range of value systems involved in the struggle for archaeological sites in Oaxaca. These systems are not necessarily identified with those philosophical values which inspire the academic conservation and restoration movements or the responsibility for transmission of cultural heritage to the future. Rather, the social issues described here show the struggle turns on the conceptualization of archaeological sites as resources, and the right of access to their exploitation in different ways, including tourism, agriculture, real estate, housing, and commerce. Those earlier philosophic values of conservation and restoration are confined to the academic world, and understood by those social groups which surround the sites only with great difficulty. The importance of that vision of the future which formed part of the principles of the golden age of Mexican archaeology evidently has been forgotten.

Data gathered in the course of this research affirm that the level of importance attached to archaeological zones today corresponds most closely to the immediate financial gains they can generate. This attitude has been demonstrated by many sectors, not just the individual who speculates in land, nor of those with authority over land who use their power to decide who gets what. It is also found at the highest levels of the entity with responsibility for conservation, as it must be concerned with near-term gains rather than the long term.

In Mexico the public body with overall policy and coordinating responsibility for culture is the National Council for Culture and the Arts (CENCA). As the most authoritative representative of government policy for culture, CENCA has emphasized an orientation to the globalization process taking place in all areas of national life. As this process assumes as part of its ultimate objective a certain uniformity in Mexico it generates ambiquity and tension. Thus the president of CENCA makes an urgent call for a return to roots, to "recover specific unique elements and affirm differences," to share the development process "without losing that which characterizes and distinguishes us." Nevertheless, he says, when "the defense becomes extreme it can convert itself into a resistance to change and a rejection of that which comes from outside" (Tovar y de Teresa 1994: 12).

This type of contradiction has characterized the neoliberal policies introduced in Mexico by recent administrations. Such policies have thus far failed to develop a coherent response either to cultural diversity or to the tremendous social and economic inequality which marks contemporary Mexico. I am not going to enter into a wide-ranging discussion of national politics. These comments simply place in a broader context the official discourse regarding archaeological heritage conservation, helping us to understand the place conservation occupies in the wider policy arena.

As we have seen across this project, most recently official attention to archaeological heritage in Mexico has consisted of selecting 14 spectacular zones in which to develop projects better understood in terms of scenography than archaeology, and which had as a final goal tourism and other forms of commercial exploitation. Of these projects only one was in Oaxaca, and this was Monte Alban.

In this case it is clear the conservation issue was not seen in its cultural and natural context, as I have tried to describe here. Instead the site was addressed solely in terms of its monumental areas with rapid exploration and massive reconstruction. Equally the project deemed as a fact that archaeological areas are "federal property" without the legal process of purchase or condemnation with compensation that assures for INAH tenure over land within the bounded areas and the right to exploit the subsoil therein.Nevertheless, another federal agency charged with regulating land use, stated and published "the property regime in the area will not be modified" (SEDESOL 1996: 3), that is, that communal and ejido land , as well as private lands contained within the boundary, would continue with the same status and that the boundary-setting exercise contemplated only the regulation of land use.

Unfortunately I have to say this was not the only special project managed with a lack of theoretical, legal, and technical focus on conservation, as this neglect was a constant in the management of projects oriented toward tourism. Within these contradictions in site management there has at no time been credit either for the customary law or the tremendous organizational capacity which social groups, marginal or legitimate, have demonstrated when confronted by government intervention into their affairs.

Mitla is an interesting example in the sense of being considered as an archaeological site "practically lost"—in the words of more than one INAH official—which at the same time represents for the owners of the housing which surrounds the site pieces of land they have "won" despite the presence and opposition of INAH. In the same sense, thorough research on the different social groups with interests in the site in order to do more effective conservation planning—interpreted as "getting yourself in trouble" in the words of the same INAH officials—signifies a fertile research filed in archaeological resource management and practically the only possibility for exploring alternative projects of heritage conservation grounded in community participation and understanding.

Analysis carried out through anthropological research at Mitla and Monte Alban makes it possible to recognize that the operational framework imposed by the structures of power associated with cultural resources management does not coincide with the official discourse in Mexico. Nor is it consistent with the frameworks for cultural resources management in other countries as a contemporary response to possible sustainable use of archaeological heritage. Instead it once again falls into the practice of academic isolation which, as noted at the start of this study, bring more adverse than beneficial consequences at all levels.

Here we see the process of archaeological heritage conservation finds itself immersed in a whirlpool of contradictions stemming from the complexity of social and political interests it touches. It is understood and in general terms accepted that the Mexican national government jealously guards for itself resources highly valued for historic and aesthetic reasons. Nevertheless, this position does not have to be an obstacle to updating approaches to research, conservation, and economic use of archaeological monuments for collective benefit. To accomplish this I propose an approach to archaeological resources management consistent with national realities, including:

1. involvement of communities and groups with capacities for self-management in the sustainable development of sites, with the benefits and responsibilities this arrangement creates.
2. assuring professionals in the field be true specialists as defined in the course of this analysis, and not just imports from the discipline of archaeology.
3. reinforcing the institution charged with administering cultural resources by updating personnel and orienting them toward education at all levels, and by taking care that site exploitation be truly sustainable.

This proposal points in the direction of a new conceptualization of academic and administrative dimensions of site use which stands apart from and as a counterpoint to the traditional academic activities of archaeology.

Approaches to the Concept of Archaeological Resources Management

Administration and management of the political, economic, educational, and tourism dimensions of Mexico's archaeological heritage has developed, as we have seen, more or less simultaneously with archaeological research. This fact has contributed to confusion at all levels about their relationship to the discipline of archaeology. Internationally differentiation exists at the philosophical, theoretical, and operational levels, a differentiation Cleere (1989: 1) suggests first appeared in Sweden in 1666. Today Great Britain, the United States, Denmark, and Canada, along with other countries, have separated the two, using terminology such as Archaeological Heritage Management, Cultural Resources Management, Public Archaeology, and Conservation Archaeology, respectively, to describe a focus on management, use, and conservation of our archaeological heritage.

These concepts have developed from pioneering work in the 1960s and 1970s by authors such as McGimpsey (1972), Lipe and Lindsay (1974) McGimpsey and Davis (1977), King (1977), Schiffer and Gumerman (1977), and Cleere (1984, 1989). These early efforts have been summarized brilliantly by Lipe in his "Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources" (1984). In Great Britain significant early contributions are associated with Thompson (1981), Cleere (1984, 1989), Thapar (1984), Lowenthal (1985), and Darvill (1987).

In Denmark the conservation of archaeological heritage has been a priority for some time, and it is included as a branch of the environmental agency (Fredningstyrelsen) where it is grouped with conservation specialties such as wildlife, landscape, and others which separate conservation planning from "pure" research in archaeology, biology, and other fields (Kristiansen 1984: 21). In Canada Parks Canada at the federal level and counterpart agencies at the provincial level are charged with devloping management programs for archaeological sites. In addition there exists the opportunity for private consultants to compete for projects under guidelines or standards imposed by government (Province of British Columbia 1995: 22).

Management of archaeological sites in the United States at the national level is distributed across several agencies including the National Park Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Corps of Engineers, and Bureau of Indian Affairs, all of which are required to develop plans and programs for management and protection of the archaeological resources present on the lands under their jurisdiction (Department of the Interior 1989: 11). Other agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration and the Department of Defense support official programs by taking responsibility for making sure their activities do not damage archaeological resources. They may do this by hiring their own archaeologists or by hiring private firms to do archaeological survey and salvage (Department of the Interior 1989). The official managment of these resources does not present an obstacle for state level agencies, Indian tribes, nonprofit organizations, universities, and even private firms to dedicate efforts to cultural resources management and the formation of specialists. Sometimes this fragmentation leads to uncertainty in the public mind as to who should be doing what, or to disagreements among the various institutional actors.

The Spanish model or "Madrid model" also envisions a wider role for the public administration of cultural heritage, including arrangements which locate archaeological heritage in a context of private participation, conservation of collective heritage, and professional preparation of specialists (Vasquez Leon 1996: 75). This model is in fact another example of how the practice of archaeological heritage conservation and a modern context which includes both tourism and other forms of private exploitation of historic and archaeological monuments can be the subject of specific legislation (Garcia Fernandez 1984). And this can happen without a loss of control and leadership by professional archaeologists over decision-making affecting the integrity of collective cultural heritage.

In this respect it appears increasingly clear that INAH in Mexico needs to take the responsibility for integrated management of archaeological heritage through a conscious and systematic preparation of its personnel and modernizing its institutional infrastructure. Without abandoning its fundamental pupose of scientific research in the general fields of anthropology, archaeology, and history, INAH needs to create room for the development of a new discipline addressing issues which up until now have been handled in an improvisational manner as a "complementary" activity or as a secondary concern of archaeology. Recent research on the operations of INAH in the field of archaeology reinforce this proposal (Vasquez Leon 1996: 79), although without clarifying how it might be realized, or the components necessary in the Mexican context. At a more general level, as government archaeologists we continue to claim, as has been shown, the realm of archaeology as ours and continue to proclaim ourselves as specialists in the conservation and management of archaeological heritage without this being the case (Rodriquez Garcia 1996: 153).

The Preparation of Specialists

Academic programs such as those at the University of Nevada at Reno or the University of Victoria in Canada, which offer complete graduate programs in the specialty of Cultural Resources Management, reinforce awareness in those countries about this concern. It is clear the preparation of specialists in the conservation and management of archaeological sites is an urgent necessity in the Mexican context. This is true not only in terms of the academic importance of being current on new areas of research opening up around the world, but because of the tremendous loss of cultural material through the absence of management plans and programs which assure the integrity of archaeological heritage in its natural and cultural setting. As we have seen, the two principal causes of such losses are the overexploitation of archaeological sites through unmanaged mass tourism and land use decisions incompatible with the goal of conservation.

This specialty, which I propose naming Management of Archaeological Resources, should constitute a new profession in Mexico covering the pressing necessities of organizing, planning, researching, and regulating the uses of cultural heritage. Based on Mexico's long history of solid legislation on cultural heritage (Gertz Manero 1976; Bernal 1979; INAH 1980; Litvak 1980; Lombardo 1988), and on the equally long experience developed in the field of conservation and restoration, this specialty would have its own focus. This would be defined in part by the search for feasible planning solutions to the interaction of social actors and groups competing for access to archaeological resources. In this sense the broadest configuration of the new specialty would share the general format suggested by Cleere (1989), which includes four basic elements:

1. An emphasis on methods and techniques to optimize the results of salvage archaeology, as the modern world increasingly obliges us to deal with fragmented sites in danger of disappearing. Governments are less and less willing to finance "pure" research projects, and institutions responsible for development infratructure feel obligated to pay for only that research which clears the area affected by their own projects (e.g., electricity transmission lines, pipelines, highways, or irrigation projects).
2. Training in land use planning, with the ultimate objective that all infrastructure projects be subject to review by people properly trained to mitigate to the maximum the impact of modern development on archaeological sites. Archaeologists, just like other professionals involved in preservation, ought to understand the planning strategies for different land uses in different parts of the country.
3. An understanding of institutional context, as a challenge for this specialty will be to accomplish effective interactions and common policies which benefit the activities and interests of all. One of the most important elements for a resources management specialist (natural or cultural) is to understand both the internal organization of institutions which affect the subject area, and the web of external relations which create its environment. In this sense, as we have seen in the cases summarized here, it is critical to change the tendency to leave to political appointees the management of policies which affect archaeological heritage. In the same sense it is urgent to train specialists able to design and manage the implementation of these policies.
4. The importance of constant updating of knowledge related to techniques and ethics of conservation, of the philosophies governing criteria to be applied in each case, and a commitment to participation in international meetings on this subject, interchanging ideas with colleagues confronting similar problems (Cleere 1989: 12-13).

However, this does not imply simply copying the systems of advanced countries and transferring them to Mexico, a practice which in other fields has proven to be clearly damaging. Nor does it mean that those who have not studied this specialty in the first world are out of context, as Cleere has suggested (Cleere 1989: 15). In any case it means trying to take advantage of those elements which will be useful in dealing with the specific issues found at the local, state, and national levels, as we have seen through-out this study. And it means trying to adapt those elements most useful to dealing with the issues we face at the national, state, and local levels, such as those addressed in the course of this study.

In this respect I find myself in agreement with the position taken by authors from developing countries such as Raj Isar (1986), who recognize our countries are in the process of developing a real ethic of cultural heritage conservation while caught up in policies which openly favor interests which consider economic development as an ultimate objective (Raj Isar 1986: 27). From our position of marginality in the world system, only by using and reclaiming our heritage can we hope to aspire to a better future. Using materials and experience available in our immediate surroundings may offer practical, more economic solutions to problems than attempting to import them from other contexts. For example, this means giving greater attention to community participation in the processes of destruction and conservation of archaeological heritage, and in the organizational capacity demonstrated by community social actors. Both of these merit much more professional attention than current practice accepts.

Community Participation (the Site-Society Interface)

In the academic environment surrounding cultural heritage in Mexico there have not been, until now, empirical studies which give real meaning to what has been called "society", "community", or "social actors". Instead these terms have been used to create theoretical formulations which, while given nominal recognition and endorsement, have little identifiable content (Schavelzon 1990; Garcia Canclini 1992; Florescano 1993). Here their character is subject to empirical definition and application in projects and programs of archaeological heritage conservation. They become central to our understanding of the ways in which different segments of society take part in the destruction, or conservation, of archaeological resources, and we can see their utility in the analysis of case materials from Monte Alban and Mitla.

Obviously here I have not exhausted different approaches to the social complexities confronting the archaeological zones which are the subject of this study. I recognize as well my limitations in terms of identifying and interpreting the meanings each social actor attaches to cultural resources. Undoubtedly this stems from the fact that meanings of objects and events are determined by cultural conventions (Layton 1989), and these are difficult to capture without adequate preparation in various specialties of anthropology. Nevertheless, understanding the value society attaches to what archaeologists study and its level of participation in these studies merits systematic research. Equally, we need a better, more systematic understanding of the causes, processes, and consequences of patterns of resistance to government programs of heritage conservation.

Here I call attention to the existence of specific social actors and to the structure of group organization which affects the process of destruction or conservation of archaeological heritage. These actors and organizations, as we have seen, respond first of all to their economic condition and social situation. In both sites we find their immediate surroundings are marginal areas in the national sense, just as the nation is to some extent marginal by being part of the Third World. In this regard this study represents merely an initial approach to the complexities outlined thus far. For example, a priority for research and analysis should be the views of "the others", i.e., precisely those actors and organizations referred to above, for a more complete understanding of the meanings they attach to heritage conservation and the programs which promote it. This in turn suggests the need to conduct anthropological and sociological research in concert with archaeological research, planning and conservation, assessments of site use, interpretation, and restoration of archaeological heritage.

This research focus I suggest be called the Site-Society Interface, the place and circumstances where the need to conserve archaeological heritage (with all that it implies in terms of programs and policies) interacts with contemporary society, organized in a specific fashion, in accordance with the social and economic realities of its environment. In this respect Robles and Corbett have called attention to the urgent need to integrate social research with the process of archaeological preservation in Mexico (Robles and Corbett 1994, 1995). This proposal implies giving considerable weight to anthropological research as a key phase in the analysis of cultural heritage prior to proposals and plans which affect it or institutional programs to protect it. In essence the argument is that only through prior understanding of social actors and their organization will we be in a position to interact with them to propose archaeological heritage conservation projects which have some prospect for realization. The Site-Society Interface, then, is the time and circumstances where one sees the interaction between social components in their broadest sense with the thinking and practice driving the process of archaeological heritage conservation.

This concept appears crucial in understanding the realities associated with conflict over archaeological resources and therefore with the design of effective projects and programs for the conservation of same. In a more general sense it guides us toward new fields of research and thinking compatible with contemporary frameworks for archaeological heritage conservation. It also suggests some utility in examining the experience of natural resource conservation issues. These share with cultural resources the characteristic of being, first of all, economically exploitable resources within the modern global framework.

One example with interesting parallels to this study in Oaxaca is Peluso's work on forest resources in Java, where both the customary users and the government have constructed ideologies which justify their access to the forest (Peluso 1992: 6), resulting in constant confrontations with those actors considered "illegal" by the others. All parties have rational explanations as to why their interpretation of access rights is morally correct and defensible, and why the claims of others are without justification. Situations like these direct us to the more general discussion of access to common resources (Hardin 1968; McCay and Anderson 1987; Ostrom 1990; Ross and Saunders 1991; Peters 1994). Here the focus should be on understanding the nature of the specific problems associated with economic and social exploitation of the resources in their contemporary context, and by extension trying to develop responses and solutions which bring into play community participation, knowledge, organization, and interests.

In recent decades efforts of this type have been made in Mexico in the field of environmental conservation, a specialty which has shifted from being a collection of "pure" sciences to an interdisciplinary activity highly politicized and participatory in nature (Gomez-Pompa 1982, 1987, 1990); del Amo (1986, 1988); Toledo (1988); and Leff (1990), among others, have made clear the validity of including studies of values and traditional techniques in the most recent proposals for conservation alternatives and sustainable natural resource management. At the international level, without a doubt the forefront of academic research on the subject centers primarily on the management of protected areas in forests and tropical jungles. Such research directs our attention to issues of development affecting various dimensions of life in traditional communities (Posey et al, 1984; Anderson 1990; Croll and Parkin 1992; Peluso 1992; Schelhas 1994).

On the other hand, the great common challenge confronting natural and cultural resources is without a doubt the impact of tourism which affects them both. Here it is not a question as to whether tourism should or should not be present in the process of making use of cultural resources, as this is now a given fact, and its presence is a result of a global development process in which we all participate. The goal is to work on the design of strategies which permit a sustainable use of archaeological resources, resources which should, without a doubt, be characterized as non-renewable.

Within the framework of the new professional specialization proposed here research on sustainable tourism becomes a priority, hardly a novel idea as in the last decade a number of authors have reached the same conclusion (Crick 1989; Smith and Eadington 1992; Nelson, Butler, and Wall 1993; Coccossis and Nijkamp 1995; Wight 1995). In effect these authors participate in a search for strategies for tourism management with a style and on a scale assuring it remains viable for an extended period without degrading or altering the environment (Butler 1993: 29). In the specific relationship between cultural heritage and tourism research focuses on true participation by communities in processes of rational exploitation through different types of tourism (Hussey 1989; van den Berghe 1995). True participation avoids transformation of the community into a staging area or arena controlled by and for the benefit of outside interests, and assures that there is a positive relationship between the nature of tourism and the community's everyday life (Herzfeld 1991).

In the end we confront (A) an academic panorama sufficiently rich to nurture the theoretical work necessary to sustain the best possible management of archaeological resources in Mexico, and (B) a lengthy practical experience in the process of exploiting and conserving the same. Combining the two with sufficient political commitment will leave us on the threshold of a better future for our cultural heritage.

Referenced Bibliography

Acosta, J.R.
1965 Exploraciones Arqueologicas en Monte Alban. XVIII temporada 1958. Revista Mexicana de Estudios Antropologicos 1958-59. Tomo XV.

Adams, W.Y.
1973 Strategies of Archaeological Salvage. Geophysical Monograph Series No. 17.

Alvarez, M.F.
1900 Las Ruinas de Mitla y su Arquitectura. Talleres de la Escuela Nacional de Artes Plasticas. Mexico.

Amo, R.S. del
1986 Management of secondary succession for the creation of useful Rainforest in Uxpanapa, Veracruz, Mexico. International workshop on Rainforest regeneration and management. Gori, Venezuela.

Amo, R.S. del, L.R. Aguilar, and R Delgado
1987 The Tecallis: a traditional cultivation system. In Global Perspectives On agroecology and sustainable agriculture. Proceedings of the 6th International Scientific Congress of the International Federation of Organic Movements. Santa Cruz: California.

Anderson, A.B.
1990 Alternatives to deforestation. Columbia University Press, New York.

Archivo de la Administracion
1995 Estadistica de ingreso de visitantes a las zonas arqueologicas y exconventos 1990-1995. Centro INAH-Oaxaca.

Archivo de la zona Arqueologica de Monte Alban
1994 Informe de Trabajo de la Zona Arqueologica de Monte Alban Correspondiente al periodo de junio de 1993 al mes de abril de 1994. Centro-INAH. Oaxaca.

Arrillaga, J.
1864 Recopilacion oficial completa y correcta de Leyes, Decretos, Bandos, Reglamentos, y Providencias del Poder Supremo del Imperio Mexicano y de otras autoridades que se consideran de interes comun (Julio-Diciembre de 1862 a Enero-Mayo de 1863) Imprenta A. Boix, Mexico.

Avila, A.
1995 Escuela Nacional de Antropologia e Historia. In INAH una Historia, Edited by Julio Cesar Olive Negrete, pp. 211-328. INAH-CENCA. Mexico.

Batres, L.
1904 Reparacion y Consolidacion del edificio de las Columnas en Mitla, Mexico.

Beals, R.L.
1945 Ethnology of the Western Mixe. Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 1-176. University of California, Berkeley.

1979 Economic Adaptations in Mitla, Oaxaca. In Mesoamerica: Homenaje al Dr. Paul Kirchoff, edited by Barbo Dalhgren, pp. 165-193. INAH, Mexico.

Blanton, R.E.
1978 Monte Alban: Settlement Patterns at the Ancient Zapotec Capital. Academic Press, New York.

Blanton, R.E., S.A. Kowalewski, G. Feinman, and J. Appel
1982 Monte Alban's Hinterland, Part 1: The Prehispanic Settlement Patterns of the Central and Southern Parts of the Valley of Oaxaca. Memoirs of the Museum of Anthropology 15. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Brandi, C.
1990 Principios de la Teoria de la Restauracion. INAH, Mexico.

Brew, J.O.
1962 A Guide for Salvage Archaeology. Museum of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe.

Butler, R.W.
1993 Tourism—An Evolutionary Perspective. In Tourism and Sustainable Development, edited by J.G. Nelson, R. Butler, and G. Wall, pp. 27-44, Department of Geography Publication Series No. 37, University of Waterloo.

Butterworth, D.
1962 A Study of the Urbanization Process Among Mixtec Migrants from Tilantongo in Mexico City. America Indigena. 22:257-274.

1973 Squatters or Suburbanites? The Growth of Shantytowns in Oaxaca, Mexico. In Latin American Modernization Problems, edited by Robert G. Scott, pp. 209-235. University of Illinois, Urbana.

1973 Tilantongo: comunidad mixteca en transicion. INI-SEP, Mexico.

Caso, A.
1932 Exploraciones en Monte Alban. Temporada 1931-32. Instituto Panamericano de Geografia e Historia. Publicacion no. 7, Mexico.

1938 Informe sobre los trabajos de exploracion arqueologica efectuados en Oaxaca durante la sexta temporada. Direccion de Arqueologia, Mexico.

1939 Resumen del informe de las Exploraciones en Oaxaca durante la 7a y la 8a Temporadas, 1937-1938 and 1938-1939, in XXVII Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Actas, vol. 2, pp. 159-189, Mexico.

1967 A un Joven Arqueologo Mexicano. Empresas Editoriales, S.A. Mexico.

1969 El Tesoro de Monte Alban. Memorias del Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia. III-INAH-SEP. Mexico.

Caso, A. and D. Rubin de la Borbolla
1936 Exploraciones en Mitla 1934-1935. Instituto Panamericano de Geografia e Historia. Publicacion 21, Mexico.

Caso, A. and I. Bernal
1962 Culturas Zapoteca y Mixteca. INAH-SEP. Mexico.

Caso, A., I. Bernal and J. Acosta
1966 La Ceramica de Monte Alban. INAH-SEP, Mexico.

Centro Regional de Oaxaca INAH
1982 Documentos Internacionales. SEP-INAH. Mexico.

Chance, J.K.
1970 Kinship and Urban Residence: Household and Family Organization In a Suburb of Oaxaca, Mexico. Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society. 2: 122-147.

Chanfon, C.
1988 Fundamentos teoricos de la Restoracion. Coordinacion General de Estudios de Posgrado, Facultad de Arquitectura UNAM, Mexico.

Cleere, H.
1989 The Rationale of Archaeological Heritage. In Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World, edited by Henry Cleere. pp. 1-19. Unwin Hyman, London.

Cleere, H., ed.
1983 Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Coccossis, H. and P. Nijkamp, eds.
1994 Sustainable Tourist Development. Avebury, Aldershot.

Comision Nacional de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos para la UNESCO
1985 Zona de Monumentos Historicos de la Ciudad de Oaxaca, zona arqueologica de Monte Alban, y sitio de Cuilapan. File in the archive of the Archaeology Section, C.R.O.

Croll, E. and D. Parkin
1991 Bush Base, Forest Farm. Routledge, New York.

Crick, M.
1990 Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences. Annual Review of Anthropology 18: 307-344.

Darvil, T.C.
1987 Ancient Monuments in the Countryside. English Heritage, London.

De la Fuente, J.
1949 Yalalag: una villa zapoteca serrana. Museo Nacional de Antorpologia, Mexico, D.F.

Dennis, P.
1987 Intervillage Conflict in Oaxaca

1991 Conflictos por Tierras en el Valle de Oaxaca. INI-SEP, Mexico.

Department of the Interior, Federal Archaeology.
1988 the Current Program. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Diaz Berrio, S.
1984 Conservacion de Monumentos y Zonas. INAH, Mexico.

1985 Proteccion del Patrimonio Cultural Urbano. INAH, Mexico.

Diskin, M.
1968 Economics and Society in Tlacolula, Oaxaca. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California Ð Los Angeles, Los Angeles.

Dupaix, G.
1978 Atlas de las Antiguedades Mexicanas halladas en el curso de los tres Viajes de la Real Expedicion de Antiguedades de la Nueva Espana. San Angel Editores, Mexico.

ENAH
1989 Licenciatura en Arqueologia. Escuela Nacional de Antropologia e Historia, INAH, Mexico.

1995 Licenciatura en Arqueologia. Escuela Nacional de Antropologia e Historia, INAH, Mexico.

Flannery, K, ed.
1986 Guila Naquitz: Archaic Foraging and Early Agriculture in Oaxaca. Academic Press, New York.

Flannery, K. and J. Marcus
1976 The Early Mesoamerican Village. Academic Press, New York.

Florescano, E. comp.
1992 El Patrimonio Cultural de Mexico. Fondo de Cultura Economica, CENCA, Mexico.

Gandara, M.
1992 La Arqueologia Oficial Mexicana: causas y efectos. INAH, Mexico.

Garcia Barcena, J.
1996 Arqueologia, in INAH una historia, edited by Julio Cesar Olive Negrete, Vol. 1, pp. 123-136. Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, INAH, Mexico.

Garcia Canclini, N.
1992 Culturas Hibridas. Editorial Sudamerica. Buenos Aires.

Garcia Fernandez, J.
1990 The new Spanish archaeological heritage legislation, in Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World, edited by Henry Cleere, pp. 182-194. Unwin Hyman, London.

Gomez-Pompa, A.
1987 Tropical deforestation and Maya silviculture: an ecological paradox. Tulane Studies in Zoology and Botany, 26: 19-37.

Gomez-Pompa, A. and A. Kaus.
1991 Traditional management of tropical forests in Mexico. In Alternatives To Deforestation, edited by Anthony Anderson. pp. 45-64. Columbia University Press, New York.

Gomez-Pompa, A. and E. Jimenez Avila, eds.
1982 Estudios ecologicos en el agrosystema cafetelera. CECSA-INIREB, Mexico.

Granstaff, T.B.
1990 Manager's Guide to Rapid Rural Appraisal. Bangkok.

Hardin, G.
1968 The Tragedy of the Commons. Science. 162: 1243-1248.

Herzfeld, M.
1991 A Place in History. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Higgins, M.J.
1974 Somos Gente Humilde. INI-SEP, Mexico.

1983 Somos Tocayos. University Press of America, New York.

1986 Quienes son los migrantes etnicos al teatro urbano del valle de Oaxaca? In etnicidad y pluralismo cultural: la dinamica etnica en Oaxaca. Edited by Alicia Barabas and Miguel Bartolome, pp. 401-422. CENCA, Mexico.

Holmes, W.
1897 Archaeological studies among the ancient cities of Mexico. Field Columbian Museum. Pub. 16, Anthropological series, vol. 1, Chicago.

Hussey, A.
1988 Tourism in a Balinese Village. The Geographical Review. 79 (3) pp. 311-325.

INAH
1980 Disposiciones Legales del Patrimonio Cultural. INAH-Mexico.

1995 Ley Federal sobre Monumentos y Zonas Arqueologicos, Artisticos, e Historicos. INAH-Mexico.

Kearney, M.
1971 The Winds of Ixtepji. Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York.

King, T. F., P.P. Hickman and G. Berg
1977 Anthropology in Historic Preservation. Academic Press, New York.

Kowalewski, S., et al.
1989 Monte Alban's Hinterland, Part III: Prehispanic Settlement Patterns In Tlacolula, Etla, and Ocotlan, the Valley of Oaxaca, Mexico. 2 volumes. Technical Report No. 23, Ann Arbor Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan.

Kristiansen, K.
1984 Denmark. In Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage, edited by Henry Cleere, pp. 21-36. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Layton, R.
1990 Introduction. In Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions, edited By Robert Layton. pp. 1-23. Unwin Hyman, London.

Leff, E., coord.
1991 Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo en Mexico. Vol.1. UNAM, Mexico.

Lipe, W.D.
1984 Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources. In Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage, edited by Henry Cleere. pp. 1-11. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lipe, W.D. and A.L. Lindsay, eds.
1974 Proceedings of the 1974 Cultural Resource Management Conference. Federal Center, Denver, Colorado. Northern Arizona Society of Science And Art, Flagstaff.

Litvak, J.
1985 La Escuela Mexicana de Arqueologia: un desarrollo cientifico Mexicano. Serie Los Nuestros. UNAM, Mexico.

1986 Todas las piedras tienen 2000 anos Editorial Trillas, Mexico.

Lombardo S. and R.S. Vicente
1988 antologia de las Leyes sobre Monumentos Historicos (1536-1910). INAH, Mexico.

Lowenthal, D.
1985 The Past is a Foreign Country. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Magadan, M.
1984 Destruccion y conservacion de una zona monumental. El Caso Mitla. Tesis de Maestria en Arquitectura. Escuela Nacional de Conservacion, Restauracion, y Museografia. INAH-SEP.

Malinowski, B. and J. de la Fuente
1957 La Economia de un Sistema de Mercados en Mexico. Acta Antropologica. Seq. 2, Vol. 1, No. 2, Mexico.

Marquina, I.
1984 Arquitectura Prehispanica. INAH-SEP, Mexico.

Matos, E.
1985 Manuel Gamio. La Poblacion del valle de Teotihuacan. Serie Los Nuestros. UNAM, Mexico.

McCay, B. and J. Acheson
1987 Human Ecology of the Commons. In The Question of the Commons, edited by Bonnie J. McCay and James M. Acheson. pp. 1-34. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

MaGimpsey, C.R.
1972 Public Archaeology. Seminar Press, New York.

McGimpsey and H.A. Davis, eds.
1977 The Management of Archaeological Resources. Society of American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

McLowry, R.
1970 Ayoquezco Zapotec: Ethnography, Phonology, and Lexicon. Tesis de licenciatura inedita. Universidad de las Americas, Cholula, Mexico.

Miller, W.C.
1954 Uses of aerial photography in archaeological fieldwork. American Antiquity 23: 46-62.

Molina, A.
1975 La Restauracion Arquitectonica de Edificios Arqueologicos. Serie Arqueologia, INAH-SEP, Mexico.

Monzon, F.M.
1991 Expediente tecnico. Sitio Arqueologico de Mitla, Oaxaca. Sub-direccion de Registro Publico de Monumentos y Zonas Arqueologicas. INAH-CRO, Oaxaca.

Morales, T. and C. Camarena O.
1995 Fortaleciendo lo propio. Ideas para la creacion de un museo comunitario. Programas de museos comunitarios y eco-museos. INAH-CONACULTA, Mexico.

Murphy, A.
1987 Study Housing Areas in a Developing Nation. Housing and Society. 14: 143-160.

1991 Introduction and Overview. Urban Anthropology. 20: 1-14.

1994 To Title or Not to Title. Urban Anthropology. 23: 209-232.

Murphy, A. and A. Stepick
1991 Social Inequality in Oaxaca. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Murphy, A. and H. Selby
1985 Poverty of the Domestic Cycle in Oaxaca. Urban Anthropology. 14: 347-365.

Nahmad, S.
1965 Los Mixes: estudio social y cultural de la region del Zempoaltepetl y el Istmo de Tehuantepec. Ediciones del Instituto Nacional Indigenista, Mexico.

Nelson, J.G., R. Butler, and G. Wall
1993 Tourism and Sustainable Development. Publication Series Number 37. Department of Geography, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario.

Olive Negrete, J.C.
1995 INAH una historia. Vol. 1. CONCULTA-INAH, Mexico.

Ostrom, E.
1990 Governing the Commons. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Paddock, J.
1966 Ancient Oaxaca. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Paredes, B.
1992 Informe de trabajo de delimitaciones de las zonas arqueologicas de Monte Alban y Zaachila. INAH-CRO, Oaxaca.

Parsons, E.C.
1936 Mitla: town of the souls. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Peluso, N.L.
1995 Rich Forests, Poor People. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Peters, P.
1994 Dividing the Commons. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Posey, D, et al.
1984 Ethnoecology as applied anthropology. Human Organization 43: 95-107.

Province of British Columbia
1995 Heritage Conservation: a Community Guide. Ministry of Small Business, Tourism, and Culture, Victoria, British Columbia.

RRA Notes Number 13
1991 Participatory Rural Appraisal. RRA Trainers Workshop, Bangalore.

Raj Izar, Y.
1986 Heritage Preservation versus the Demands of Modernization. In Why Preserve the Past?, edited by Y. Raj Izar. pp. 21-30. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Rees, M, A. Murphy, C.W. Morris and M. Winter
1991 Migrants to and in Oaxaca City. Urban Anthropology. 20: 15-30.

Rhoades, R. E.
1987 Basic Field Tecniques for Rapid Rural Appraisal. Proceedings of the 1985 International Conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal, pp. 114-128.

Robles Garcia, N.
1987 Temporada 1987 Proyecto Mitla. Archaeological Section Archives, INAH-CRO, Oaxaca.

1989 Proyecto Mitla: Reporte sobre canteras. Archaeological Section Archive. INAH-CRO, Oaxaca.

Robles Garcia, N. and A. Moreira Q.
1990 Proyecto Mitla: Restauracion de la zona arqueologica en su contexto urbano. Coleccion Cientifica 193. INAH, Mexico.

Robles Garcia, N., M.L. Magadan, and A. Moreira Q.
1987 Reconstruccion colonial en Mitla. Escuela Nacional de Conservacion, Restauracion, y Museografia. INAH, Mexico.

Robles Garcia, N. and J. Corbett
1994 Problematica social del manejo de Recursos Arqueologicos. Ponencia presentada en la IV Semana Cultural de la DEAS. INAH, Mexico.

1995 Land Tenure Systems, Economic Development, and Protected Areas in Mexico. In Sustainable Society and Protected Areas, edited by Robert Linn. George Wright Society. Hancock, Michigan.

Rodriguez Garza, I.
1996 Patrimonio cultural, interes publico y privatizacion. In Arqueologia, realidades, imaginaciones, edited by A.M. Crespo, C. Viramontes, and I. Rodriquez. Pp. 105-154. Section X of SNTE, INAH, Mexico.

Ross, M. and J. O. Saunders, eds.
1991 Growing Demands on a Shrinking Heritage. Canadian Institute of Resources Law, Calgary.

Rozat, G. and J. A. Contreras
1995 Relexiones para nuevas practicas del p.e. en Mexico. In El Patrimonio Sitiado. Trabajadores Academicos del INAH. pp. 351-358. Mexico.

Schavelzon, D.
1981 Historia social de la Restauracion Arquitectonica en Mexico. Vivienda. 6: 434-477.

1990 La Conservacion del Patrimonio Cultural en America Latina. Facultad de Architectura, Diseno, y Urbanismo, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires.

Schelhas, J.
1994 Building sustainable land uses on existing practices. Society and Natural Resources. 7: 67-84.

Schiffer, M.B. and G.L. Gumerman
1977 Conservation Archaeology. Academic Press, New York.

Scott, J. C.
1985 Weapons of the Weak. Yale University Press, New Haven.

SEDESOL
1996 Propuestas para la conservacion y preservacion del area de Monte Alban y Ejecucion del Decreto que la declara Zona de Monumentos Arqueologicos. Delegacion Estatal Oaxaca, Subdelegacion de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda, Oaxaca.

Selby, H.
1966 Social structure and deviant behavior in a Zapotec village. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Selby, H., A. Murphy, and S. Lorenzen
1990 The Mexican Urban Household. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Smith, V.L. and W.R. Eadington, eds.
1992 Tourism Alternatives. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Stepick, A. and A. Murphy
1980 Comparing squatter settlements and government self-help projects as housing solutions in Oaxaca. Human Organization. 39: 339-343.

Taylor, W. B.
1990 Cacicazgos coloniales en el valle de Oaxaca. In Lecturas Historicas del Estado de Oaxaca. Vol. II, Epoca Colonial, edited by Maria de los Angeles Romero Frizzi. pp. 149-192. INAH, Mexico.

Thapar, B.K.
1984 India. In Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage, edited by Henry Cleere, pp. 63-72. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Thompson, M.W.
1981 Ruins: their preservation and display. British Museum Publications, London.

Toledo, V. M.
1988 La sociedad rural, los campesinos, y la cuestion ecologica. In Las Sociedades rurales hoy, edited by Jorge Zepeda P. pp. 237-285. El Colegio de Michoacan, Zamora.

Tovar y de Teresa, R.
1994 Modernizacion y Politica Cultural. Fondo de Cultura Economica, Mexico.

Van de Berghe, P.
1995 Marketing Mayas. Annals of Tourism Research. 22: 568-588.

Vasquez Leon, L.
1996 El "modelo Madrid" de arqueologia en gestion patrimonial. In Arqueologia, Realidades, Imaginaciones, edited by A. M. Crespo, C. Viramontes, and I. Rodriquez. pp. 75-102. Section X of SNTE, INAH, Mexico.

Vasquez Olvera, C.
1995 El museo y su nueva relacion con los sectores sociales. In Patrimonio sitiado. Trabajadores Academicos del INAH. INAH, Mexico.

Waterbury, R.
1970 Urbanization and the traditional market system. In The Social Anthropology of Latin America, edited by Harry Hojier and Walter Goldschmidt, pp. 126-153. Latin American Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wendorf, F.A.
1962 Guide for Salvage Archaeology. Museum of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe.

Wight, P.
1995 Sustainable Ecotourism. Tourism Recreation Research. 20: 5-13.

Winter, M.
1989 Oaxaca: the Archaeological Record. Editorial Minutiae Mexicana, Mexico.

Winter, M., C. Morris, and A.D. Murphy
1990 Planning and implementation in the informal sector. City and Society. 2: 131-143.

Young, F.W. and R.C. Young
1961 Key Informant Reliability in Rural Mexican Villages. Human Organization. 20: 141-148.