

## Colonial Latin American Historical Review

---

Volume 12  
Issue 1 *Volume 12, Issue 1 (Winter 2003)*

Article 6

---

12-1-2003

### John R. Fisher, Bourbon Peru, 1750-1824

Timothy E. Anna

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/clahr>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Anna, Timothy E.. "John R. Fisher, Bourbon Peru, 1750-1824." *Colonial Latin American Historical Review* 12, 1 (2003): 86.  
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/clahr/vol12/iss1/6>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Colonial Latin American Historical Review by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [disc@unm.edu](mailto:disc@unm.edu).

children in their wills in an effort to include them among the necessary heirs. Despite being legally invalid, these wills routinely were upheld in practice in a society where concubinage remained a socially accepted norm.

Lewin's documentation of how the law diverged in theory and practice raises new questions not easily answered. Understanding how the law should have functioned enables us to interpret the wills of the newly ennobled in a new light. Clearly, these documents transgress the law; whether that reflected deliberate strategy or merely ignorance remains unclear. The introduction of new legal terminology for children of unknown parentage that left the form of their illegitimacy in doubt suggests the former.

The scope of this study extends well beyond the narrow confines of inheritance law, being situated within broader legal changes that took place during the Pombaline era (1755-1777). An emerging sense of "legal nationalism" favored laws imposed by the "right reason" of Portugal's monarchs over precedents grounded in Roman, Visigothic, and canon law. Ironically, Brazil's liberal jurists of the post-Independence era continued to rely upon absolutist legal commentaries of eighteenth-century Portuguese legal scholars in matters of inheritance. Lewin's documentation of a greatly expanded minor nobility in the late colonial era also has important implications with respect to our understanding of Brazil's class composition.

My criticisms of this ambitious and generally well-executed study are few. Lewin occasionally overstates her claims: for example, not all would agree that "for the agrarian society that defined Brazil on the eve of independence, the inheritance system offers the master key for unlocking economic organization and social arrangements" (p. 2). Her criticisms of colleagues who have failed to fully appreciate the complexities of Luso-Brazilian inheritance law also seem a bit too harsh. As most scholars have not asked the same questions of wills and estate inventories as she, it is perhaps unfair to take them to task for failing to come up with the same answers. Nonetheless, Lewin's interrogation of inheritance law and practice has provided a fundamental reference work for every scholar of Brazil.

Judy Bieber

*Department of History*  
*University of New Mexico*

*Bourbon Peru, 1750-1824.* By John R. Fisher. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003. xix + 224 pp. Tables, notes, appendixes, glossary, bibliography, index. \$26.95 paper.)

John R. Fisher is a long-established specialist in the history of late colonial Peru, and readers can approach this book with confidence that it will be thoughtful, judicious, and broadly authoritative. Arguing that the Bourbon reforms were not systematically applied to Peru until the reign of Charles III

after 1759 and the famous *visita general* of José Antonio de Areche after 1776, Fisher concentrates on the last half of the eighteenth century and up to the final defeat of royalist arms in Peru in 1824. The title, however, suggests a more complete work than actually exists; it should perhaps have been titled "Selected Issues in Bourbon Peru." At several points, Fisher comments that he will write no more on a specific item, suggesting that this may be the farewell of a master to a group of topics he has pursued for many years.

Fisher's bibliography here lists no fewer than thirty-six of his own articles and books dating from 1968, all on late colonial Peru. There is a long preface which recounts his career in Peruvian studies and his longtime interest in such key areas as mining, the intendant system and local administration, and international trade. Even if meant to suggest an intellectual odyssey, the preface is more about the author rather than the subject. There are also forty-nine pages of appendices, in the form of brief biographies of the viceroys of Peru in the Bourbon period, the two *visitadores generales*, the president-intendants of Cusco, regents of the *audiencias* of Lima and Cusco, and the intendants of the other seven intendancies of Peru. Like the choice of themes, the appendices suggest personal selections by the author. For example, if he was going to include such extensive appendices, why not also list members of the two *audiencias*? And it is not entirely clear why intendants of Cusco are listed separately from the others.

Rather than a narrative, there is a series of reflections clustered around the themes of defense, the economy and finance, society and culture, revolts and rebellions, and the final years of the viceregal power after abandoning Lima in 1821. While there is close attention to the independence struggle after 1821, there is only passing mention of the process before then. To summarize some of the major arguments Fisher makes: while trade, mining, and tax revenues grew distinctly after 1750, the Bourbon reforms were not effective in seriously improving local administration throughout the country. Callao remained the chief port of South America even after it lost its previous monopoly. Textile output in large *obrajes* declined but increased substantially in new areas and smaller *obrajes*. Lima and its oligarchy remained the defining forces in Peruvian history and did not easily embrace independence. The argument is that "Bourbon Peru" defines the period roughly from 1750 to 1850, though the years after 1824 are only briefly mentioned. Indigenous rebellions from Tupac Amaru to 1815 could not bring independence, and often did not aim to do so. These are all conclusions worth noting, but in some cases the details are not fully sketched.

The volume reflects mature thought and a wide consciousness of the literature, and its prose is both very rich and quite dense. There are many very long sentences with complex parenthetical interjections, sentences often running over one hundred words in length. Despite its broad title, it is not a book for the introductory student; it cannot really be described as accessible in terms of prose or analysis. Fisher's judgments are always sensible and well grounded, and historians of colonial Peru must consult his writings.

Nevertheless, the reader comes away with the sense that there are no great breakthroughs in this book, but rather a tendency to confirm the author's earlier judgments and to fill in the picture a bit more on some specific questions.

Timothy E. Anna  
*Department of History*  
*University of Manitoba*

*We Alone Will Rule: Native Andean Politics in the Age of Insurgency.* By Sinclair Thompson. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002. xii + 399 pp. Maps, notes, chart, bibliography, index. \$55.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.)

Sinclair Thompson focuses on the La Paz region to explore the political dimensions of the 1780-1781 native rebellion in Upper Peru. Compared to the Tupac Amaru rebellion in Cuzco and the Tomás Katari rebellion in Chayanta (south of La Paz in the district of Potosí), both starting a few months earlier, Tupaj Katari's rebellion in La Paz was more radical and violent. Tupaj Katari and the thousands of Aymaras who fought under his banner sought the annihilation of Spanish colonial rule and the death of all Spaniards, Creoles, mestizos, and Indians who refused to submit to new native rule. The siege of La Paz lasted 184 days from March to October 1781, when the Spanish army arrived from Buenos Aires, gained the support of loyalist Indians, and lifted the siege. The leaders of the Indian rebellion were captured and executed.

Rather than hereditary Indian lords (caciques), Indian commoners from local Indian communities (*ayllus*) led the La Paz uprising. How did commoners come to organize and lead a rebellion as large and as sustained as the siege of La Paz? This question becomes the focus of Thompson's research. Thompson rejects "essentialistic" causes of the rebellion. Indian commoners rebelled in 1781 not so much because they were mistreated and furious (that had always been the case), but because they developed specific political goals during a formative period of protest from the 1740s to the 1770s. In communal meetings, they articulated reasons for rebellion and what they sought to achieve. By the 1780s, they had acquired political experience and a political vision. In 1781, they evaluated political events, namely the earlier rebellions, and adjusted strategy and tactics based on those events. Indian commoners had become political actors and political strategists.

Political activity by Indian commoners before and after the rebellion led to a fundamental structural change in how Indian communities were ruled. Thompson shows how indirect Spanish colonial rule through caciques unraveled during the insurrectionary period. As the colonial state involved the cacique in greater exploitation of Indian communities, especially via the forced sale of goods, the cacique's right to rule was challenged from below. In judicial complaints, *ayllu* leaders showed how the cacique had become unjust.