

## PALABRAS EN LA PRESENTACIÓN DE LA EDICIÓN FACSIMILAR DE LA REVISTA *TIERRA FIRME* (1935-1936) <sup>1</sup>

— *Tierra Firme*, edición facsimilar, 8 vols., Madrid, Sociedad Estatal de Conmemoraciones Culturales-CSIC-Publicaciones de la Residencia de Estudiantes, 2008, Vol. 1, estudio introductorio e índices a cargo de Salvador Bernabéu Albert y Consuelo Naranjo Orovio.

Confieso mi debilidad por las ediciones facsimilares de las revistas. De entrada, nos permiten hacer lo que no pudieron realizar los lectores coetáneos de su aparición: leer en simultaneidad la secuencia de sus números. Por eso, estudiarlas en esa artificiosa integridad de una colección completa nos proporciona el insólito placer de conferir sentido a lo que pudo ser una causalidad o una improvisación —un elenco de colaboradores, la elección de unos temas— y nos permite transitar de los síntomas a los datos, o de los datos a los síntomas, con la seguridad de saber ya la historia en que se trenzaron. Puede que el placer del conocimiento obtenido tenga algo de tramposo, como lo tiene el del crucigramista que resuelve su tablero a la vez que mira furtivamente la solución que se transcribe en otra página del periódico; pero la trampa, en asuntos de historia cultural, es tentación irresistible...

Cuando celebramos el primer centenario de la Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, se nos ofrece el precioso regalo de los 8 números de *Tierra Firme* (que se agruparon en 7 entregas) entre 1935 y 1936, cuando fue la «Revista de la Sección Hispanoamericana del Centro de Estudios Históricos», como reza

---

<sup>1</sup> Recojo aquí mi intervención en la presentación de la edición del facsímil de la revista *Tierra Firme*, editado conjuntamente por el Gobierno de España, los Ministerios de Educación y Ciencia y de Cultura, la Sociedad Estatal de Conmemoraciones Culturales, el CSIC y la Residencia de Estudiantes (Madrid, 2008). La presentación, enmarcada en las actividades del II Congreso Internacional sobre la Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, tuvo lugar el 6 de febrero de 2008 en la Residencia de Estudiantes, con la participación de Alicia Gómez-Navarro, directora de la Residencia; Consuelo Naranjo, en nombre de los coautores del volumen inicial, y el firmante de estas líneas.

su subtítulo. La dirigió Enrique Díez-Canedo, aunque en su última entrega (II, 2, 1936) aparece a su frente un Consejo Directivo en el que figuraban Américo Castro, su impulsor, y el propio Canedo, al lado de un selecto grupo de firmas americanas, quizá las más representativas de la cultura progresista americana del momento: los mexicanos Genaro Estrada y Alfonso Reyes, el cubano Fernando Ortiz y el argentino Ricardo Rojas. Todo esto y otras cosas se cuentan con meticulosidad y acierto en un volumen de estudio e índices que acompaña a los siete del facsímil y que han preparado dos valiosos miembros de la joven escuela de americanistas españoles, Salvador Bernabéu y Consuelo Naranjo Orovio.

La reimpresión de *Tierra Firme* nos permite entender algo más de un asunto de política cultural muy atractivo. Desde 1892, cuando se celebró con modesto boato el IV Centenario del Descubrimiento, las relaciones entre España y la América de habla española han venido a traducirse en una larga lista de propósitos retóricos y de exiguas realidades prácticas, como corresponde a un terreno tan propicio a la exaltación como tan sembrado de recelos. La razón es muy simple: el diálogo de dos nacionalismos —como lo eran el español y el americano— suele ser cosa imposible. Y es que el nacionalismo y la sordera se asemejan mucho: en ambas cosas, no se escucha al oponente y se le habla demasiado alto... A finales del siglo XIX, nuestro país remataba una larga serie de decepciones —económicas, coloniales, internacionales— a los que se sumaban incipientes síntomas de defecciones separatistas y un galopante desprestigio de la estructura misma del Estado. Los países americanos descubrían, por su lado, los engaños de las economías de rapiña, los peligros del aventurerismo político y la fragmentación de misma estructura social, que les hacía descubrir países dramáticamente escindidos. Unamuno hablaba de la *historia* frente a *intrahistoria*, al pensar en la de España, como Eduardo Mallea, tiempo después, hablaría de la *Argentina invisible* y la *Argentina visible*, en la deriva porteña de los años treinta. La angustiada visión de países duales es la pesadilla predilecta en estos casos, como lo es remitir al ensueño o a la intuición la solución del futuro. En España y en América, el nacionalismo fue cosa de los derrotados y los pesimistas: una fuerte crítica del presente histórico que se mezclaba a una mirada feroz hacia el pasado inútil y un rincón de esperanzas futuras en las que se mezclaban la complacencia telúrica y la tentación utópica.

El año de 1898 pudo dar nuevos impulsos al diálogo y los poemas de Rubén Darío parecieron alumbrar los términos de un nuevo pacto de nacionalismos, pero nunca pasó a la práctica, asaltado siempre de los mismos recelos mutuos. El discurso de Rafael Altamira, «La universidad y el patriotismo», que abrió en 1898 las actividades de la universidad ovetense, fue el punto de partida del *idealismo americanista* español. En 1927, la más famosa «polémi-

ca del Meridiano», librada en las páginas de *La Gaceta Literaria*, de Ernesto Giménez Caballero, demostró la inviabilidad de aquellas propuestas: cuando Guillermo de Torre propuso en sus páginas la necesidad de que Madrid, y no cualquier otra ciudad europea (París), se constituyera en «meridiano intelectual» de los nuevos americanos, todos los órganos culturales de América, desde la cubana *Revista de Avance* a la bonaerense *Martín Fierro*, condenaron la pretensión y advirtieron su orgullosa hostilidad a cualquier tutela espiritual. No nos extrañará que, casi a la vez, los *integralistas* portugueses (y luego el hostil salazarismo) demostraron la inviabilidad del otro fetiche del nacionalismo español, el *iberismo*, que habían compartido federalistas de izquierda y conservadores sin prejuicios (como Juan Valera).

Pero, entre tanto, corrió mucha tinta —y no toda inútil— por parte del americanismo español. Un año antes de la sonada polémica, en 1926, la veterana Unión Iberoamericana, con sede en Madrid y fundada en 1885, puso en la calle una publicación mensual, *Revista de las Españas*, que persistió hasta la víspera misma de la guerra civil. Aquella Unión ostentaba una nutrida Junta Directiva que presidía el Duque de Alba y que tuvo como vicepresidentes a figuras políticas, aristócratas, escritores de nota (como Ramiro de Maeztu y Eugenio d'Ors) y también algún notorio universitario muy vinculado a nuestra Junta de Ampliación de Estudios: entre estos estaban los filólogos Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Américo Castro y Tomás Navarro Tomás, el físico Blas Cabrera y el jurista Rafael Altamira, el pedagogo Lorenzo Luzuriaga y el economista Luis Olariaga.

La *Revista de las Españas* no estaba mal del todo, pero *Tierra Firme*, a despecho de su brevedad, fue mucho mejor: de sus páginas desapareció toda sombra de paternalismo imperial y casi toda la retórica que ya había hecho inviable la «polémica del Meridiano». No podía ser de otro modo, por la propia representatividad intelectual del Centro de Estudios Históricos, aunque la arribada de éste al hispanoamericanismo había sido muy tardía: como cuentan Bernabeu y Naranjo, sólo en 1933 se creó la correspondiente Sección de americanismo y entre 1910 y 1936 sólo tres becarios españoles recibieron pensiones de la Junta para realizar estudios en América, aunque gentes vinculadas al Centro diseñaron y dirigieron el Instituto de Filología, de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, y colaboraron en la puesta en marcha de los estudios hispánicos en la Universidad de Río Piedras, en Puerto Rico. La dirección contraria de los viajes fue más favorable y aquí trabajaron, como se sabe, Alfonso Reyes y Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Y ya con la Sección americana en funcionamiento, la revista nos permite conocer los nombres de los becarios americanos y españoles que participaron en ella. Todos hicieron fructíferas carreras académicas. Rodolfo Barón Castro, Silvio Zavala y Ángel Rosenblat son figuras indiscutidas

de la historiografía de sus países respectivos, pero la suerte de los españoles fue diversa: Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois, hijo de los historiadores Antonio Ballesteros Beretta y Mercedes Gaibrois, fue un puntal de la universidad franquista; Antonio Rodríguez Moñino fue depurado tras la guerra civil, trabajó con acierto para empresas culturales privadas, fue el mejor de los bibliófilos españoles y sólo al final de su vida la Real Academia lo acogió como numerario; Ramón Iglesia Parga, por su parte, había sido el «joven español» en Götterborg al que Giménez Caballero quiso hacer primer recluta del fascismo español en 1928. Acabó por hacerse de izquierdas y ser el talento más prometedor de todo el pequeño grupo, aunque no le acompañó la suerte en el posterior exilio y acabó por suicidarse.

Es curioso que *Tierra Firme* comenzara como una publicación intelectual de interés general y vocación matizadamente hispánica, pero no americanista. En su primera entrega, Américo Castro publicó un ensayo sobre «Poesía y realidad en el *Cantar del Cid*» y Gonzalo Lafora, un acercamiento a «La personalidad y el carácter de Cajal», que preceden a la traducción de una preciosa carta del historiador holandés Johan Huizinga al ensayista francés Julien Benda, acerca del famoso libro del último *La trahison des clercs*. Uno y otro (Huizinga publicaría al año siguiente un libro, *Entre las sombras del mañana*, que leyeron muchos) eran la encarnación viva de aquel humanismo un poco agorero y alarmado que circuló ampliamente en los años del *compromiso*. Y cuyas alarmas tenían alguna razón, sin duda... Entre las reseñas de este volumen, un jovencísimo Antonio Tovar publica una excelente acerca de *Paideia*, el gran libro de Werner Jaeger, y el economista Ramón Carande, otra de la monografía de Hamilton acerca del tesoro de América y las fluctuaciones de precios españoles en los siglos XVI y XVII: no mucho tiempo después, Tovar tendría una fulgurante —aunque breve— carrera como la gran esperanza de la universidad fascista y Carande, objeto de depuración política por los vencedores (¡a la vez que nombrado Consejero de Falange!), se retiraría con discreción a escribir su gran libro sobre los banqueros de Carlos V.

El número 2 (1935) incluye ya un trabajo de Julio Álvarez del Vayo a propósito de la guerra del Chaco y el inicio de la monografía de Ángel Rosenblat acerca de la cuantificación de población indígena de América. Pero sólo en la cuarta entrega el hispanoamericanismo define plenamente la vocación de la revista. Un becario de la Sección, nuestro conocido Ramón Iglesia, presenta un trabajo original, ambicioso y discutible sobre «Bernal Díaz y el popularismo histórico», un concepto que podría engarzar un sector de la cronística medieval y la *Verdadera Historia*, antes de que los prejuicios oficialistas acabaran con tan peligroso propósito (Iglesia había comenzado la edición de la obra de Bernal Díaz que, años después, su antiguo compañero Carmelo Sáenz de San-

tamaría concluyó y publicó bajo su solo nombre de autor; de estas miserias estuvieron llenos los primeros años de vida del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas...). Otro becario, Rodolfo Barón Castro escribió de «Españolismo y antiespañolismo en la América Hispana» y el ensayista cubano Jorge Mañach reseñó con elogio «La antología del modernismo», que es la publicada por Federico de Onís en 1934 bajo el título *Antología de la poesía española e hispanoamericana (1885-1932)*, cuyos mayores méritos son los que señalaba con agudeza el crítico: haber considerado conjuntamente la poesía hispánica y haber situado la noción de *modernismo* (sin confusiones *noventa-yochistas*) como argumento central de su interpretación. Pero inevitablemente, el lector actual se sentirá más atraído por una «Cartelera de libros hispanoamericanos» que lleva la firma de Guillermo de Torre y donde, entre otras novedades, se habla de la *Historia universal de la infamia*, que acaba de publicar su cuñado Jorge Luis Borges, y de *Residencia en la tierra*, un título que en pocos años había hecho del nombre de Pablo Neruda toda una referencia poética intercontinental.

Esa línea que mezclaba la actualidad y el pasado de lo más vivaz de la cultura prosiguió en una secuencia de números que ya estaba al borde de su precipitado final. En la primera entrega de 1936, Miguel Pérez Ferrero nos da cuenta, en una crónica muy amena, de «Dos poetas españoles en América y uno americano en España»; aunque podían haberlo sido, no son tres vates de los siglos áureos sino los muy conocidos contemporáneos Federico García Lorca —que ha estado en Puerto Rico y en Argentina—, Rafael Alberti —que ha recorrido el Caribe, lleno de fervor antiyanqui— y Pablo Neruda, cónsul en Barcelona y Madrid, a quien tanto admiran sus colegas españoles. El historiador Emiliano Jos, el estudioso de Lope de Aguirre (cuyo trabajo sería, tiempo después, el cañamazo de una novela histórica de Ramón J. Sender), presentó en este mismo número las actividades del Congreso de Americanistas de Sevilla, celebrado en octubre de 1935, y que fue, sin duda, uno de los acontecimientos académicos en aquel despertar de la universidad española.

Pero el lector de la revista —ese crucigramista tramposo que evocaba al comienzo...— sabe que el tiempo ya se acababa. El extenso número 3 y 4 de ese año de 1936 se publicó ya en 1937, por cuenta de la Comisión Delegada de la Junta de Ampliación de Estudios que debió trasladar su sede en Valencia, cuando a fines de 1936 la administración estatal abandonó el Madrid asediado. ¡A cuántas revistas científicas no les pasó lo mismo!. La *Revista de Filología Española* de 1937, por ejemplo, apareció, ya bajo el franquismo, ampliada la fecha hasta ese año e incorporó a sus páginas una fotografía del cuadro de José Aguiar que representaba a Franco con todos sus arreos de Generalísimo... pero olvidó excluir de la relación de artículos publicados uno de Bergamín sobre

Larra, que había aparecido en la revista republicana *Hora de España*, e incluyó en la lista de libros recibidos uno de Manuel Azaña (debo la observación a mi amigo y compañero Alberto Montaner).

Los sumarios suelen ser inocentes de tales desastres: en la última entrega de *Tierra Firme*, José María Ots Capdequí (que se convertiría en el mejor americanista del exilio), escribía sobre el régimen municipal de la colonia; el geógrafo Dantín Cereceda (que conocería persecución por permanecer en su país) lo hacía sobre la huella más precoz de alimentación antillana en la cocina mediterránea; nuestro conocido Rodríguez Moñino, que supo del mismo destino, trataba de «¿Cómo se publicaba un libro en Indias a principios del siglo XVII?». Y el poeta Juan Larrea, que acababa de hacer efectiva la donación de su colección de cerámica precolombina al futuro Museo de América, publicaba un concienzudo trabajo sobre «Un vaso peruano del Museo de Madrid», rebatiendo lo dicho por Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois en un número anterior. No resulta aventurado, sin embargo, suponer que tras la dura crítica al becario no hubiera algo de la inquina política de aquellos días.

Pero lo más conmovedor de esta última entrega reside en las páginas que, bajo el marbete de «Testimonio», se debieron de añadir en los últimos momentos. Se trata de una serie de informes acerca de «Un año de labor cultural de la República Española (julio de 1936-julio de 1937)», en el que notables colaboradores recogen sin triunfalismos hechos como la creación de unas seis mil escuelas nuevas, o la de las Milicias de la Cultura, o la publicación de la *Cartilla Escolar Antifascista*, que era tan ingenua como noblemente patriótica y que habría de parecerse muy poco a la rahez literaria de fanatismo religioso y culto al Caudillo que mostraron sus equivalentes en la España sublevada. Un informe de Timoteo Pérez Rubio, pintor y esposo de la novelista Rosa Chacel, nos da cuenta de la creación de la Junta de Protección e Incautación del Tesoro Artístico, mientras que el filólogo Tomás Navarro Tomás, director de la Biblioteca Nacional, informa de la labor de las bibliotecas circulantes del frente y de la preservación del patrimonio de la institución que dirigía. Y María Zambrano narra la fundación y primeras actividades de la Alianza de Intelectuales Antifascistas.

No es fácil que la buena literatura subsista ante el imperativo de la propaganda. Pero este episodio de una «cultura en armas» que cierra la breve trayectoria de *Tierra Firme*, nos viene a recordar que en la agonía de la República —como después en la Francia de la Resistencia o en la Italia *partigiana*— esa difícil hermandad de la violencia legítima y de la cultura se produjo de una forma natural y muy a menudo admirable. En el centenario de la Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, que celebramos en años de bonanza, puede ser más fácil identificarse con lo que representó —bajo dos regímenes, la monarquía y

la república— una ejecutoria que fue por igual nacional, liberal y laica. Pero también es obligado hacerlo con quienes defendieron ese legado en los años más duros... Tras aquella guerra, bajo el término de «Hispanidad» (creado por el clérigo Zacarías de Vizcarra y difundido por Maeztu), el americanismo español fue el ruborizante folclore neoimperial o el aplauso interesado de los autores americanos más reaccionarios. Y el verdadero americanismo se continuó en el exilio.

José-Carlos MAINER  
Universidad de Zaragoza

## TOWARDS A NEW SOCIAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY IN PERU. REVIEW ESSAY

- O'PHELAN GODOY, Scarlett, and Mónica RICKETTS SÁNCHEZ-MORENO (eds), *Homenaje a Jorge Basadre. El hombre, su obra y su tiempo*, Lima, Instituto Riva-Agüero, 2005.
- BURGA, Manuel, *La Historia y los historiadores en el Perú*, Lima, Universidad Nacional de San Marcos/Universidad Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, 2005.
- DRINOT, Paulo y Leo GAROFALO (eds.), *Más allá de la dominación y la resistencia. Estudios de historia peruana, siglos XVI-XX*, Lima, IEP, 2005.
- MÉNDEZ, Cecilia, *The Plebeian Republic. The Huanta Rebellion and the Making of the Peruvian State, 1820-1850*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2005.
- RÉNIQUE, José Luis, *La batalla por Puno. Conflicto agrario y nación en los Andes peruanos, 1866-1995*, Lima: IEP/Sur/CEPES, 2004.

Jorge Basadre (1903-1980) is without any doubt the father of modern Peruvian historiography. He wrote a number of fundamental books, the most important of which are arguably *La multitud, la ciudad y el campo del Perú* (1929), *Perú: problema y posibilidad* (1931) and the eleven volumes of *Historia de la República del Perú*. Born in the provincial environment of Tacna, he came to Lima when he was nine years old. In 1919 he entered San

Marcos University. Following the university reforms of that same year, he began to work with a group of students who were voluntarily cataloguing archival materials in the archives of the National Library. In the process, he developed a historian's mind, and rapidly integrated into the intellectual circles of Lima. He was Director of the National Library from 1943 and Minister of Education in 1945 and from 1956-58. This article attempts to ascertain his influence on twentieth century Peruvian historiography and to discuss some examples of present-day history writing and their significance for historical debates in Peru.

#### JORGE BASADRE BETWEEN HISTORY AND POLITICS

Basadre's continuing importance as an historian is rooted in his erudition and profound knowledge of Peruvian reality. His intellectual inspiration was demonstrative of a great intellectual independence that allowed him to openly admire intellectuals as diverse as Pedro Zulen, José Carlos Mariátegui, Francisco García Calderón and José de la Riva-Agüero. The attention he gave to the preservation and analysis of historical documents is symbolic of the transformation of history writing from a general pastime to a professional occupation. But above all he was important because in the first half of the twentieth century he had already incorporated in his analysis of Peruvian political history what we call today the «subaltern classes». In this way, he opened new windows for the interpretation of Peruvian history and already anticipated the new social history that would become so important in the 1970s and '80s. In 2003 an international congress was organized in celebration of the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Jorge Basadre's birth. The contributions to this congress have now been published in a book that, as the title conveys, is a *Homenaje a Jorge Basadre*. Despite the inevitable hagiographic tone and the uneven quality of the essays, the book is a worthy starting point for understanding the problems and possibilities of Peruvian historiography.

In the first place, *Homenaje a Jorge Basadre* demonstrates the variety of occupations and debates in which Basadre was involved. And at the same time it provides an eloquent insight in the position of intellectuals and their work in a Latin American country such as Peru. The interesting contribution of Alfonso Quiroz connects Basadre's not very successful involvement in politics during his two periods as education minister with his merciless analysis of corruption as an endemic problem in Peruvian politics. In this position he confronted in daily reality what he had been describing with such analytical rigour in his historical work. Looking back he observed: «[E]l problema esencial está



en que el hombre que vive en el mundo del pensamiento tiene una visión de las cosas que choca con lo terriblemente prosaica que es la vida política» (in Pablo Macera, *Conversaciones con Basadre*, 1979, p. 117). As most intellectuals find out sooner or later, this is not an easy task! Basadre remained first and foremost an intellectual who tried to understand rather than change history. There is no doubt that his opinions had political consequences, and that as a good Latin American intellectual he ventured into the realm of politics, even more, of course, in his ministerial functions. The image that emerges from this book, however, is of an eminent intellectual who reinstated both a regional and a social dimension into Peruvian history, and in doing so provided Peruvian history writing with a profoundly democratic element.

A number of authors draw attention to Basadre's provincial background to explain his unorthodox and in many respects innovative vision on Peruvian society, and especially on the nature of the Peruvian nation-state. Vincent Peloso sees this background as the prime explanation of Basadre's regional perspective that — long before Benedict Anderson — considered the Peruvian nation-state as a project of constant construction and reconstruction. In this same context, Frederica Barclay presents an interesting comparative analysis of Basadre's views on the Amazon region and the southern provinces of the country. In his *Historia de la República* Basadre asked himself why the Amazon provinces had stayed within the realm of the Peruvian state in spite of the federalist rebellion in the 1890s, the havoc created by the Guerra de Pacífico, and the difficult means of communication. As Barclay suggests, the people of Tacna and Arica remained loyal to the Peruvian nation-state because they felt that they belonged to something called Peru, to what Basadre calls «la patria invisible». Basadre drew much optimism from the strong nationalism that existed in the southern provinces in spite of decades of foreign occupation. He remained optimistic about the possibilities of this «nacionalismo constructor» in this typical frontier society of the *Oriente*.

Only in the latter part of his professional life did Basadre manage to integrate the ethnic question and, more specifically, the position of the indigenous population in his historical analysis. Where he had emphasised the crucial importance of the mestizo in his earlier work, in his writings of the 1950s the role and cultural heritage of the Indians became a recurrent theme. Augusto Ruiz Zevallos even claims that he was more radical in his belief in the Indian population than, for example, José María Arguedas, the famous pro-Indian Peruvian writer, who continued to see the Indian population as an obstacle to national unity. In line with his ideas on the Peruvian national identity, Basadre included the indigenous population in his analysis, but he left no place for separatism or ethnic chauvinism. «Luchemos con todas nuestras fuerzas contra el

colonialismo interno, [pero] no fomentemos los micronacionalismos» (quoted by Ruiz Zevallos, in *Homenaje*, 204).

Manuel Burga drew attention to another element of Basadre's work in his 1993 essay «Para qué aprender historia en el Perú» («Why learn history in Peru?»). Basadre's *Historia de la República* was, in his view, the last attempt to cover the entire Peruvian history, «el último gran esfuerzo por construir una historia nacional» (p. 59). This essay has now been republished with a number of more recent articles in an interesting but not always sufficiently edited book, *La historia y los historiadores en el Perú*. Burga basically looks at the profession of history writing after Basadre by considering the different intellectual and political projects proposed by historians. Doing so provides the reader with a concise but sharp intellectual history of twentieth-century Peru.

In his noteworthy essay, Burga presents a well-argued and passionate plea for a professional Peruvian historiography. In the process he also implicitly presents a provocative agenda for future historians. After Basadre's pioneering work, new forms of history writing emerged. The first wave of Andean ethnohistory that began with the pre-Columbian civilizations switched rapidly to consider the structures and cultural logic of present-day Indian society. Secondly, the agrarian history that developed everywhere in the world in the 1960s received an additional impetus in Peru because of the military government of general Velasco. The government's far-reaching agrarian reforms and the expropriation of large land-holdings gave historians the opportunity to rescue and research an abundance of agrarian, hacienda archives. A third wave of history writing, strongly influenced by Marxism and associated with the name of Alberto Flores Galindo, gave attention to the subaltern classes. However, within the Peruvian context, it also focussed on the heritage of the Indian cultures in Peru, and especially, on what became known as the «Andean utopia» (*la utopía andina*).

Within these three waves of history writing, different «*discursos históricos*» can be distinguished which reflect the complex reality of twentieth-century Peru. Many historical tendencies share, in Burga's view, a vision of Peruvian history as a «lost good» (*bien perdido*) and of missed opportunities reflecting in one way or another the «failed state» of contemporary Peru. Another continuing element in twentieth-century Peruvian historiography is the role and place of the indigenous population. From the early *indigenista* visions, which were strongly influenced by anthropological thinking, to the recent more *indianista* vision that attempt to re-vindicate indigenous claims, the place of the Indians in the Peruvian nation state has been a recurrent topic. Using the ideas of Flores Galindo, Burga suggests that only by focusing on a popular, indigenous proto-nationalism will it be possible to bring back the

«national» in Peruvian historiography. In a somewhat apocalyptic analysis, Burga sees such a historiographical development as an important (the only?) way to counter the danger of a demagogic Indianist nationalism and so to avoid the disintegration of Peru as a nation. It is surprising that there is no reference here to Nelson Manrique's now-famous book on *Las guerrillas indígenas en la guerra con Chile* (1981) which, according to Cecilia Méndez (p. 11), has been a «true milestone» in Peruvian historiography, provoking one of the few significant debates about the «national question» in contemporary Peruvian historiography.

The other contributions in the book present a number of reflections on the reality of history writing in Peru based on the personal experience of Burga himself. They are sometimes insightful and amusing, sometimes repetitive and somewhat disjointed. All in all they give an interesting overview of the topics and debates in twentieth-century historiography and the relationships between its practitioners. They show that Burga and many of his colleagues remained firmly within the tradition of Latin American history writing. Influenced by discussions in French historiography, they resorted to the consistent use of historical sources, in this way modernizing history writing in Peru. But they did not keep aloof of the pressing problems of Peruvian society and continued to look for large-scale visions and all-encompassing societal proposals.

#### NEW IDEAS ON PERUVIAN HISTORY

Almost as a reaction to this essayistic tradition, from the 1970s onwards a new kind of history writing emerged in Peru that was more strictly professional and did not pursue direct political or societal objectives. In a way, the historians in this school took up the challenge of historical materialism and the new social history emerging elsewhere. Seeking to write a new subaltern history, they began using new sources and insights that allowed them to understand the social and political structures underpinning Peruvian history. Historians like Luis Miguel Glave, Nelson Manrique, Christiane Hünefeld, José Luis Rénique, Carlos Aguirre and Carlos Contreras, to mention just a few, introduced a new social history. Although they were strongly influenced by the nestors of Peruvian historiography mentioned before, they tried to combine their suggestions with a clear adherence to historical materialism and a critical viewpoint towards the Peruvian state. To find arguments to substantiate their ideas, these historians went back to the historian's skilful work in the archives. They tried to understand the history of the masses and their role in Peru's political and social transformation. In the process and because of the availability

of sources, they often returned to analyses on a regional level. In the same period, professional contacts with foreign, most US and French, scholars allowed a more intensive contact with the international academic arena. This led, among other things, to an increasing number of younger scholars acquiring a PhD from foreign universities. Stronger links with the Anglo-Saxon academic world, especially, is starting to change Peruvian historiography. It has introduced new themes, ideas and methodologies into the historical debate and at the same time, has educated a group of younger historians who have lived (part of) their professional life outside Peru.

A number of essays by this new generation of Peruvian historians have now been brought together in the collection *Más allá de la dominación y la resistencia. Estudios de historia peruana, siglos XVI-XX* edited by Paulo Drinot and Leo Garofalo. In their short introduction the editors clearly posit themselves as a generation of young historians who wish to present a new way of looking at Peruvian history. Making use of the ideas and insights they have encountered abroad, they aim to present a different perspective on Peruvian history which, in their view, has been polarized between conservative *hispanista* and critical, subaltern viewpoints. They want to go, as the subtitle says, «beyond domination and resistance». Their point of departure is that the professionalized history of the 1980s and '90s has been unable to shed its ideological feathers and has tended to reduce Peruvian history «a una historia de dominación por parte de elites o de poderes extranjeros y de sus representantes comerciales» (p. 11). Instead, the historians contributing to this book aim at an analytical framework that «privilegia el análisis del punto de encuentro entre la dominación y la resistencia» (p. 12). They clamour for a more eclectic kind of history that is prepared to use different theoretical and ideological points of departure and innovative sources.

The resulting book is interesting for different reasons, but does not completely fulfil all its ambitions. Its strength lies in a number of well-researched and provocative articles that have succeeded in shaping new visions of Peruvian history. It is impossible to mention all the contributions here, but I was especially impressed by the articles written by Rachel Sarah O'Toole and Leo Garofalo. These articles clearly demonstrate the strength of the new pragmatic history writing that is promised in the introduction. In her fascinating «Castas y representación en Trujillo colonial», O'Toole looks at ethnic representations in the northern city of Trujillo. Making creative use of judicial documents, she shows how historical subjects tended to play with ethnic categories in colonial society. On different occasions they tended to perform and present themselves differently. When it suited their interests, mestizos performed as Indians and vice versa. In the same vein, mulattos started to identify themselves as a social

class when they expected rewards from their recognition by the colonial state. Colonial legislation created its own structures of behaviour and representation. O'Toole stresses that it was not so much a matter of social mobility in which changing identity opened new avenues of mobility, but much more a manipulation of the system. Ethnic performance was a continuing and ever-changing negotiation among colonial subjects in the context of changing legislation and state ruling.

Garofalo also looks at the social and ethnic interaction in colonial Peru in his «La sociabilidad plebeya en las pulperías y tabernas de Lima y Cuzco, 1600-1690». Closely connected thematically to O'Toole's article, he shows how the rigid differences between classes and ethnic groups suggested by official documents were a myth. As spaces of multiple social interaction, the public drinking places provided a diverse, complex and dynamic picture of colonial society.

It could be that the distance to the colonial period might allow for more provocative interpretations, but the contributions on the nineteenth century are nevertheless less innovative and appear more mainstream. They provide interesting views on regionalism, the civilizational projects of the state and the agency of the subalterns, but apart from being firmly grounded in documentary research, they are only loosely connected and do not provide a radical historiographical change. What this collection has managed to do, however, is identify a number of new topics and viewpoints. Implicitly, it takes distance from the exclusive and sometimes somewhat obsessive attention to the relationship between the state and the indigenous population that has characterized much of the more recent historiography. It draws attention to the intermediate groups, the mestizos, the poor, labouring whites, the protestant missionaries, and the public employees who tried to find their way in the interface between political projects and daily reality. In the light of this diversity, it is surprising that only one of the contributions, a short article by the Norwegian historian Tanja Christiansen, looks explicitly at the position of women. Women were all but absent in Basadre's work. Although this is no longer the case in modern historiography, it appears that they have not yet captured a specific place in mainstream historiography (in spite of the interesting note in the article by José Deustua on the significant combination of *indigenismo* and *feminismo* in the work of Clorinda Matto de Turner, *Homenaje*, 391-2).

Most contributions focus on small cases and draw modest conclusions. This may be a result of the Anglo-Saxon emphasis on the historian as a professional, but it may also be a consequence of the stage in which most of the authors find themselves. Whatever the explanation, it is a clear rupture with the broad generalizations and daring interpretations of traditional Peruvian

historiography. On the one hand the professional attitude to history is refreshing because it is based on solid documentary research and distances itself from the rhetoric, often unsubstantiated, of traditional historiography. On the other hand, it may be asked to what extent this collection has succeeded in presenting the new perspective on Peruvian history suggested by the editors. The theoretical and empirical consequences of the research presented in this book need further work. Fortunately, these young historians have plenty of time to convince us of the value of their position.

#### TOWARDS A NEW PERUVIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY: TWO EXAMPLES

The promises of the new professional history writing are clearly present in two recent monographs. The first is *The Plebeian Republic. The Huanta Rebellion and the Making of the Peruvian State, 1820-1850* by the young Peruvian scholar Cecilia Méndez. She analyses the monarchist movement in Huanta at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Many of the themes treated above are present in her painstaking study that presents a return to a classic theme of national Peruvian history. At the same time it is a repudiation of the nationalist biases in its analysis. It is no coincidence that Méndez articulates the aim of her book in almost the same words as the editors of the book presented above. She writes that the book's aim is «less to trace a history of «resistance» than of relationships — asymmetrical, more or less violent, convenient or inevitable — between the emerging republican state and a rural society of the south-central Peruvian Andes» (p. 12). Méndez uses the relatively short-lived rebellion in which Indian peasants, mestizo intermediaries and a number of local hacendados resisted the imposition of republic rule to present a nuanced and sophisticated analysis of regional society within the context of large-scale and sometimes dramatic political changes. Méndez returns to what we may consider classical political history, but she blends it with the insights of the new social history that has drawn attention to popular history. In this way, the book considers classical themes such as the military operations of the War of Independence and the animosity between Simón Bolívar and the Peruvian elites, but, at the same time, analyses Indian leaders who favour a return of the Spanish monarchy and regional processes of social and economic transformation.

The rebellion under the direction of the Indian leader Antonio Huachaca that took place in 1827 was in itself not so important had it not been for its symbolic significance in this period of political turmoil. It demonstrated that the indigenous rural population could act as a historical agent in this kind of

liminal threshold. It also questioned the separation between the *castas* and demonstrated that inter-ethnic alliances were forged everywhere in the republican and the monarchist camps. The rebellion was certainly not an exclusively indigenous rebellion; Indians in higher and lower areas of the mountains and with different occupations were divided among themselves. On the other hand, local and regional elites who saw their interests threatened by the Bolivarian laws allied themselves with the movement and tried to maintain (part of) their independence. In addition, there was a confused ideological struggle over what it meant to be in favour of the monarchy. Méndez argues convincingly that the rebellion was not a backward looking movement, but a movement in which ideas about the future and modern objectives were often couched in monarchist rhetoric. It is also interesting to note that after the failure of the rebellion the leaders, Spaniards, criollos and Indians were not harshly punished; many of the leaders re-emerged later in official positions. This supports the suggestion by Méndez that these struggles were just as much about politics and economic measures as they were about peasant resistance. The rebellion and its constituency demonstrated that the struggle over the Peruvian state and its authority not only took place in the large cities but in the rural context of the sierra as well. It may be considered symbolic that Cécilia Méndez focuses on the period of the wars of independence that also so fascinated Jorge Basadre. With her study, it would appear that Peruvian historiography has come full circle. The political topics that fascinated the first generations of historians and which were replaced by other themes in recent decades, have again been placed in the spotlight.

The second book that is beautifully demonstrating the possibilities of a new social history is José Luis Rénique's *La batalla por Puno*. This book is the result of a life-long work on the history of the southern highlands of Peru. Where in his influential *Los sueños de la sierra* (1991) Rénique wrote on the region around the old Inca-capital Cusco and its self-conscious urban elite, he now focuses on the long-term history of the neighbouring Puno province. This province always occupied a more marginal position within the Peruvian state, but at the same time, the region can be seen as a mirror sharply reflecting the main political developments within the country. In the nineteenth century it lived under the firm control of regional land-owners and political strongmen, called *gamonales* in the local vernacular. Around the turn of the century the new access to the world-market and the economic modernization of the national economy changed the context of the region's development. Modernizing politicians started their attempts to incorporate what was considered a backward indigenous population into the modern nation-state. Urban *indigenistas* professed a new faith in the vitality and creativity of indigenous

society and vehemently opposed the archaic domination of the regional elites. In the process they allied themselves with indigenous leaders (often called *mensajeros*: messengers) who were delegated by their people to defend the interests of their communities. Rénique beautifully describes how modernizing politicians, indigenistas and indigenous leaders came together in the early twentieth century in an alliance that was eventually doomed to fail. The disillusion among the highland peasantry which was the result of this process, led to a plethora of agrarian activism and social conflict which reached its culmination point in the 1950s. The agrarian movement achieved some successes, but was in general brutally repressed. The plight of the peasantry was exacerbated in the 1980s when it was crushed between the indiscriminate violence of the Maoist guerrilla's of Shining Path and the Peruvian military.

Rénique's book describes this history of a poor, marginalized region where, especially after the demise of the wool economy, a weak and vindictive elite was faced with a dense and numerous indigenous rural population which at times could take advantage of unexpected support from politicians and intellectuals from far-away Lima. It is also the story of how the Peruvian nation-state tried to come to grips with an indigenous population which she labelled in simple categories but never really managed to understand. In the end it convincingly demonstrates how political actors, from Liberal politicians and indigenistas to development organizations, military or revolutionaries, continuously constructed and reconstructed representations of Indianness basically to serve their own ends. Through their ignorance they constantly threatened to destroy the society they pretended to protect. As Rénique (265) writes: «La «batalla por Puno» es la confrontación entre proyectos de envergadura nacional que esperaban encontrar en el altiplano una importante base de acción». The irony was, that the peasant population which historically was firmly linked to the outside world, maintained its own perspective and, so doing, changed Peruvian history. «[L]os pobladores rurales calcularon riesgos y posibilidades, tomaron de los foráneos lo que requerían sin renunciar, finalmente, a su propio camino, a sus propios estrategias. Sus supuestos liberadores serían también transformados por la experiencia».

For some more general reader the book may sometimes be too detailed. Also Rénique does not entirely solve the problem historians encounter when they write history «until the present». Although he succeeds admirably well in maintaining a historical distance to the events he witnessed himself and acts of people he most probably knows, the nature and density of his analysis necessarily changes when it approaches the present-day. However, the power of Rénique's book is its *longue durée* perspective spanning more than a century of intensive social and economic convulsion and conflict. It is a fascinating



account of one highland region, but in the process the book engages with all the essential issues of Peruvian modern history. It eloquently conveys in every page and with a great wealth of information the urgent necessity for historical knowledge for understanding contemporary social and political processes.

#### TOWARDS A NEW SOCIAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY

The books of Méndez and Rénique demonstrate how «traditional» themes of Peruvian historiography are today approached with completely new questions and methodologies. Supported by similar tendencies in international historiography and the work of some US historians especially, Peruvian historians seem to be moving towards a new mix of political and social history in which old themes are analysed in a new light. Three innovations may be underscored here.

Firstly, the new political history again focuses on processes of nation-building and economic and social modernity but it now includes, and often even prioritizes the influence and agency of subaltern classes. The state and its political and societal projects are thus investigated in close relation to subaltern agency. But not only that: These historians see state activity and processes of political change as a result of constant (and historical) negotiation between different sectors of society. They explicitly include the poor, indigenous population, but at the same time try to understand the changing role of the state and its employees and their relation with local powerholders and intermediate, often regional social and economic groups.

Secondly, the new generation of historians has given new importance to regional history. In the process of rephrasing political history, the history of the state has become fragmented and multidirectional. As a consequence, regional and even local perspectives have acquired new importance. The work of the new generation of historians reviewed here, especially Rénique's book, demonstrates the importance of a vision «from the periphery» to understand the workings of the Peruvian state.

Thirdly, it is clear that the new political history aims at understanding political processes, without placing it within preconceived ideological frameworks. Basadre's description of himself and his colleagues in the prologue of his *La multitud, la ciudad y el campo*, as having «una actitud de rebeldía a veces beligerante» was also true for posterior generations of historians who were strongly influenced by Marxist ideas. They considered the position of intellectuals as being invested with a clear moral responsibility and were intent on having a clear impact on political debates in their country. In contrast, the

new generations, often educated abroad, tend to consider their work more as professional. They are socially and politically engaged, as is clear from Rénique's active political career and also, for example, from Cecilia Méndez's introduction in which she links her work to the ill-famous assassination of eight journalists in 1983 in the region of her research and the subsequent discussion on the nature of indigenous society. However, they tend to privilege the analytical task of historians over their possible political involvement and try, even when they describe their own lifetime, to maintain a historical perspective which allows for the visions of all historical actors.

These new insights may have led to a kind of history that has lost some of its urgency and direct societal relevance, but they have also shaped a historical discipline that increasingly allows us to understand Peruvian history in all its complexity and contradictions. In the end, both the essayistic, political and the more professional, empirical kinds of history writing need to come together to forge a historical vision that will underscore the particularities of the historical development in Peru, but does not exclude comparative perspectives. In this way, this new history writing may help to find solutions for the pressing problems of contemporary Peruvian society.

Michiel BAUD

Historian and Director of the Centre for Latin American Research  
and Documentation (CEDLA), Amsterdam