trace the relation between the internal crisis of the cacicazgo and the empowerment of the community that supported the formation of new forms of leadership: for instance, Sinclair Thomson’s study of Túpac Katari in La Paz. Yet the characteristics of Huanta make this book particularly relevant for comparisons to the northern Andes, Quito, and New Granada, where mobility and mestizaje transformed the ethnic identification of the lower classes, and plebeian leadership proved crucial both in the age of revolution and in the later popular alliances with political liberalism.

The book definitively contributes to a new political history of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, it should be read as a complement, and not as simply a rejoinder, to the dominant historiography that has emphasized the difficulties of constructing hegemony and overcoming regional and racial exclusion in Peru. Méndez successfully shows the existence of a liberal foundation of the Peruvian state. Yet it is also true that the weakness of the central state with respect to the dominant regional classes eventually resulted in the formation of more-authoritarian alliances, particularly during the formation of the oligarchic state after the 1850s guano boom.

Nevertheless, Méndez’s focus on this early period of state formation, and her historical reconstruction of the Peruvian liberal tradition, provide elements for a more dynamic reading of the political system, one in which the oligarchic state no longer appears as the natural result of the lack of participation of other classes but as an effect of an unequal competition. In fact, the formation of democratic tendencies in the 1930s, the particular character of the Peruvian military, the relevance of indigenista ideology, and the resistance of this region’s peasantry to Senderista violence can also be better understood after reading this book.

VALERIA CORONEL, New York University
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In the last decade, historians have shown increasing interest in prisons as the subject of critical inquiry. This scholarship has sought to understand the greater dimensions of social control, the difficulties in wholly translating Western institutional models to Latin American societies, and the ways in which the criminal-justice and penitentiary systems have reflected states’ exclusionary practices based on class, ethnicity, race, and gender. More broadly then, much of this new research has looked at power and the way it has functioned in the postcolonial world. Carlos Aguirre’s work here is no exception. However, what is exceptional is the innovative perspective that Aguirre takes in examining the world within four of Peru’s prisons: the Lima penitentiary El Panóptico, the penal colony El Frontón, the Carcél de Guadalupe, and the Carcél Central de Varones.
He seeks to uphold a subaltern view, one from inside the prison walls, that reveals a tenuous and often improvised relationship between both “common” and political prisoners, prison officials, wardens, criminologists, and doctors, as well as the families, cronies, coworkers, neighbors, and friends on the outside. We learn that one cannot draw the line between the two worlds so distinctly: in many ways, life in the Lima prisons was a reflection of the forms of clientelism and hierarchy that characterized Peruvian society, a point made most elegantly in Aguirre’s analysis of inmate loyalty to political leaders outside the prison during the Augusto Leguía regime. But Aguirre contends that prisoners were also at odds with the system of patronage and used alternative vocabularies—from the language of human rights to the language of tattoos—to express themselves.

Breaking the book into three parts, Aguirre first introduces some of the key elements related to prison reform encapsulated in the debates between legalistic and increasingly medicalized notions of criminality. Criminological theories, no matter their lack of rigorous research or consensus, enjoyed tremendous cachet among Leguía policymakers, who translated these scientific studies of crime into legal and penal codes and guides on prison management. The second part takes a closer look at the prison experience, revealing the contradictory nature of rehabilitation and reform. On the one hand, the state sought to implement the strategies that famed Peruvian eugenicist Carlos Enrique Paz Soldán designed to inculcate morality, a commitment to hard work, and good citizenship, while the simultaneous neglect and abuse of inmates was commonplace. Relating the horrors of solitary confinement known as la sepultura in El Frontón, Aguirre observes how violence seemed endemic to the penitentiary; in it, a “true regime of terror reigned” (p. 106). The author concludes that despite the attempts by the modernizing Peruvian state to make the prison a model of discipline and order, that “customary order” was built not according to prison design but through personal negotiation, bribery, and resistance, creating a more porous boundary between inmates and prison authorities. In this sense, Aguirre suggests that the idea of authority can be imagined as a floating concept that could be invoked by prison employees, wardens, and inmates, each exerting their leverage over one another in ways that mirrored the racial, spatial, and gendered notions of patronage in society. This idea is best exemplified by the small group of caporales—individuals drawn from the convict population to assist in prison administration—who at times held certain authority over prison officials by virtue of their special knowledge of the prison’s inner workings.

The author’s examination of inmate correspondence, particularly the prisoners’ sketches included in the final chapter, offers a valuable perspective on political prisoners, prison administration, and inmate abuse. The extensive documentation and compilation of arrest records for the period of his study, as well as the tables on the number of inmates, painstakingly broken down by categories of age, race, regional origin, and occupation, are illuminating and indispensable data for scholars working in criminality or labor history.

Aguirre’s work reaffirms just how important it is that we study the institutions inhabited by subalterns in order to understand the mechanisms of authoritarian rule. His
research suggests new ways to see how power is exercised through contestation, solidarity, ambivalence, and—as often is the case in Peru’s prisons—through acts of violence.

SHARI ORISICH, University of Maryland
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El futuro del pasado: Las coordenadas de la configuración de los Andes.


Heraclio Bonilla is one of the most respected, if controversial, Peruvian historians of recent times. His work was crucial in overcoming the old nationalistic current in historiography that dominated until the late 1960s, and since the 1980s he has been subject to greater critique than possibly any other Peruvianist historian. First he was blamed for not giving sufficient weight to Peru’s regions or the Indians, then the new cultural historiography denounced his structuralist view of history. Finally, the new political historiography criticized his lack of attention to politics and the political system. It could be said that, even today, historians define their position by the extent to which they differentiate their own work from Bonilla’s theoretical framework.

The Fondo Editorial del Pedagógico San Marcos and the Instituto de Ciencias y Humanidades have now republished 63 of Bonilla’s articles that were until now dispersed throughout a number of small journals of limited availability. Although the two volumes do not cover all of Bonilla’s work, they provide a good overview of his principal topics of research. The book is divided into seven parts. In the first, we find articles with general interpretations of large-scale issues, such as “The Andean Region as Situation and Problem” or “The Past and the Present in the Andes.” The second part brings together Bonilla’s classic studies of Peruvian dependency in the nineteenth century, most of which were written in the 1970s. The third part demonstrates that Bonilla has paid more attention to colonial history in recent years, while still retaining his dependentista outlook. The fourth part concentrates on a topic strongly associated with Bonilla in the 1970s: the Peruvian nation, especially in relation to the Indians. The wide range of dates on the articles show that Bonilla never abandoned this issue. The fifth part focuses on the “rural question”; most of these articles date from the 1970s, and here one notes a loss of interest in the topic of the countryside in later work. The sixth part concerns the state, again with heavy interest in the role of Indians in Andean societies.

The last section is entitled “The Conclusion,” but as the three contributions are from 2000, 1994, and 1984, the present they describe is already some years old. Most of the articles are either about Peru or about general Andean history, with Peru as a primary example. Nevertheless, the collection shows that Bonilla has begun to publish quite a few articles on Colombia (where he now lives) over the last ten years.

This is not the place to repeat or describe all the shortcomings of Bonilla’s work.