Book Review


This book represents four decades of the author’s interaction with Andean anthropology and more specifically with the cultural history of Arequipa in the southern reaches of Peru. Reference to “the independent republic of Arequipa” brings proud smiles to the faces of some Arequipans and often provokes bemused smirks on those of other Peruvians. Thomas Love tackles the question of how intense regionalism developed in southern Peru, where Arequipans have developed an “imagined community whose identity pivots on a deeply rooted sense of having been held back, wronged—shortchanged in their ability to control their own destiny” (p. 4). Love was struck by the phenomenon when doing field research in Arequipa in the late 1970s and over the ensuing years has formed the interpretation presented in this book. He inserts Arequipa’s regionalism within the theoretical construct of subnational identities, drawing particularly upon the work of Pierre Bourdieu.

Love emphasizes several factors that have contributed to Arequipans’ desire for independence or at least autonomy within Peru: the cult of the Virgin of Candelaria (Candlemas) at Chapi, Arequipan reaction to Peru’s loss in the War of the Pacific, and the culture surrounding bull fights (peleas de toros), in which bulls are pitted against each other. In Chapter 2, Love spends considerable space tracing Arequipa’s links to the Andean Altiplano, to show that the Chapi cult derives at least in part from pre-Hispanic traditions. A pre-Inca huaca or sacred site at Churajón was located near the modern Chapi sanctuary. Worship of the Virgin of Candelaria began following reports of her miraculous appearance at Chapi, shortly after the arrival of the Spaniards and the founding of the city of Arequipa in 1540. Meanwhile, Churajón’s importance faded. Love speculates that Chapi not only replaced Churajón as an object of pilgrimage. Nonetheless, it did not really become a cross-ethnic, cross-class phenomenon until the early twentieth century, when Catholic authorities in Arequipa began to promote it. By the late 1900s as many as 200,000 pilgrims were visiting Chapi in a year, paying devotions to the Virgin, whom regional residents
had transformed into a symbol of Arequipan regionalism by placing a basket in her hand and giving her a hat like that worn by rural women in the region.

Love next discusses the growing regionalism of the nineteenth century. Arequipans grew frustrated when the Peruvian-Bolivian Confederation collapsed, leaving southern Peru under Lima’s control. Local writers extolled the region’s unique character. Mariano Melgar wrote with romantic nostalgia for Arequipa’s imagined heroic past, while with revolutionary fervour Juan Gualberto Valdivia decried Lima’s dominance. Chile’s victory in the War of the Pacific in the early 1880s not only discredited the Limeño oligarchy, which failed to protect Peru, and the indigenous population, which did not rally in defence of the nation against the Chilean invaders; but defeat also deprived Arequipa of its southern nitrate-rich provinces in the Atacama.

In the early twentieth century, Arequipa’s regionalism became less economic and political and took on a stronger cultural tone. Numerous minifundios made up most of the Arequipan campiña (the agriculture lands surrounding the city), and they were worked by industrious, prosperous mestizos, which the rest of Peru would do well to imitate, said Arequipan propagandists. Authors such as Francisco Mostajo and Jorge Polar described an Arequipa that was mestizo, despite the fact that Arequipa had been the most Spanish of Peruvian cities. In the early twentieth century, Arequipan elites abandoned a heritage that was conservative, Spanish, and Catholic and created one that was mestizo, thereby purposefully “browning” rather than “whitening” the culture. They did this out of frustration with their impotence to resist the centralizing power of Lima, which more and more controlled the economic and political reins of the nation. In response Arequipans rejected both the Spanish and indigenous cultures held up as the guiding lights around which Peruvian nationalism should be built and argued instead that mestizaje culture, which they uniquely represented, was the true Peruvian reality. In a way this was a nostalgic looking back to an Arequipa that may never have truly existed and a claim of cross-class unity that was also largely imaginary.

Aside from the main thrust of his study, Love mentions pre-Hispanic trade in the region but only briefly engages John Murra’s theory of indigenous vertical archipelagos. Although the book alludes to the arrieros, whose teams of mules linked Arequipa with the coast and with the Altiplano, Love might have discussed the dimensions of the wine and brandy trade, which enriched Arequipa and Moquegua in the eighteenth century. Several good maps would help situate readers in southern Peru, as would more clarity about the term Arequipa: when is the author referring to the city, when is the reference to the region, and what jurisdictions does that region contain at different periods of time? Better organization would have eliminated some of the repetitive sections, and sentences occasionally are long and overly complicated. This reader also found it frustrating that the references often lacked precise page numbers and the index omitted many persons and subjects from the text.
Despite these quibbles, specialists interested in the central Andes will find Love’s book rewarding. He draws on a vast bibliography, particularly of Arequipan writers and scholars and makes extensive use of John Wibel’s dissertation and Sarah Chamber’s monograph on nineteenth-century Arequipa. The book ranges widely rather than focusing narrowly on Arequipan regionalism and subnational identities, and thus contains information that will attract readers interested in other aspects of southern Peru.
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