POPULATION AND ETHNICITY IN EARLY REPUBLICAN PERU:
Some Revisions*

Paul Gootenberg
State University of New York, Stony Brook

All numbers on the makeup of Peru's republican population are wrong, the one point on which historians can agree. Peruvian governments had neither the capacity nor the will to mount thorough surveys of their scattered and elusive Andean subjects. Between the late viceregal census of 1791 (reporting a population of 1,076,000) and the first modern effort of 1876 (yielding a count of 2,699,000) lies a century of demographic no man's land, despite partial surveys claimed for 1812, 1836, 1850, and 1862. Unfortunately, historians cannot fly back in time and redo the head counts missed or mismanaged by successive governments, although this miracle has seemingly been worked for the older Incan and conquest periods.[1] The best scholars can attempt at this point is to untangle the confusions of existing census documents and bring new evidence to bear on their strengths and weaknesses.

This article will address two problems, one quantitative, the other rife with broader social implications. First, my research has unearthed an untapped fiscal census of 1827 (the first under the republic) that can fill in the serious gap between Peru's late-colonial population and that of the guano era. These new data yield a post-independence population of about a million and a half, a higher figure than previously thought and one that can replace the spurious republican "census" of 1836. This new statistic is preliminary, yet it reveals realistic and robust demographic growth rates during these transformative years.

Second, these data are also employed to reestimate the "Indian"

*I thank the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council for research support as well as Brooke Larson, Rory Miller, Noble David Cook, and the three *LARR* mystery readers for their highly constructive criticism.

1. See Noble David Cook, *Demographic Collapse: Indian Peru, 1520–1620* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). This work is the model combining demographic and social history. For two untangling exercises, see David Browning and David Robinson, "The Origin and Comparability of Peruvian Population Data, 1776–1815," *Bulletin of the Society for Latin American Studies* 25 (Nov. 1976):19–37; and Rory Miller, "The Population Problem in Nineteenth-Century Lima," manuscript, Amsterdam, 1988.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

composition of the Peruvian population and to analyze the paradoxical ethnic developments of the nineteenth century. Specifically, this research revises Kubler's crucial work on the phenomenon of Indian persistence in republican Peru and the thesis that native majorities actually increased in the aftermath of colonialism. It is now clear that Peru exhibited even greater social continuities and stabilities than previously supposed. These findings and a review of recent research on native communities suggest a new periodization and interpretation for Peru's long route to modern *mestizaje*. This part of the story is not just preliminary but speculative as well.

PERUVIAN "CENSUSES," 1790–1876

By modern standards, Peru did not achieve a genuine national census until 1876, a half-century after independence. Even contemporary statisticians and officials were wary of the population estimates of the time. Indeed, census takers like Manual Anastasio Fuentes and Mateo Paz Soldán made a cottage industry of writing critiques of all extant figures, including their own. Their doubts, however, should be pondered elsewhere.[2] The truism holds that all population figures were low, although by what margin or consistency it is difficult to know. Most surveys were actually reactivated fiscal registers recording Indian and "casta" tributes, with all the concealment and flight that such techniques naturally evoked among Peru's fluid underclasses (the most unreliable of all were the counts launched prior to military recruitment drives). Even today, Peru's difficult social geography can challenge surveyors, and thus it is easy to imagine the obstacles for early regimes faced with civil war, faltering bureaucracies, and primitive communications. Survey and statistical methods were haphazard, to say the least. In lieu of fresh data, officials customarily projected past census figures onto much later dates. Thus it is not unusual to find villages or provinces exhibiting a remarkable demographic stability (nil change between, say, 1790 and 1850), or a revival of veritable Incan mathematical techniques (amazingly round numbers, such as "100,000").

It is easier to indicate the least reliable population estimates for

2. The best compendium of census data and contemporary critiques is that by Francisco Pini Rodolfi for the Centro de Estudios de Población y Desarrollo, "La población del Peru a lo largo de un siglo, 1785–1884," in *Informe Demográfico del Perú, 1970* (Lima: CEPD, 1972), 19–125; see also the introduction, "Aspectos históricos," a collective effort aided by Jorge Basadre, 3–18. For examples of critics, see Mateo F. Paz Soldán, *Diccionario geográfico estadístico del Perú* (Lima: Imp. del Estado, 1878), xx–xxv, 522–27, 716–40; Mateo Paz Soldán, *Geografía del Perú* (Paris: Ermin Didot, 1862), 154–56, 438; Manuel Anastasio Fuentes, *Estadística general de Lima* (Lima: Tip. Nacional, 1858), 40–43; and M. A. Fuentes, *Resumen del censo general de habitantes del Perú hecho en 1876* (Lima: Imp. del Estado, 1878), 1, prologue.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

republican Peru than to confirm the most accurate. Table 1 compares the results of five major national censuses between 1791 and 1876, arranged where possible according to their initial republican political units.

The census of 1791, taken under Viceroy Gil de Toboada, was an ecclesiastical survey that was updated and republished in successive official gazettes of the 1790s. Initial parish estimates yielded a total of 1,076,997 Peruvians, including some 609,000 Indians, 244,000 mestizos, 136,000 whites, 41,000 *pardos,* and 40,000 black slaves (those being counted must have sensed new Bourbon taxes on the way). Because of the major flaw of its slow, two-part compilation, one recent study dubbed the survey the "Censuses of approximately 1785–91 and 1791–96."[3] The highest figure in the series, published in the 1797 *Guía del Perú,* was 1,208,723. Beyond the predictable undercount of Amazonian natives, another major lacuna was omission of the densely populated southern Indian zone of Puno, attached in 1791 to the Audiencia of Alto Perú. By 1797 the pleasing number of 156,000 appeared for Puno, which added to the 1791 census (along with 6,200 inhabitants of northern Jaén) produces the population of 1,239,197 cited in table 1.

In his "Memoria" of 1797, Viceroy Gil criticized the census, venturing a population closer to 1,300,000; Tadeo Haenke felt that 1,200,000 was the most realistic guess.[4] A more recent critical study by Browning and Robinson scrutinized the database of the imperial censuses. Although an original head count surely occurred, all of its addenda (especially the so-called imperial census of 1812) were fictitious compilations and extrapolations, unfit for serious analysis.[5] Still, this 1791 effort by strong viceregal

3. H. Unánue, *Guía política, eclesiástica y militar del Virreynato del Perú para el año de 1793* (Lima: Sociedad Académica de Amantes del País, 1793), 115, and editions to 1797; data also published in various issues of *Mercurio Peruano de Historia, Literatura y Noticias Públicas* (1791–1795); and "Población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 20–27. See also Alberto Arco Parró, "Sinopsis histórica de los Censos en el Perú," in Perú, Dirección Nacional de Estadística y Censos, *Censo nacional de población y ocupación, 1940* (Lima: DINEC, 1944), 1, prologue. Various sources cite a population of 100,000 for Puno in the 1790s (e.g., the 1797 *Guía*). I prefer the more realistic figure of 156,000 quoted by J. G. Paredes in *Calendario y guía de forasteros de Lima para el año de 1828* (Lima: J. M. Concha, 1828), 5. A minimally different population of 1,249,723 (including Puno) is cited in some works, but its origin is unclear. Caste data can be found in George Kubler, *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795–1940: A Population Study Based upon Tax Records and Census Reports* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1952), Institute of Social Anthropology Publication no. 14, 30–33, t. 9.

4. See *Memorias de los virreyes que han gobernado el Perú,* compiled by Manuel A. Fuentes (Lima: F. Bailly, 1859), 4:76; and Tadeo Haenke, *Descripción del Perú* (Lima: El Lucero, 1901), 90. The latter figure has also been attributed to Inspector General Escobedo.

5. Browning and Robinson, "Origin and Comparability of Peruvian Data." This detailed critique of the 1791 census calls for an improved aggregate based on archival research, although most of the difficulties (apart from the dating of some surveys to the 1780s) lie with later updates, such as the so-called census of 1812. An even more minute (but inconclusive) archival critique is the 1965 Cologne dissertation of Gunter Vollmer, which is analyzed in Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, *The Population of Latin America: A History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974), 109–10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1 Peruvian Census Data of 1791, 1836, 1850, 1862, and 1876

Province	*1791*	*1836*	*1850*	*1862*	*1876 (Departments Only)*
Lima					
Lima (Cercado)	62,910	58,326	85,116	105,567	
Callao	—	6,790?	8,352	17,539	225,800 (Lima)
Chancay	13,945	18,712	23,428	30,525	34,492 (Callao)
Canta	12,133	13,932	14,384	18,155	
Cañete	12,616	13,892	15,553	37,541	
Huarochirí	14,024	16,549	14,258	15,207	
Yauyos	9,574	12,276	15,264	16,311	
Santa	3,334	2,594	—	—	
Ica	20,576	18,031	12,920	45,697[a]	60,225 (Ica)
Departmental totals	149,112	151,718	189,275	240,545	320,517
Junín (Ancash)[b]					
Pasco/Tarma	34,911	37,050	79,911	98,979[a]	
Jauja	52,286	61,023	89,796	106,567	
Huánuco	16,826	14,534	28,189	33,199	209,759 (Junín)
Huamalíes	14,234	13,172	32,027	40,114	78,991 (Huánuco)
Cajatambo	16,872	18,464	24,799	29,773[a]	
Junín subtotals		144,243	245,722	278,859	
Ancash					
Huaylas	40,822	49,667	69,077	39,833	284,830 (Ancash)
Huari, Conchuco	25,308	25,091	38,638	53,693	
Conchucos Bajo		44,110[a]	42,715	75,956[a]	
Others		—	—	65,034[a]	
(Santa)			5,349	9,670	
Ancash subtotals		121,462	155,799	244,186	
Departmental totals	201,259	263,111	401,501	523,045[a]	573,580
La Libertad (Trujillo)[b]					
Cajamarca	62,196	41,993	46,122	70,683	
Chota		15,438	62,597[a]	77,004[a]	147,336 (La Libertad)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1 (continued)

Province	*1791*	*1836*	*1850*	*1862*	*1876 (Departments Only)*
Lambayeque	35,192	43,202	22,682[a]	27,696	86,738 (Lambayeque)
Trujillo	12,032	12,032	7,211	32,025	212,746 (Cajamarca)
Huamachuco	38,150	43,058	60,845[a]	49,486[a]	
Jaén	6,200[a]	6,706	7,560	11,864[a]	
Chiclayo	—	—	25,133	36,720	
Piura	44,491	53,815	74,372[a]	131,464[a]	135,615 (Piura)
Departmental totals	192,061	216,244	261,553	492,535[a]	582,435[a]
Amazonas					
Chachapoyas	25,398	18,426[a]	27,728	17,952	34,284 (Amazonas)
Maynas	15,000	—	11,346	14,129	
Pataz	13,508[a]	17,565	29,394[a]	27,748	
Loreto[c]				—	61,905 (Loreto)
Departmental totals	38,906[a]	35,991	39,074[a]	83,980[a]	96,189
Puno					
Azángaro	—	—	54,333	47,912	
Huancané/Puno	—	—	56,765	59,217[a]	
Carabaya	—	—	22,605	34,068	
Chucuito	—	—	75,957	19,449[a]	259,449 (Puno)
Lampa	—	—	76,488	44,682[a]	
Departmental totals	100–156,000[d]	156,000	286,148	205,328[a]	259,449
Cuzco (Apurímac)					
Cuzco (Cercado)	32,082	—	41,152	27,005	
Quispicanchi	24,337	—	49,416	19,674[a]	243,032 (Cuzco)
Urubamba	9,250	—	28,360	14,972[a]	
Paucartambo	12,973	—	17,206	15,403	
Paruro	20,236	—	17,732	15,926	
Abancay	25,259	—	21,912[a]	16,104	
Calca y Lares	6,199	—	14,223	18,452	118,525 (Apurímac)
Aymaraes	15,281	—	18,228	22,985	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1 (continued)

Province	*1791*	*1836*	*1850*	*1862*	*1876 (Departments Only)*
Cotabambas	19,824	—	23,241	27,667	
Chumbivilcas	15,973	—	22,050	20,248	
Tinta (Canas)	34,968	—	37,605[a]	27,674[a]	
Anta	—	—	22,980[a]	21,231	
Others	—	—	32,106[a]	63,311[a]	
Departmental totals	216,382	216,382[e]	346,211	310,652[a]	361,557[a]
Ayacucho (Huancavelica)[b]					
Huamanga	25,970[a]	—	29,617	44,898	
Lucanas	15,725	—	15,401	27,807	
Parinacochas	16,011	—	19,334[a]	24,618	
Cangallo	12,474	—	20,176	34,722	
Huanta	27,337	—	26,358	33,165	142,215 (Ayacucho)
Andahuaylas	12,020	—	19,184	51,701	
Ayacucho subtotals	111,559		130,070	236,577	
Huancavelica	3,245	—	17,301	22,835	103,069 (Huancavelica)
Angaraes	5,146	—	17,318	26,240	
Castrovirreyna	9,365	—	14,348	18,761	
Tayacaja	13,161	—	27,151	40,802	
Huancavelica subtotals	30,917		76,118	108,638	
Departmental totals	142,476	159,608	206,188	345,215[a]	245,284[a]
Arequipa (Moquegua)[b]					
Arequipa	37,721	—	63,816	53,334	157,046 (Arequipa)
Camaná	10,052	—	11,270	12,063	
Condesuyos	20,145	—	21,170	12,448[a]	
Caylloma	13,905	—	23,446	18,887	
Others	—	—	15,659[a]	37,944[a]	
Moquegua	28,279	—	32,380	29,209	28,785 (Moquegua)
Arica/Tacna	18,776[a]	—	18,642	33,815[a]	36,009 (Tacna)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1 (continued)

Province	*1791*	*1836*	*1850*	*1862*	*1876 (Departments Only)*
Tarapacá	7,923	—	10,418	17,239	38,225 (Tarapacá)
Departmental totals	136,801	136,812	196,801	214,939	260,065
National totals	1,239,197	1,373,736	2,001,123	2,461,936	2,699,106

Sources: See text and its footnotes for discussion. A comprehensive secondary source is CEPD, "Población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 19–125. See CEPD for different counts (under the same census) of aggregate population. For 1791, the author rectified with Puno and Jaén additions. For 1836, see 1847 almanac count. For 1850, see the official "rectified" census. For 1862, the 1863 almanac count was used.

[a]Author's recalculation for boundary changes. Due to boundary uncertainties, not all columns can be added. Departmental totals and subtotals are most certain data used for national totals.
[b]Late-colonial Tarma includes subsequent departments of Junín, Ancash, Huaylas. Late-colonial Ayacucho (or Huamanga) includes subsequent departments of Ayacucho and Huancavelica. Late-colonial Arequipa includes subsequent departments of Arequipa and Moquegua. Late-colonial Trujillo is later La Libertad and includes later Piura.
[c]Includes other minor and shifting demarcations.
[d]Late-colonial estimates vary; part of Viceroyalty of Upper Peru; 156,000 is 1797 total.
[e]The 1832 census total was 232,774.

authorities was clearly superior to those that followed (perhaps the reason why its numbers show up far into the republican era). And until historians produce the new archival aggregate required, this census must serve as the indispensable "colonial" baseline for study of the nineteenth century.

The next census allegedly occurred in 1836, producing a republican total of 1,373,736 during the depression and armed struggles of Peru's caudillo era. This time officials recorded no ethnic distinctions, commensurate (one supposes) with their new ideals of a casteless society. According to this census, the population had inched up a mere 10.9 percent over forty-five years. Destined for repetition over the next decade and a half, this "census" first appeared in the *Guía de forasteros* of 1837, without clues as to methodology or even actual recounts. The *Guía* cryptically dubbed it as "Population of the departments and littoral provinces according to the *matrículas* activated until 1836 and other data."[6] Essentially, this so-called census was no more than a reading of tax registers

6. See J. G. Paredes, *Calendario y guía de forasteros de Lima, para el año de 1837* (Lima: J. Masías, 1836), 14–15, 5; and Eduardo Carrasco, *Calendario y guía de forasteros de la República Peruana para el año de 1847* (Lima: Imp. Instrucción Primaria, 1846), 5 and provincial surveys. These figures continued to be published until the 1851 almanac.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from "Northern Peru" from sometime between 1826 and 1836. For the departments of Lima, La Libertad, Junín, Huaylas, and Amazonia, the total population is listed as 669,658, a 15 percent increase over the 1790s figures for these regions. But even for the north, the figure for Trujillo was cribbed directly from 1791 reports, and the inhabitants of tropical Maynas had vanished altogether. For the south—the departments of Cuzco, Puno, Ayacucho, and Arequipa—this report was no census at all: starting with subsequent *guías,* the number 668,802 was admittedly borrowed straight from the 1795 census. Skeptics might perceive expedient politics in the equal estimates of 669,000 for both jealous parts of the Peru-Bolivia Confederation (1836–1838). Officials even ignored a published 1832 Cuzco census that had raised the region's population to 232,774 since the 1790s. As Kubler suggests, "To call it a census is to dignify it by an undeserved title." Yet he and others still cite 1836 figures as fact.[7]

The better-documented census of 1850, which produced a population of 2,001,123, occurred at the start of Peru's guano upturn and consolidation of the Lima state. With an increase of 627,387, the population would have jumped 45.7 percent in just fourteen years, if one takes a base year of 1836 seriously. More believable is the 60 percent expansion since the late colony. The work of the new 1848 "Consejo Supremo de Estadística" under Buenaventura Seoane, this census appeared in two versions. The first, which overlooked foreigners, slaves, and newer matrículas, reached 1,887,840. This total, however, was hastily "corrected" in May 1850 to its two-million mark—by the war ministry, which was eager to bolster the military levy.[8] One wonders whether such purposeful zeal could have offset the typical downward bias of Peruvian head counts. Some historians date the fiscal registers used as early as 1826; more likely, officials tabulated a new number from the matrículas of 1845–1850. None of the decreed provincial statistics boards actually met, however, and no ethnic breakdowns were provided. Despite its obvious flaws, the 1850 estimate remains the best glimpse of demography before the social impact of the guano era.

The 1862 census, which was timed for a revised electoral roll,

7. Kubler tabulates all almanac data in *Indian Caste of Peru,* 33. For other critiques, see "La población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 30–33; but see also provincial tables (62–81) and the erroneous claim of superiority over 1828, 53. See P. C. Flores, *Guía de forasteros del Departamento del Cuzco para el año de 1833* (Cuzco: Imp. Pública, 1834), 3–4, 26–45. For an example of continued use of the 1836 census, see Javier Tantaleán A., *Política económico-financiera y la formación del estado: siglo xix* (Lima: Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo y la Participación, 1983), 66, 285.

8. "Censo rectificado de 1850," *El Peruano* (Lima), 25 April, 4 May 1850; E. Carrasco, *Calendario y guía de forasteros de la República Peruana para el año de 1852* (Lima: Imp. Instrucción Primaria, 1851), 29. Also Kubler, *Indian Caste of Peru,* 34, t. 7. For the best breakdown (with likely *matrícula* years), consult "La población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 52; for critics, see Paz Soldán, *Diccionario geográfico,* xxi–xxii.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

found a population of 2,461,936.[9] The increase represented a 23 percent rise over 1850, a galloping rate considering reports of devastating epidemics of typhoid, cholera, and diphtheria in the sierra in the late 1850s. By this time, the height of export prosperity, Peru's population had doubled since its colonial days. A real, if hasty, census had also been recorded, as evident in the detailed provincial breakdowns by sex and age (but with women and children tellingly lumped together). Many contemporary critiques appeared, like that by Paz Soldán ridiculing its poor organization and patent errors (using assumed error ratios, he offers an upper-bound alternative of "4,000,000 *almas*").[10] Nevertheless, this census marked a new departure in Peruvian statistics, one liable to invite criticism because it was the first to supersede traditional tax and parish records with direct survey techniques. The conclusions of the 1862 census lie well within nineteenth-century trend lines.

Peru's first modern census, which detailed its preparations and procedures, registered in 1876, a time when the guano boom was collapsing and Peru was approaching its crushing war with Chile. Directed by French statistician Georges Marchand and compiled and published by the expert M. A. Fuentes, the census mobilized a small army of officials who for the first time collected minute occupational, social, and regional data. This information reveals, for example, the profound diversity of Peru's regional social structures: that 1,554,678 of 2,699,106 Peruvians were deemed Indian; that only 15 percent of the population lived in towns (including most of Peru's 498 confessed "*israelitas*"); and that the country's forty-four hundred "haciendas" were home to a quarter of the rural folk. The census total of 2.7 million Peruvians, while open to question then and now, is still regarded as a "rigorous effort" by the extensive modern critical literature. The weakest data concern some provincial statistics and social items like occupation and literacy.[11] More alarming than the imper-

9. For various tables, totals, and critiques, see "La población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 42–50. For accounts of sierra epidemics in the 1850s, see Pablo Macera, "Las plantaciones azucareras andinas (1821–1875)," in *Trabajos de historia*, edited by Macera (Lima: Instituto Nacional de Cultura, 1977), 4:195–96, and census data, 4:277–94.

10. Mateo Paz Soldán, *Compendio de geografía, matemática, física y política* (Paris: E. Didot, 1863), 2:454–55; Manuel Anastasio Fuentes, *Estadística general de Lima*, 2d ed. (Paris: Laine et Harvard, 1866), 41–43; and Hildebrando Fuentes, *Curso de estadística* (Lima: Imp. La Revista, 1907), 311.

11. See Perú, Dirección de Estadística, *Censo general de la República del Perú formado en 1876* (Lima: Imp. del Estado, 1878), 7 vols.; for a self-critique, see M. A. Fuentes's prologue to *Resumen de censo.* For a professional appraisal, see Arco Parró, "Sinopsis histórica de censos," xxxi–xxxiii; or Alida Díaz, *El censo general de 1876 en el Perú* (Lima: Seminario de Historia Rural Andina, 1974). For some of many recent uses, see Clifford T. Smith, "Patterns of Urban and Regional Development in Peru on the Eve of the Pacific War," in *Region and Class in Modern Peruvian History*, edited by Rory Miller (Liverpool: Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Liverpool, 1987), monograph no. 14, 77–102; or H. Pinto and A. Goicochea, *Ocupaciones en el Perú, 1876* (Lima: Universidad de San Marcos, 1977), 4 vols.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fections of the 1876 census is the fact that the next national census did not occur until 1940, three-quarters of a century later. This hiatus has left an enormous gap for studying the emergence of modern Peru.

Only one work to date has attempted to revise nineteenth-century demographic history, George Kubler's pioneering *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795–1940.* Based on a careful archival reconstruction of 164 "matrícula" tax registers, Kubler and his team worked for several years to unravel regional patterns of ethnicity in the nineteenth century. Concentrating on Indians, the 1952 study does not aim for new aggregate population estimates. But by combining registers and published census data (including those of 1836 and 1850), it encompasses a national population of 1,110,150 over the broad interval of "1826–1854" for use in analyzing ethnic change.[12] Kubler also published his original tax register database, critical evidence for all historians.

Kubler's central finding is that Peru's Indian majorities actually peaked in the era following independence. Some 59.3 percent (651,993) of republican society were "Indian," an increase occurring between the 57.6 percent of 1795 and their decline to 54.8 percent in 1876, when the modern path to mestizaje became apparent. But given the vague periodization of 1826–1854, the important thesis of "Indianization" remains open. When and why did this trend begin, how far did it progress before reversing? These issues will be touched on subsequently, during a reanalysis of Kubler's figures.

In sum, although no historian can vouch for the veracity of any Peruvian census, some appear better done than others. Overall, the 1791 census remains an indispensable baseline and the 1876 census, the most reliable here. For better or worse, both are ballpark aggregates. The haphazard 1850 and 1862 surveys can serve at least to suggest a minimal pace of change.

The 1836 "census," although still employed by historians, has no value whatsoever. Its distortions are dramatized by simple calculations of annual compound demographic growth rates (see table 2).[13] From 1791 to 1836, growth appears to have been modest indeed at 0.23 percent, a rate of 23 per 1000—or nil if the viceroy's high guess is taken for 1795. Then in the brief period from 1836 to 1850, the rate of growth supposedly leaped

12. Kubler, *Indian Caste of Peru,* t. 9 and passim; for my modifications, see the discussion on Indian Peru.

13. The formula is *r* equals the root number of years of pop1/pop0 minus 1. These rates differ slightly from those in "Aspectos históricos," *Informe Demográfico del Perú, 1970,* 12, due to my higher 1791 base year (which includes Puno). Even for the period 1876–1940, the rate is 1.31 percent. It is most unlikely that the stable historic rate of 1 percent is a statistical distortion (representing even 1 percent annual improvements in census efficiency). The methodology of the 1850 census was patently not a 60 percent improvement over that of 1791. The biological, cultural, and resource basis for Peru's relatively consistent record will be explored in due course.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 2 *Unrevised Demographic Rates, 1791–1876*

Years	Growth (%)	Span (years)	Annual Rate (%)
1791–1836	10.9	45	0.23
1836–1850	45.7	14	2.73
1791–1850	61.5	59	0.82
1791–1862	98.7	71	0.97
1850–1876	34.9	26	1.03
1791–1876	117.8	85	0.92

Sources: Author's calculation from table 1; annual rate determined by compound interest formula. Compare with revisions shown in table 5.

to 2.73 percent per year: a tenfold acceleration comparable only with the worst Third World "population explosions" of the mid-twentieth-century. No reason exists to believe that Peruvian growth ground to a halt during the years of the late colony and early republic; for example, one finds no reports of crushing epidemics. Nor does any explanation fit a phenomenal burst of fecundity in between 1836 and 1850, during the height of Peru's caudillo era. For long-term contrasts, it should be borne in mind that Peru's yearly demographic advance from 1791 to 1850 was 0.82 percent and over the full nine decades (1791–1876), 0.92 percent. Such rates are reasonable and consistent ones for buoyant agrarian societies, which Peru was after its demographic upswing in the mid-eighteenth century. The 1836 figure is thus not only bogus but far too low.

The great mystery then is the lacuna between 1790 and 1850, six decades evenly divided between colony and nationhood, and a period of important shifts in demographic behavior throughout much of Latin America. In the nineteenth century, population growth—or more often *"despoblación"* or *"falta de brazos"*—even carried specific political overtones. As one republican observed in 1826, "If the population has been stationary or even diminished, it would be the most flagrant proof of the homicidal character of the government that ruled us until Independence."[14] Which regime caused the sluggish growth observed until 1836? New evidence blames neither.

14. Paredes, *Guía de Lima en 1828,* 5–6. The obsessive demographic concern with "falta de brazos" is epitomized by Juan de Arona in P. P. Soldán y Unánue's *La inmigración en el Perú* (Lima: Imp. Universo, 1891). Given Peru's robust natural population growth, nineteenth-century elite cries over "depopulation" appear to have been highly ideological. The underlying issue was the availability of exploitable (non-Indian) wage labor, as argued by Macera in "Plantaciones azucareras," 68–91, and others.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE LOST 1827 CENSUS

Historians might have suspected that Peru actually attempted a national census in 1827. Clues abound in later census reports and in contemporary, if cryptic, references to a "La Mar census."[15] More surprising are the accessibility, range, and richness of the surviving data. Published province by province in the official gazette, *La Prensa Peruana,* and other periodicals between 1827 and 1829, no fewer than thirty-four detailed surveys are available for the fifty-seven Peruvian provinces of 1827. Fragments of this data have already been published, even in major works of demographic history, but without their full potential being realized.[16] Never aggregated when collected, these accounts cover 914,176 Peruvians, roughly three-quarters of the known population in the late colonial era.

The thirty-four standardized and detailed *Estadísticas* enumerate caste categories (*indígenas, castas,* and *esclavos*), and they provide income estimates for groups by province—a feat not even attempted in 1876.[17]

15. See Paredes, *Guía de Lima en 1828,* 5 (and the 1837 edition); José de Larrea y Loredo, "Bases para la estadística del Perú" (1826), in *Tierra y población en el Perú (ss. xviii–xix),* compiled by Pablo Macera (Lima: Seminario de Historia Rural Andina, 1972), 3:525–55 (originally published in *La Prensa Peruana,* Lima, 1826). See also *Prensa Peruana,* 3 Mar. 1828, and other sources (Memorias de Hacienda). "Aspectos históricos" describes Larrea's efforts, without citing sources, but simply considers the census failed and unpublished (p. 11). Yet its data somehow found their way into the famous French census collection of Coquebert de Montbert. Occasionally, even aggregates are cited for a "La Mar census," as in Arco Parró's "Sinopsis histórica." But the figure of 1,249,728 actually represents a common 1791 estimate including Puno.

16. Notably, Macera published twenty-nine of the documents in his 1972 *Tierra y población* (3:557–623), along with later archival matrículas. Sánchez-Albornoz reproduced twenty of these in *The Population of Latin America,* p. 111, t. 4.3. Neither analyst attempts to compile or analyze the material as a viable census.

17. This database provides 59 percent of the 1827 population produced below. Because Peruvian periodical collections vary in breadth (Yale's Sterling Library is the best), the "Estadística" sources listed here are arranged in order of encounter in the official gazette *La Prensa Peruana* (PP) or copies in *El Telégrafo de Lima* (TL). For the department of Lima: Canta (PP, 1 Aug. 1827); Lima (PP, 13 Aug. 1828); Chancay (PP, 4 Sept. 1828); Cañete (TL, 25 Aug. 1828); Huarochirí (TL, 16 Oct. 1828); Yauyos (PP, 29 April 1828); and Santa (TL, 1 Aug. 1828). For Junín: Pasco (PP, 26 Aug. 1829); Huánuco (PP, 26 Aug. 1829); Jauja (PP, 29 Aug. 1829); Huaylas (PP, 5 Sept. 1829); Huamalíes (PP, 5 Sept. 1829); Cajatambo (PP, 25 April 1829); Conchucos Alto/Huari (PP, 12 May 1829); and Conchucos Bajo (PP, 12 May 1829). For La Libertad: Cajamarca (PP, 11 Aug. 1829); Chachapoyas (PP, 11 July 1829); and Piura (PP, 24 Feb. 1829). For Cuzco: Abancay (PP, 23 May 1829); Calca y Lares (TL, 26 July 1828); Quispicanchi (PP, 13 May 1828); Urubamba (PP, 14 March 1829); Paucartambo (PP, 17 Mar. 1829); and Paruro (PP, 1 Apr. 1829). For Ayacucho: Huamanga (incomplete, PP, 14 Feb. 1827); Angaraes Huancavelica (PP, 5 Mar. 1829); Parinacochas (PP, 21 Apr. 1829); and Lucanas (TL, 25 Oct. 1828). For Puno: Azángaro (PP, 16 Feb. 1829); Carabaya (TL, 3 Jan. 1829); Lampa (PP, 27 Dec. 1828); Chucuito (TL, 27 Dec. 1828); and Puno Huancané (TL, 17 Dec. 1828). For Arequipa: Arica/Tacna (PP, 5 May 1829). Most stray descriptions of other provinces appeared in late 1829 in both papers. The total of thirty-four is the full extent of published (or promptly delivered) data on provinces because, with one exception, it squares with notices published by the finance ministry in "Estado de débito en que se hallan las subprefecturas de departa-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These data can thus form the basis for regional and caste distribution studies, if not a full national product estimate for 1827. For example, in the crudest calculation, Peruvian per capita income was a believable 30.4 current pesos in 1827 (with Indians averaging 22.8 and non-Indians, 45.5 pesos).[18] More central to the present study, the series definitively proves the inauthenticity of the 1836 census. All the northern departmental statistics already existed a decade earlier (the 1836 "census" simply copied 1827 figures), and the population of the southern departments in 1827 inevitably exceeded the colonial figures still being cited for 1836. This distortion is the central one in early republican demographic rates, not any lack of data. Moreover, with these new data, historians can now construct a new estimate of the total 1827 population, a reliable one that can resolve many of the mysteries enumerated above.

The first orders to conduct a republican matrícula census, for fiscal and electoral purposes, were issued in early 1826. The head count was managed by Peru's capable Ministro de Hacienda, José de Larrea y Loredo. His introductory treatise written for census takers in the "Juntas Departamentales" elaborates theoretical and practical aspects of statistics and even ventures a preliminary calculation of the population.[19] If birthrates were "normal" between 1795 and 1826, Peru's population should have approached 1,700,000 by 1826, including slave and white immigrants. The actual expansion, however, would have been slower in the era of colonial crisis.

By August 1827, the first provincial *Estadísticas* began appearing in the Lima press; by mid-1829, thirty-four had been published (see table 3). Some local statisticians were extremely zealous. One surviving sample is the famous *Ensayo de estadística completa de Azángaro* by José Domingo Choquehuanca for the province of Azángaro (Puno), which was later published as a seventy-page book listing minutely the population, property, activities, and trade of every hamlet in the district. Following the same model, a detailed occupational and foreign census of Lima also

mentos . . . por contribuciones" (*Telégrafo*, 13 Dec. 1828) and "Razón del número de contribuyentes comprendidos en los departamentos de la República" (*Prensa Peruana*, 5 Mar. 1829). But a few matrículas were also published for the later 1830s, and this account does not limit the number of censuses actually mounted in the 1820s. Kubler, for example, cites an 1834 document alluding to 118 early registers.

18. These estimates can be further developed to help measure growth and distribution throughout the century; an alternative tax-based calculation produces a comparable 28.4 pesos of per capita income. Both are "ballpark" figures, closely trailing estimates for Mexico, as expected. On Mexico, see John H. Coatsworth, "Obstacles to Economic Growth in Nineteenth-Century Mexico," *American Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (Feb. 1978):81–85.

19. Larrea, "Bases para la estadística," 3:543–49. Larrea's estimate assumed a natural net increase of 14,103 annually from 1790, 1500 in slave imports (a high late-colonial rate that historians do not address), and 300 in European immigration. But his increase of 472,859 over a population in the 1790s cited as 1,325,000 has been adjusted downward because Larrea actually uses the first republican Puno estimates of 205,000 in his base.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

survives, which predates the similar 1837 *Estadística histórica, geográfica y comercial de los pueblos de Lima* of José María Córdova y Urrutia.[20] But other prefects, particularly in the far north (La Libertad) and far south (Arequipa), lapsed in zeal, as might be expected in zones at the fringes of the Lima state.

A summary fiscal report from March 1829 (covering 237,783 Indian and casta tributaries) laments the fact that thirteen provinces remained unreported: Cangallo, Huamanga, and Castrovirreyna (Department of Ayacucho); Aymaraes (Cuzco); Huamachuco, Chota, and Jaén (La Libertad); and all of Arequipa (Tacna-Arica had actually delivered its census).[21] But several entire departments were complete: the vast and central mestizo zone of Junín-Ancash, with its eight provinces (263,111, one-half of them casta); and for the first time, all five provinces of the dense Indian *altiplano* territory of Puno (200,250, 94.3 percent of them Indian). The department of Lima lacked only the province of Ica, and the census for the capital itself (at 58,326) is new to historians. Coastal slave populations, while unspecified for urban Lima, Ica, and Trujillo, are also crucial findings dating just after the disruptions during the independence era. All the matrículas display documented changes since the 1790s (one official responsibility was to compare rises and falls since 1793). Their variation underscores, along with archival evidence, the actual occurrence of the new head counts. Each report includes up-to-date descriptions of the economy and geography of each province (indicating, for example, those with surviving cottage industries), even from the statistically delinquent zones.[22]

20. J. D. Choquehuanca, *Ensayo de estadística completa de los ramos económicos-políticos de la Provincia de Azángaro en el Departamento de Puno de la República Peruana en el quinquenio desde 1825 hasta 1829 inclusive* (Lima: M. Corral, 1833); J. M. Córdova y Urrutia, *Estadística histórica, geográfica, industrial y comercial de los pueblos que componen las provincias del Departamento de Lima* (Lima: Imp. Instrucción Primaria, 1839), chap. 7. These figures probably date to earlier matrículas, as seen in published updates in *Telégrafo* (Huarochirí and Chancay, 8 Mar. 1837, 12 Aug. 1837) and in *La Miscelánea* (Lima) (Chancay y Santa, 25 Jan. 1831, and Puno, 26 Jan. 1831). Following the same model is a detailed mid-1830s economic census of Huaraz (Huaylas) later published in *El Comercio* (Lima), Dec. 1839–Jan. 1840. Córdova y Urrutia possibly used the unstudied Lima census of 1831, which covers occupations, nationality, and neighborhood composition; an archival version of Districts 1 and 4 is found in the *Biblioteca Municipal de Lima.* All evidence points to a flurry of undiscovered census activity in the early republic.

21. "Razón de número de contribuyentes comprendidos en los departamentos de la República," *Prensa Peruana,* 5 Mar. 1829; "Estado de débito en que se hallan las subprefecturas de departamentos . . . por contribuciones," *Telégrafo,* 13 Dec. 1829.

22. The Lima census ("Province of Cercado," with nearby villages and haciendas) is found in *Prensa Peruana,* 13 Sept. 1828, population 58,326 and income (*riqueza*) of $5,008,177. José Serra thought this total too low by one-third. It is based, however, on a flat 50,000 within city walls and does not differentiate urban Indians and slaves. (Rory Miller points out tricky boundary problems in Lima censuses.) Overall, these totals were reported for slaves: Cañete, 2,132; Chancay, 3,799; Lima (haciendas), 4,602; and Santa, 374. Provinces reporting taxable manufactures were Yauyos, Quispicanchi, Chachapoyas, Cajamarca, Huánuco, Con-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In sum, in Peru's first republican "*empadronamiento*" in 1827, officials exhibited a rare thoroughness for the nineteenth century. It is thus the only matrícula census worthy of the name, given the fact that the Peruvian taxation system was soon to begin its inexorable decline during the rest of the nineteenth century: first, in the political breakdown of the caudillo period, and after 1850, in the fiscal affluence and laxity of the guano era. This fact explains why most of Kubler's archival registers date between 1826 and 1830, and why his figures closely match the numbers published from 1827 to 1829. Far more registers (fifty-eight) were established in the late-1820s than in 1836 (ten), or even during the social peace of the late 1840s (twenty-nine). And these totals consider only the located records, as by 1830, Peruvian treasury documents exhibited a completely revised national tax base. In short, the 1827 census data not only supersede those of 1836, they appear superior to the census of 1850.[23] Moreover, these data can be taken even further.

THE PERUVIAN POPULATION IN 1827

From these and additional sources, scholars can construct a verifiable estimate for Peru's post-independence population. Of the three types of data used, the main building block consists of the thirty-four provinces reporting new direct data for 1827.

The combined population of these thirty-four varied zones was 914,176, with 66 percent (603,057) considered "Indian." Due to boundary changes, however, only thirty provinces (with 839,735 inhabitants) can be compared directly with those of 1791–1793. Their combined increase

desuyos, Pasco, Jauja, Huaylas, Huamalíes, Lambayeque, Cangallo, Piura, Paruro, Parinacochas, Cajatambo, Abancay, Huari, Santa, Lampa, Chuquito, and Puno. These reports include descriptions. The pattern of production was woolens in the south and cottons toward the north. In 1826 Larrea estimated that 25,000 families were already out of work (with an income loss of two million pesos) from import competition. See Larrea, "Bases para la estadística," 542. Perhaps this is the reason why this statistician became a leader in Peru's early protectionist movement. See José de Larrea y Loredo, *Principios que siguió el ciudadano J. de Larrea y Loredo en el Ministerio de Hacienda y Sección de Negocios Eclesiásticos de que estuve encargado* (Lima: J. M. Concha, 1827).

23. Kubler, *Indian Caste of Peru*, t. 1. Ideally, the total over the period 1826–1854, at five-year intervals, would be 348 registers; 118 were known to exist by 1834. See J. M. Pando, *Memoria sobre el estado de la Hacienda de la República Peruana, en fin del año de 1830, presentado al Congreso por J. M. Pando* (Lima: J. Masías, 1831), app. 4, "Estado que manifiesta lo debido cobrar en las contribuciones directas por un año, término medio, de julio de 1826 a dic. de 1829." On the tax base generally, consult José Serra, "Memoria sobre el curso y progreso de las contribuciones, 1831," in Macera's *Tierra y población en el Perú (ss. xviii–xix)* (1977) 2:441–51. Since Kubler's study over thirty years ago, newly located registers should have appeared in the Archivo General de la Nación (mostly in AGN sec. H-4, where I counted 56 listed for the late 1820s, some not used by Kubler). Others are surfacing in regional archives. For a recent study based on archival tax registers (the "patentes" business tax), see Paul Gootenberg, "Artisans and Merchants: The Making of an Open Economy in Lima, Peru, 1820 to 1860," M.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1981.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 3 *Provincial Peruvian Censuses Published for 1827*

Province	*Population*	*Increase over 1793 figures*	*Indians*	*Castas*	*Total Income (pesos)*
Lima					
Lima (Cercado)	58,326	-5,416	2,549	n.d.[a]	3,869,362[b]
Chancay	18,712	4,766	10,791	4,122[c]	661,717
Canta	13,932	1,799	12,368	1,564	347,992
Cañete	13,892	1,276	10,243	1,517[d]	416,661
Huarochirí	16,549	2,525	16,140	409	381,526
Yauyos	12,276	2,702	10,981	1,295	256,277
Santa	2,594	-740	617	1,603[e]	83,634
Total	136,281[f]				
Junín					
Pasco	37,050	2,139	19,380[g]	17,660	1,035,521[h]
Jauja	61,023	8,737	37,854	23,169	1,653,314
Huánuco	14,534	-2,292	9,048	5,486	597,485
Huamalíes	13,172	-1,062	7,121	6,051	373,993
Cajatambo	18,464	1,592	11,321	7,143	491,548
Huaylas	49,667	8,845	25,409	24,250	1,134,258
Conchucos Alto (Huari)	25,091	43,893[i]	6,387	18,754	716,485
Conchucos Bajo	44,110		15,069	29,041	857,687
Total	263,111	61,852	131,589[j]	131,554	6,860,291[j]
La Libertad/Amazonas					
Cajamarca	41,993		21,787	20,206	1,009,904
Piura	53,818	9,327	30,943	22,872	1,097,350
Chachapoyas	14,508	-10,398?[k]	10,275	4,233	349,299
Total	110,319[l]				
Puno					
Azángaro	43,416	n.d.	41,072	2,344	861,988
Huancané (Puno)	36,569	n.d.	35,381	1,182	624,749
Carabaya	18,936	n.d.	17,588	1,348	468,960
Chucuito	52,451	n.d.	49,296	3,155	1,147,502
Lampa	48,878	n.d.	45,513	3,365	1,131,764
Total	200,250	44,250[m]	188,850[n]	11,394	4,234,963[o]
Cuzco					
Quispicanchi	26,865	2,528	23,033	3,832	949,733
Urubamba	14,918	5,668[j]	9,530	5,388	695,101
Paucartambo	12,929	-7,307[j]	12,278	651	310,271
Paruro	12,126	-8,110	9,760	2,366	406,977
Abancay	35,738	10,179	30,654	4,884	798,139
Calca y Lares	13,097	6,899	11,812	1,285	456,489
Total	115,673[p]				

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 3 (continued)

Province	*Population*	*Increase over 1793 figures*	*Indians*	*Castas*	*Total Income (pesos)*
Ayacucho					
Huamanga[q]	6,498	n.d.		n.d.	
Angaraes (Huancavelica)	20,272	11,881[k]	16,819	3,453	874,498
Parinacochas	31,354	15,343	23,942	7,412	494,634
Lucanas	10,233	-5,492	7,551	2,682	492,677
Total	68,357[r]				
Arequipa					
Arica (Tacna)	20,185	1,409	10,545	9,640	668,017
Total	20,185[s]				
National totals[t]	914,176		603,057[u]	311,119[v]	27,651,000[w]

Sources: *La Prensa Peruana*, 1827–1829; *El Telégrafo de Lima*, 1827–1829; see also n. 17 of this article.

[a]No separate data, but 4,602 slaves on suburban haciendas.
[b]$5,157,859; alternative gross estimate for Lima income is "1/4 higher."
[c]And 3,799 slaves.
[d]And 2,132 slaves.
[e]And 374 slaves.
[f]Missing Ica and Callao; for Lima Indians and slaves, suburbs only.
[g]Excluding Cerro de Pasco.
[h]Excluding mines.
[i]Seems to include both "Conchucos"; boundaries uncertain.
[j]Indians are 50 percent of the provincial total; total income represents 26.1 pesos per capita.
[k]Boundary change likely explains unusual negative or positive figure.
[l]Missing Lambayeque, Chota, Huamachuco, Jaén, Maynas, and Pataz.
[m]According to the 1797 census.
[n]94.3 percent of the population.
[o]21.2 pesos per capita.
[p]Missing Cercado, Aymaraes, Cotabambas, Chumbivilcas, and Tinta.
[q]Castrovirreyna district, incomplete.
[r]Missing part of Huamanga and Cangallo, Huanta, Andahuaylas, and Tayacaja.
[s]Missing Cercado, Caylloma, Camaná, Condesuyos, Moquegua, and Tarapacá.
[t]34 provinces out of 57.
[u]66 percent of the population.
[v]Includes 10,907 slaves and undifferentiated "casta" populations of Lima and Huamanga.
[w]30.4 pesos per capita (incomes include taxes).

comes to 162,112 over 1791, accounting for 58.4 percent of Peru's total increase. Thus their expansion rate of 23.9 percent over thirty-six years already represents a far more reasonable pace than previous rates based on the longer lapse to 1836, and in conservative fashion, exceeds those estimates based on weaker data. Overall, these published data account for 59 percent of the 1827 population estimate (see table 4).

The next step is to locate and fit data for the missing twenty-three

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 4 Peruvian Population in 1827

Province	Source	Population
Lima		
Cercado	1827	58,326
Callao	CU	6,516
Chancay	1827	18,712
Canta	1827	13,932
Cañete	1827	13,892
Huarochirí	1827	16,549
Yauyos	1827	12,276
Santa	1827	2,594
Ica	K1836	18,031
Total		160,828
Junín		
Pasco	1827	37,050
Jauja	1827	61,023
Huánuco	1827	14,534
Huamalíes	1827	13,172
Cajatambo	1827	18,464
Huaylas	1827	49,667
Huari	1827	25,091
Conchucos Bajo	1827	44,110
Total	1827	263,111
La Libertad		
Cajamarca	1827	41,993
Piura	1827	53,818
Chota	I	44,953
Lambayeque	K1836	43,202
Huamachuco	K1836	43,058
Jaén	K1836	6,706
Trujillo	K1836[a]	12,032
Total		245,762
Puno		
Azángaro	1827	43,416
Huancané	1827	36,569
Carabaya	1827	18,936
Chucuito	1827	52,451
Lampa	1827	48,878
Total	1827	200,250
Cuzco		
Cercado	1832	40,000
Quispicanchi	1827	26,865
Urubamba	1827	14,918
Paucartambo	1827	12,929
Paruro	1827	12,126
Abancay	1827	34,738
Calca y Lares	1827	13,097
Aymaraes	1832	18,638
Cotabambas	K	21,979
Chumbivilcas	1832	19,048
Tinta	1832,K	36,109
Total		250,447
Ayacucho		
Huamanga	K	18,167
Huancavelica	1827	20,272
Parinacochas	1827	31,354
Cangallo	I	16,325
Lucanas	K	13,843
Huanta	I	22,847
Andahuaylas	K	22,850
Castrovirreyna	I	11,857
Tayacaja	I,K	20,156
Total		177,671
Arequipa		
Arica/Tacna	1827	20,185
Cercado	I	50,769
Caylloma	I	18,676
Camaná	I	10,661
Condesuyos	I	20,658
Moquegua	I	30,330
Tarapacá	I,K	9,171
Total		160,450
Amazonas		
Chachapoyas	1827	14,508
Maynas	1814	26,101
Pataz	K1836	17,565
Total		58,174
National total		1,516,693

Sources: See text for explanation. For 1827 census, see table 2; K denotes the Kubler registers covering 1826–1830; K36, cited by Kubler, using the 1836 "census"; 1832 is the Cuzco census; I stands for interpolated figures, 1791–1850; 1814 refers to the Maynas survey of that year; and CU stands for Córdova y Urrutia's 1837 figure.

[a] 1836 figures actually based on 1791 census.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provinces from Kubler's work and other sources. Kubler's meticulous study provides 164 archival population registers, and virtually all 58 of his earliest counts (1827–1830) crosscheck well with 1827 published figures or differ only by minimal updates. Additional early registers from Kubler, the 1836 "census" (those dating clearly to the late 1820s), and reliable items from the 1832 Cuzco survey all serve as usable data for sixteen of the missing provinces.[24]

This second population block comes to 395,228, with an increase of 88,037 since 1791, or 31.8 percent of the total expansion. Provinces treated in this way include Ica, Huamachuco, Jaén, Pataz, Cuzco (the town, or *cercado*), Aymaraes, Cotabambas, Chumbivilcas, Tinta, Huamanga, Lucanas, and Andahuaylas. No new data exist for Trujillo, but by all accounts, its population barely advanced. The Maynas figure of 26,101 comes from a separate 1814 parish survey, a more rigorous one than most for Amazonia and also inherently conservative.[25] Boundary changes by 1827 are also amended here. Combined with the published block considered above, the calculation now encompasses forty-eight provinces with 1,292,963 inhabitants. Direct data thus forms 85.2 percent of the total estimate for 1827 and more than nine-tenths of Peru's new population growth.

Only nine provinces remain truly sketchy ones: the new northern province of Chota; and in the south, Cangallo, Huanta, Castrovirreyna, Condesuyos, Caylloma, Arequipa (cercado), Camaná, and Moquegua. The method used for this category was to add one-half of their expansion over the period from 1791 to 1850, a modest rise in most cases and one consistent with extant Kubler registers.[26] This interpolated third block contributes 223,730 (or 14.8 percent) to the total population for 1827. Their slower expansion rate of 15.8 percent since 1791 underscores the conservative approach taken with the weakest data.

The final figure of 1,516,693—or one and a half million—is the new

24. See Kubler, *Indian Caste of Peru,* extended tt. 2–3. Another detailed breakdown of (published) provincial statistics can be found in "Población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 62–81; and in its 1832 Cuzco census, 30 (for the original version, see Flores, *Guía del Cuzco*).

25. For discussion of populations of Amazonia, see "Población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," 27–29, 62. In this region of Peru, European disease was still taking a toll in the nineteenth century, and Indianization, by means of literal reconquest of settler groups, went on until the 1850s.

26. For the south, new surveys will likely surface, as regional historians intensify their work (in Buenos Aires or by researching Bolivian confederation records). This estimate, alternatively, could have used annual geometric, provincial, or caste ratios, but the difference is minimal. See my discussion and table 7 of this article. For some recent southern parish demography, see Noble David Cook, *The People of the Colca Valley: A Population Study* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview-Dellplain, 1982); or Luis Miguel Glave, "Demografía y conflicto social: historia de las comunidades campesinas en los Andes del sur," IEP Documento de Trabajo 23 (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1988). Both these sources include some post-independence material.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 5 Revised Demographic Rates of Peruvian Population Growth, 1791–1940

Years Covered	*Growth (%)*	*Time Span (years)*	*Annual Rate (%)*
Revised			
1791–1827	22.4	36	0.56
1827–1850	31.9	23	1.21
1827–1862	62.3	35	1.39
1827–1876	77.9	49	1.18
Context			
1791–1850	61.5	59	0.82
1850–1876	34.9	26	1.03
1791–1876	117.8	85	0.92
1876–1940	130.0	64	1.31

Sources: Author's calculations from tables 1, 2, and 4; annual rate computed by compound interest formula.

estimate of the Peruvian population in 1827. Of these Peruvians, 61.6 percent were Indians, following a parallel tabulation. Except for Arequipa, parts of La Libertad, and the perennial mystery of Amazonia, these figures are unlikely to change much, even if new data should surface. The overall estimate falls short of Larrea's loose projection of 1.7 million, but then it should, being a conservative calculation following the turbulent late colonial years. Like all surveys, the final figure is probably "low." But its deviation from another series—Peru's real population—is likely no greater than in the best census data available.

What does a 1.5 million population in 1827 reveal about demographic growth in Peru? Prior to this estimate, Peruvian demographic rates appeared bizarre. Between 1791 and 1836, growth seemed essentially nil at a 0.23 percent annual rate, before suddenly accelerating to an equally aberrant 2.73 percent rate between 1836 and 1850. By eliminating the bogus 1836 census and substituting the larger and empirical 1827 count, these obvious distortions are eliminated (see table 5). The result now shows that Peru's population grew by an estimated 22.4 percent between 1791 and 1827 and by 31.9 percent between 1827 and 1850. Annual compound growth rates were then 0.56 and 1.21 percent respectively, within a trend of 0.82 registered over the entire span of six decades. By comparison, the rate for 1827–1876 is 1.18 percent and for 1791–1876, 0.92 percent; even the modern trend (1876–1940) is close at 1.31 percent.

These demographic rates of 0.6 to 1.3 percent represent typical ones for buoyant preindustrial societies. For example, the comparable pace in England and Wales just prior to the industrial revolution was 0.71

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

percent; also, nineteenth-century Mexico grew by 0.83 percent annually.[27] The new rates are also in line with Peru's long-term demographic trajectory after the country's belated mid-eighteenth century recuperation from the Indian biological holocaust of the conquest era. Peruvian growth patterns remained notably stable until the (again belated) "population explosion" following World War II, despite an earlier acceleration of migration, urbanization, and mestizaje.

Broad social, economic, and cultural factors must have accounted for these changes, or better said, lack of change. Supporting studies of parish-level fertility and mortality patterns are sorely needed, although they will not likely reveal uniformity across Peru's highly fragmented regional and ethnic societies.[28] One generalization can be made, however. With a characteristic half-century lag, Peru exhibited the extensive "ancien régime" form of demographic growth identified by Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz for all of Latin America since 1700. In Peru, high rural fertility and low life expectancy, based on "natural" Malthusian restraints and possibilities, reigned long into the nineteenth century. While still difficult to assess, biological immunities appeared set by the late-colonial era, although the incidence of epidemic disease did not sharply abate in the nineteenth century. On the one hand, modest gains over traditional disease were reported from vaccination campaigns in 1805–6 and the mid-1840s, but new scourges, chiefly typhoid and yellow fever in the countryside and cholera in the towns, entered the Andes with force, peaking with the sierran pandemics in the late 1850s.[29] On the other hand,

27. See *Population in History,* edited by D. Glass and D. E. C. Eversley (London: E. Arnold, 1965); for the newer British estimate, see R. D. Lee and R. S. Schofield, "British Population in the Eighteenth Century," in *The Economic History of Britain since 1700,* edited by R. Floud and D. McCloskey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 1:17–35. It is worth noting that the stability evident in provincial comparisons of the 1790s and 1827 lends support to both censuses because the first was based on parish records, the second on fiscal counts.

28. In general, the aggregate is likely to have greater reliability than any single one of its provincial building blocks. At this point, it is very difficult to generalize support from the handful of parish, tributary, or district studies with data on the nineteenth century, such as Cook's *People of the Colca Valley* and Glave's "Demografía y conflicto social," and the work of Jean Piel, Carlos Contreras, Nils Jacobsen, and Mario Cárdenas Ayapoma, to be cited subsequently. Such sources clearly show population growth most everywhere in the late colonial era, as seen in the 1770s–1820s tributary *revistas* published by Sánchez-Albornoz in *Population of Latin America,* t. 4.4. Birthrates usually increase somewhere between 1720 and 1760 but exhibit variable (or more unstable) patterns in the early nineteenth century. There were no signs yet of decreasing mortality.

29. Unfortunately, we lack any epidemiology study of the nineteenth century. Two brief surveys are Macera, "Plantaciones azucareras," 195–96 (largely based on Archibald Smith's descriptions); and the fuller account in Nils Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in the Peruvian Altiplano: Azángaro Province, 1770–1920," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1982, 31–37, one of the few studies that integrate demography and social change. See also Sánchez-Albornoz's discussion in *Population in Latin America,* 120–21, as well as chaps. 4–5 for his regional demographic stages. N. D. Cook also finds broad "Malthusian" patterns; see Cook, "Eighteenth-Century Population Change in Andean Peru: Parish of Yanque," in *Stud-*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Peru's consistently high fertility was abetted by a relative abundance of economic resources, chiefly accessible land. The remarkable fact is that Peru's Incan population level of some nine million and its man-land densities were not achieved again until far into the twentieth century. Elastic food supplies derived from these conditions rather than from expanding markets or productivity in this century and a half of largely stagnant rural economy. Peruvian demographic growth thus seems to have been more consistent than in other parts of Latin America, where a "modern" shift upward (based on deepening market dependence, falling death rates, and enhanced mobility) had already begun by the 1850s.

Peru's specific demographic divide between the late colonial and early republican periods is still noticeable, but far less pronounced. The late-colonial period experienced a continuing recovery at 56 per 1000 annually, revealing the trend of Andean biological immunities to traditional Eurasian diseases (the Spanish even helped with their rapid diffusion of smallpox vaccination). Although sporadic droughts and epidemics (as in 1801–1805) may have moderated growth after 1800, multiple calamities ensued during the conflict over independence: economic dislocations after 1810, direct casualties, military recruitment, and political migrations. If Larrea's hunch about expected population was correct, then Peru forfeited some 200,000 "souls" to the crisis. And if so, without the crisis, expansion until 1827 would have paralleled the typically Peruvian rate of 90 per 1000.

Whatever the case, the most striking conclusion is that the population of late-colonial Peru was recovering at a pace much like England's during its great agrarian "take-off." Following independence, demographic catch-up induced a quickened rate of 121 per 1000 over the next quarter-century, before leveling off to rates ranging from 100 to 130 per 1000 over the next century. Whether the divide of independence constitutes incontrovertible proof of the oppression of a backward colonialism versus the enlightened policies of a free republic is best left to the reader's judgment. The idea of a late-imperial black legend is hard to swallow.

Apart from the checks already noted, several calculations verify and amplify the meaning of the 1827 population total. One such calculation is regional change in Peru, which like population growth itself appears to have been remarkably stable until at least the 1860s. In table 6, Peru is divided into northern, central, and southern departments. In 1791 the Indian south predominated with 52.6 percent; the mestizo, commercial, and mining center followed with 28.3 percent; and the agrarian north housed 19.1 percent of population. The new statistics for 1827 as well as the 1850 census reveal a strongly persisting colonial distribution. The only

ies in Spanish American Population History, edited by David Robinson (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1981), 243–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 6 *Regional Populations of Peru, 1791–1876*

Year	*South (%)*	*Central (%)*	*North (%)*	*Total*
1791	651,659	350,371	237,167	1,239,197
	(52.6)	(28.3)	(19.1)	
1827	788,817	423,937	303,939	1,516,693
	(52.0)	(28.0)	(20.0)	
1836[a]	668,802	417,423	287,511	1,373,736
1850	1,035,348	590,776	374,999	2,001,123
	(51.7)	(29.5)	(18.8)	
1862	1,076,134	809,287	576,515	2,461,936
	(43.7)	(32.9)	(23.4)	
1876	1,023,286	997,196	678,624	2,699,106
	(37.9)	(37.0)	(25.1)	

Sources: Table 1 and table 3. The South is defined as the departments of Arequipa, Puno, Cuzco, Ayacucho, and new subdivisions; the Central category includes Lima, Junín-Ancash, and Ica; the North is La Libertad, Piura, Amazonas, and new subdivisions. The 1791 figures represent the rectified census.

[a]Aberrant to trend; the 1836 census is no longer valid.

anomaly emerges when including the invalid 1836 census, which naturally underestimated the south. Peru's regional inertia even contrasts with other "traditional" Latin American countries, such as Mexico, where deep regional demographic transformations had started a century before.[30]

This pattern began to change only by 1862, as the guano era helped invigorate regions linked to the Peruvian central coast. The population of Lima itself, infused by a novel internal migration, doubled to roughly 120,000 by the end of the guano era.[31] By 1876 its pull showed clearly, as the Peruvian center and south became virtually even at 38 percent—a far

30. The relation of regionalism to demography is direct, for example, in consolidating the regional cultural or family patterns behind stable extensive growth, a point often made even in European demographic history. For comparison with Mexico, see John Tutino's analysis in *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986), app. C. In contrast to Peru, Mexico's non-Indian (northern) peripheries grew rapidly in the nineteenth century, setting the country on a radically different ethnic and social course by the 1870s. Peru's relative regional stability also suggests the broadest hypothesis possible about Peruvian demographic history: since 1700, the half-century or more lag evident in initial population recoveries, social change, and *mestizaje* have largely reflected the long-term marginalization of the Andean economy, relative to the "newer" and economically dynamic societies of Latin America. See the subsequent discussion of social change.

31. Miller, "The Population Problem of Lima"; see also detailed migration figures in Fuentes, *Estadística de Lima,* 625–26. The 37,000 new internal migrants (more than 55,000 by 1865) say a great deal about the alleged immobility of nineteenth-century populations. Internal migration was also marked in the central sierra, the other region of vigorous expansion during the guano era. See Carlos Contreras, *Mineros y campesinos en los Andes: mercado laboral y economía campesina en la sierra central, siglo xix* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1987), pt. 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cry from the traditional pattern in which more than half of all Peruvians lived in or around the southern "*mancha india*." But even this development must not be overstated as a clear result of social change. In large part, it simply reflected the devastating typhoid epidemics that swept southern Peru between 1856 and 1859. Although some reports seem exaggerated, casualties (concentrated among Indians of the punas) ran as high as 300,000 in Cuzco, Puno, and Arequipa.[32] If accurate, this toll is sufficient to explain the entire regional shift revealed by the 1862 census.

Scant census data exist for pinpointing the key regional divide between coast and sierra. Two contemporary estimates for the 1790s and 1870s reveal another remarkable continuity: in both eras, about a quarter of the nation lived on the coast and the remaining three-quarters in the highlands and *montaña*. In other respects, Peru exhibited minimal socio-demographic change in the nineteenth century. In 1900 the country ranked the lowest in urbanization of all Latin American countries reporting data (7.4 percent). Only five Peruvian towns exceeded 10,000 inhabitants.[33] All and all, these globally stable conditions underlay Peru's consistent growth in the "old regime" pattern.

One final test of the new 1827 population figure can be culled from other fiscal documents of the time: a tributary-ratio estimate by department. The first source is an official 1829 inventory of the numbers of Indian and casta taxpayers in six departments. The second source, published with the 1830 *Memoria de Hacienda*, lists all "average" late-1820s direct taxes expected from every department: in all, 1,033,402 pesos in Indian tribute, 431,784 from the *contribución de castas*, and less than 137,000 in assorted property and business taxes. This survey also reveals how quickly actual collection waned, particularly among restless mestizos.[34]

32. Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in Azángaro," 31–39 (as reported by Tschudi). Azángaro's population fell by about 20 percent between the 1850 and 1862 censuses, remaining stagnant until 1876. I still have doubts about catastrophic global estimates cited for these epidemics, such as Archibald Smith's "one-quarter" of the peasants of Cuzco. Indians were usually protected by highland dispersal patterns. The aggregate census data (see table 1 of this article) show 10 percent declines in Cuzco between 1850 and 1862 (where 150,000 reputedly perished), 28 percent in Puno, yet large increases in Ayacucho and Huancavelica.

33. Calculated from data in "Población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo." For coast-sierra breakdowns, see Larrea's estimate for 1790, "Bases para la estadística," 540–41; and Smith, "Patterns of Urban and Regional Development," 78. By 1940 the coast held 30 percent of population, a move toward pre-Columbian patterns. On urbanization, see Sánchez-Albornoz, *Population of Latin America*, t. 5.13.

34. The two documents are Ministerio de Hacienda, "Razón del número de contribuyentes comprendidos en los departamentos de la República," *Prensa Peruana*, 5 Mar. 1829; and for average provincial revenues, "Estado que manifiesta lo debido cobrar y cobrado en las contribuciones directas por un año, término medio . . . de julio de 1826 a dic. 1829," in Pando, *Memoria de Hacienda en 1830*, app. 4. An even more detailed breakdown can be found in "Estado de débito en que se hallan las subprefecturas de departamentos . . . por contribuciones," *Telégrafo*, 13 Dec. 1828. Similar accounts appeared in the late 1840s: *Anales de la hacienda pública del Perú*, edited by P. Emilio Dancuart (Lima: Imp. Stolte, 1903), 4:49, 5:215. It is doubtful, given Peru's intervening fiscal decay, that comparative ethnic populations can be derived from these later records.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 7 Tributary Index Estimate for Peruvian Population, 1826–1830

Department	Expected Revenues Ave, 1826–29[a] (in pesos)	Tributaries, Numbers[b]	Population Estimate[c]	Indian Percentages Compared[d]	1827 Census Totals Comparisons (% difference)
Lima					
Indian	73,945	14,643	70,870	44.2/47.0	
Casta	86,101	21,525	89,330		
Total taxes	261,343		160,200		160,828(0.3)
Junín					
Indian	130,270	25,796	124,853	53.6/50.0	
Casta	104,383	26,069	108,297		
Total taxes	246,905		233,150		263,111(11.3)[d,e]
La Libertad					
India	129,796	25,702	124,399	58.6/50.1	
Casta	84,638	21,160	87,812		
Total taxes	217,953		212,211[f]		245,762(13.6)
Puno					
Indian	212,885	42,155	204,032	96.6/94.3	
Casta	13,404	3,351	13,907		
Total taxes	225,289		217,939		200,250(8.8)[e]
Cuzco					
Indian	264,805	52,437	253,793	83.9/79.5	
Casta	47,032	11,758	48,796		
Total taxes	317,591		302,589		250,447(20.8)
Ayacucho					
Indian	128,276	25,401	122,942	73.9/73.0	
Casta	41,860	10,465	43,430		
Total taxes	176,747		166,372		177,671(6.3)
Arequipa					
Indian	94,420	18,697	90,494	61.6/45.0	
Casta	54,364	13,591	56,403		
Total taxes	157,164		146,897		160,450(8.4)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 7 (continued)

Department	Expected Revenues Ave, 1826–29[a] (in pesos)	Tributaries, Numbers[b]	Population Estimate[c]	Indian Percentages Compared[d]	1827 Census Totals Comparisons (% difference)
All Peru					
Indian	1,033,402	204,634	990,429	68.9/61.6	
Casta	431,784	107,946	447,976		
Total taxes	1,604,001		1,438,405[g]		1,516,693[h](5.1)

Sources: For an explanation of method, see text. On caste revenues, Pando, *Memoria de Hacienda en 1830,* app. 4, "Estado que manifiesta lo debido cobrar en contribuciones"; on tributary ratios: "Razón de contribuyentes de los departamentos," *Prensa Peruana,* 5 Mar. 1829; tables 4 and 8 of this article.

[a]Total figures in this column are expected tax revenues, not just Indian and casta tributes.
[b]Tributary numbers were calculated by dividing the expected revenues for Indians by 5.05 and that of castas by 4.00 (average tribute ratios).
[c]These estimates were calculated by multiplying the number of Indians by 4.84 and the number of castas by 4.15 (average family-size ratios).
[d]First departmental Indian percentage is from this estimate, the second from 1827 (see table 8).
[e]Junín and Puno differences due only to tributary ratio averaging.
[f]Revenue figures exclude Amazonas; with Amazonas, departmental population is 270,385.
[g]Including the Amazonas figure of 58,174, the total is 1,496,579.
[h]All population figures in column from table 4. With Amazonas figures in estimate, the total (national) difference reduces to 1.3 percent.

The first task here is to calculate average tributary ratios and family size. Head-tax rates and collections varied considerably over these years, as did the family unit associated with each taxpayer. Only Junín and Puno enjoy a complete set of population, tributary, and revenue data, but Junín was also the country's largest mestizo department and Puno the most Indian department. As examples, in Puno, indigenous taxpayers paid an average 4.7 pesos in tribute, and each tributary represented a family of 4.17 persons; meanwhile, each casta delivered a tax of 4.4 pesos for 3.73 dependents. When combined with Junín's slightly different figures, the two provinces yield average national ratios for Indians of 5.05 pesos, and 4.84 family members; castas averaged 4 pesos and a family size of 4.15. To estimate Peru's total ethnic populations, these ratios can then be divided and multiplied against the revenues earmarked for each ethnic group for each of Peru's seven departments (see table 7).[35]

35. These ratios are not ideal national tributary ratios in that we do not know how well Junín and Puno represent national distributions. A more precise method would use detailed provincial data, which is lacking. Puno and Junín differ from 1827 totals in this test due only to their averaging. For the use of tributary ratios in population estimates, see Cook, *Demographic Collapse,* chap. 6. In his central sierra study, Contreras finds the average Indian family size to have been 4.8 persons and the average casta family, 3.8. He also found highly variable

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The results summarized in table 7 are consistent with the direct 1827 population estimate for all of Peru, for its departmental totals, and for ethnic composition. Lima and Arequipa prove very close fits while all others (save Cuzco) demonstrate a margin of difference of only 5 to 10 percent. Arequipa was a vital test of the new total because the direct census record was weakest in the far south. At the least, Peru's early fiscal and population data exhibit compatibility. Overall, a tax quota yields a Peruvian population of 1,438,405, versus the 1827 direct count of 1,516,693. If one adds Amazonia (not included in the tribute documents), the difference between the two estimates is a mere 1.3 percent, a gap explicable by Peru's tiny minorities of white landlords, urban artisans, and black slaves. In short, Peru's 1827 population was indeed about 1.5 million.

INDIAN PERU

New insights are also possible on the Indian population of Peru in 1827 and beyond from combining these fresh data with a reworking of older information. The point of departure is Kubler's *The Indian Caste of Peru*. This 1952 study still provides the best map into the murky landscapes of ethnic and social change in republican Peru. By adopting the tax collectors' (somewhat controversial) social definition of *"indio"* and *"casta,"* Kubler discovered that Indian majorities actually increased throughout much of the nineteenth century, the only era in Andean history that halted, if not reversed, cultural and demographic mestizaje. This phenomenon is the root cause of contemporary Peru's extraordinary indigenous presence. Much qualitative evidence now supports this view, for the early nineteenth century represents a period when dominant white society was weakened by the stresses of economic decay, political chaos, and institutional uncertainties of the colonial transition. According to Kubler, in 1795 Indians comprised 57.6 percent of colonial population and then increased to 59.3 percent of the new nation in the broad interval between 1826 and 1854. Their numbers began to decline to 54.8 percent in 1876 and to some 40 percent by the mid-twentieth century.[36] Kubler's disaggregated regional evidence and analysis offer even richer insights. The

tribute rates. See Carlos Contreras, "Estado republicano y tributos indígenas en la sierra central en la postindependencia," *Histórica* 13, no. 1 (July 1989):9–44.

36. For provincial analysis, see Kubler, *Indian Caste of Peru*, tt. 2–3, 9, and all maps. A major dilemma in all such analysis is how "Indians" were defined. By the few indications known, early censuses used colonial-adscriptive criteria (inconsistently managed by mayors, caciques, priests, and tax-collectors). In the 1876 survey, self-identification was practiced, but surveyors were also instructed to make "delicate" ad-hoc decisions by sight or links of parentage. See Díaz, *Censo general de 1876*, 25. Nowhere, unfortunately, was language data collected, a major indicator of Indian life-style.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consistency and veracity with which the census takers defined and counted "Indians" is nevertheless always open to question.

The present study supports Kubler's findings, with some minor and major qualifications. Table 8 contains revised 1827 Indian populations by province, based on the new census data for thirty-three provinces, combined with some of Kubler's earliest republican archival registers. Of Peru's total 1.5 million population, 61.6 percent (934,816) were deemed Indians. This proportion slightly exceeds Kubler's estimate of 59.3 percent for the long interval from 1826 to 1854 (also shown by province), and it is calculated on a significantly wider population base (all fifty-seven provinces rather than only forty-three). Province by province, fourteen zones display Indian compositions that differ by 5 percent or more from Kubler's set, while three others reveal new data where none existed before (all are marked for interested ethnohistorians).[37] Half of these revised provinces were confined to Peru's central region, however. Only Chancay, Abancay, Arica, and Parinacochas diverge to any significant degree, and only the last shows any real shift from Indian to mestizo majority. The basic profile, then, is much like Kubler's: slightly increasing Indian populations near Lima and in the southern sierra, and modest mestizo advances in parts of Junín, La Libertad, and the hinterlands of Arequipa. Thus as disaggregates, the new information basically underscores Kubler's conclusions at the regional level, where his most telling ethnic comparisons emerge. This coincidence is not surprising, given the fact that both estimates are based on the same type of early fiscal surveys.

One notable revision is the precise date of the new 1827 calculation. Before the advent of independence, Peru's "Indianization" was already pronounced or had grown more intense. This date should replace Kubler's vague use of the amalgam period of 1826–1854, which suggested Indian recuperation as an early republican rather than a late-colonial phenomenon. In part, this trend must have reflected the heightened sense, and the enforcement, of caste hierarchy during the late colonial regime, particularly in the aftermath of the Túpac Amaru revolt. Yet other evidence points to real Indian demographic buoyancy, such as the larger Indian family typical of the 1820s.[38] Again, it is difficult to attribute a demographic black legend to the eve of colonialism. More important, the key

37. Precise comparisons among data in my table 8 are difficult. In several cases (especially Cuzco and Ayacucho), republican boundary shifts appear to be a factor in contrast with Kubler. Two provinces show unusual Indian majorities due to conservative interpolations of total population.

38. Kubler makes one attempt to refine zones where change seemed to occur between 1826 and 1854 (see maps 11–12). For late-colonial conditions affecting Indians, see John Fisher, *Government and Society in Colonial Peru* (London: Athlone Press, 1970), esp. chaps. 4 and 6. For a revised (and less drastic) view of the demographic impact of the Túpac Amaru war, see Magnus Mörner, *Perfil de la sociedad rural del Cuzco a fines de la colonia* (Lima: Universidad del Pacífico, 1977), 123–29.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 8 *Peruvian Indian Populations, Revised according to 1827 Figures*

Province	*Source*	*Indians in 1827*	*Percentage in 1827*	*Percentage per Kubler (1826/54)*	*Percentage in 1793–95*
Lima					
Cercado	K1827	9,690	16.6	14.9	15.5
Chancay	1827	10,791	57.7	70.2[a]	53.8
Canta	1827	12,368	88.8	74.4[a]	85.2
Cañete	1827	10,243	73.7	n.d.[b]	55.7
Huarochirí	1827	16,140	97.5	93.9	93.3
Yauyos	1827	10,981	89.5	91.3	83.6
Santa	1827	617	38.5	19.2[a]	26.2
Ica	K1830	4,754	26.4	67.6[c]	32.1
Departmental totals		75,584	47.0		42.4
Junín					
Pasco	1827	19,380[e]	52.3	n.d.[b]	53.9
Jauja	1827	37,854	62.6	57.1[a]	54.5
Huánuco	1827	9,048	62.3	62.3	45.2
Huamalíes	1827	7,121	54.1	49.1[a]	62.9
Cajatambo	1827	11,321	61.3	62.7	62.2
Huaylas	1827	25,409	51.2	50.1	51.3
C.A./Huari	1827	6,387	25.5	21.9	39.1
Conchucos Bajo	1827	15,069	34.0	45.7[c]	
Departmental totals		131,589	50.0		52.3
La Libertad/Amazonas					
Cajamarca (Chota)	1827	21,787	51.9	47.3/36.9[e]	47.7
Piura	1827	30,943	57.5	57.5	55.7
Lambayeque	1795	22,333	51.7?	n.d.[d]	63.5
Huamachuco	K1826	18,762	43.6	43.6	44.9
Jaén	K1837	1,986	29.6	29.6	49.2
Trujillo	K1850	4,164	34.6	57.8[d]	38.0
Chachapoyas	1827	10,275	70.8	54.3[c]	49.2
Maynas	[e]	20,000	76.6	n.d.[d]	n.d.
Pataz	K1835	7,476	42.6	43.1	34.3
Departmental totals		137,726	45.3		50.1
Puno					
Azángaro	1827	41,072	94.6	95.7	n.d.
Huancané/Puno	1827	35,381	96.8	96.7	n.d.
Carabaya	1827	17,588	92.9	93.5	
Chucuito	1827	49,296	94.0	87.6[a]	
Lampa	1827	45,513	93.1	n.d.[b]	
Departmental totals		188,850	94.3		
Cuzco					
Cercado	K1840	18,720	46.8	46.8	44.6

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 8 (continued)

Province	*Source*	*Indians in 1827*	*Percentage in 1827*	*Percentage per Kubler (1826/54)*	*Percentage in 1793–95*
Quispicanchi	1827	23,033	87.7	86.1	82.0
Urubamba	1827	9,530	63.8	63.4	55.8
Paucartambo	1827	12,278	94.0	93.3	86.6
Paruro	1827	9,760	80.5	80.7	74.3
Abancay	1827	30,654	85.3	63.2[c]	72.9
Calca y Lares	1827	11,812	90.2	88.0	89.0
Aymaraes	1832	17,776	95.4	72.2[c]	70.6
Cotabambas	K1830	15,614	71.0	71.0	92.0
Chumbivilcas	K1830	16,952	89.0	89.0	71.8
Tinta (Canas)	1832	33,101	91.7	94.0	83.1
Departmental totals		199,230	79.5		75.3
Ayacucho					
Huamanga	K1830	10,758	59.2	92.3[c]	78.9
Huancavelica	1827	16,819	83.0	79.4	74–83[e]
Parinacochas	1827	23,942	76.4	44.8[a]	52.9
Cangallo	1795	10,011	61.3	n.d.[b,c]	80.3
Lucanas	1827	7,551	73.7	79.4[a]	80.8
Huanta	1795	16,981	74.3	n.d.[b,c]	62.1
Andahuaylas	K1836	14,899	65.2	65.2	41.6
Castrovirreyna	1795	8,385	70.7	95.9[c,d]	89.5
Tayacaja	K1830	20,345	(99)	76.8[c,d]	60.5
Departmental totals		129,691	73.0		69.6
Arequipa					
Arica (Tacna)	1827	10,545	52.2	62.0[a]	68.5
Cercado	1895	5,929	11.7	n.d.[d]	15.7
Caylloma	K1843	19,343	(99)	89.9[d]	85.4
Camaná	1795	1,249	11.7	n.d.[d]	12.4
Condesuyos	1795	12,011	58.1	n.d.[d]	59.6
Moquegua	1795	17,272	56.9	n.d.[d]	61.1
Tarapacá	K1840	5,797	63.2	60.2	68.2
Departmental totals		72,146	45.0		48.7
Totals for Peru		934,816	61.6	59.3	61.3

Sources: See discussion in text. K/year denotes Kubler's estimates based on the register or census of indicated year; year alone indicates other census. All Indian statistics of 1827 were calculated as a percentage of 1827 populations (by province, by department, and for all Peru) of table 4.

[a]Divergence of 5 percent or more from Kubler's estimates.
[b]1827 census provides new data.
[c]Possible divergence or distortion from unreliable data.
[d]Comparison difficult due to boundary changes or interpolations of total population.
[e]Uncertain, incomplete, or interpolated data.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analytical question deepens as to when the tide actually turned toward modern mestizaje in the republic. The hiatus in data is now the half-century between 1827 and 1876—or beyond.

A far more serious discrepancy concerns Kubler's presentation and interpretation of national acculturation trends. Table 9 presents revisions of the overall proportion of Indians in the Peruvian population from 1795 through 1940. Kubler's study actually omits fourteen provinces—those that were lacking early republican archival data for long-term comparisons—and thus it surprisingly covers only a fraction of Peru's population. Although Kubler noted this fact, he did not warn scholars of its possibly distorting effect. The most serious omission is the entire department of Puno, Peru's most heavily Indian zone (in 1827, more than 94 percent of its 200,250 inhabitants claimed Indian status). Indeed, for 1795, Kubler's study considers only 68 percent of Peru's total population; for the initial republic, less than 73 percent; for 1876, 65 percent; and 67 percent of the modern 1940 census. Other critics, working directly from late-colonial parish records, have verified Kubler's regional underestimates of Indian populations.[39]

The new data for 1827 allow full comparisons over this critical century and a half. Using an Indian proportion of 94 percent for Puno in 1795 (150,155 Indians), the new 1827 figures—and the ethnic breakdowns published in the censuses of 1795, 1876, and 1940—yield new aggregate trends that differ notably from Kubler's partial ones. In 1795 Peru was 61.3 percent Indian; in 1827, 61.6 percent; in 1876, 57.9 percent; and in 1940, 46.0 percent.[40] This calculation calls into question both the notion of a late-colonial Indian surge and a definitive start to modern mestizaje by 1876.

Setting aside more intricate questions of shifts within and among provinces, these aggregate proportions suggest two trends. First, nineteenth-century ethnic stability was striking, particularly the great continuity between the 1790s and 1830s, when Indian groups remained 62

39. Kubler should have clarified this defect by showing total tabulations of the three censuses used (tt. 4, 8, and 9). He follows this approach only for the 1795 census, the one closest to his own estimate. Also underscoring ethnic data flaws are the undercounts of the 1790s suggested by the Vollmer parish study, cited in Sánchez-Albornoz, *Population of Latin America,* 110; and Browning and Robinson, "Origin and Comparability of Peruvian Data," 28–30. For discussions of long-term Indian statistics (with some error replication), see Thomas M. Davies, *Indian Integration in Peru* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970), 3. He suggests slow but genuine mestizaje by 1876. See also Magnus Mörner, *The Andean Past: Land, Societies, and Conflicts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 207–9.

40. Puno statistics from *Prensa Peruana,* 27 Dec. 1828, 16 Feb. 1829, and *Telégrafo,* 17, 27 Dec. 1828, 3 Jan. 1829. Proportions multiplied against the 156,000 total of the 1790s. The concept of "Indian" (which was never "racial") had become nebulous by the 1940 census because it had lost its older fiscal or adscriptive function. For a critique on this point, see John Rowe, "The Distribution of Indians and Indian Languages in Peru," *Geographic Review* 37, no. 2 (1947): 202–15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 9 Indian Population of Peru, Revisions of Totals, 1795–1940

Year, Source	Population Covered	National Coverage (%)	Number of Indians	Indian Percentage
1795, Kubler	850,980	79.1[a] 68.7[b]	490,515	57.6
1826–1854, Kubler	1,100,150	72.5[c]	651,993	59.3
1876, Kubler	1,776,708	65.8[d]	972,919	54.8
1940, Kubler	4,194,278	67.6[e]	1,758,541	41.9
1795, official	1,076,122	86.9[f]	608,902	56.6
1795, revised	1,238,322	100.0	759,057	61.3
1827, tables 4, 8	1,516,693	100.0	934,816	61.6
1876 census	2,699,106	100.0	1,562,910	57.9
1940 census	6,207,967	100.0	2,856,000	46.0

Sources: Kubler, *Indian Caste of Peru,* tt. 9, 8, 4; table 8 of this article; Peru, *Censo nacional de 1940;* revised 1795 total from addition of Puno and Jaén (162,200 population; 150,155 Indians).

[a]79.1 percent of the 1795 official census.
[b]68.7 percent of the revised 1795 census.
[c]72.5 percent of the 1827 figures (see table 4).
[d]65.8 percent of the 1876 census.
[e]67.6 percent of the 1940 census.
[f]86.9 percent of the revised 1795 census.

percent of the Peruvian population. It is now inappropriate to speak of a global advance of Indian populations, although in some localities such increases did occur. That effect was misconstrued by undercounting the late-colonial Indian population by 4 percent. Similarly, it is difficult to speak of a significantly advancing mestizaje by 1876, given that the Indian proportion nationwide had decreased by merely 3.7 percent. Incomplete data exaggerated that decline. Indeed, the decrease probably lies in the margin of error of the census. It shrinks by another percentage point if one considers the impact of some 90,000 Chinese coolies brought to Peru by 1876. And speaking hypothetically, if one were to measure the effect of the reputed 300,000 Indian victims of the 1850s epidemics, Peru's Indian population would have held firm at precisely 62 percent. In short, prior to the War of the Pacific, historians can attribute no rise in mestizaje to strictly social and cultural changes.

None of these observations, however, deny Kubler's core insight: that in macrohistorical terms, the nineteenth century remains the great exception to a half-millennium record of European encroachment on and assimilation of Indian communities. In fact, the present analysis greatly

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strengthens that conclusion, along with its compelling historical and anthropological implications.[41]

PERIODIZATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Some of these implications must be broached, along with their relation to historical periodization. The most obvious issue is the essentially social, even political definition of *indio.* No biological (much less "racial") scheme can account for these overarching patterns of Indian resurgence, persistence, and decline in Andean society. Clearly, it remains vital to explore the specific changes in epidemiology, fertility, mortality, and sexuality in the nineteenth-century sierra as well as any cultural or ecological influences underlying them. Until such studies are made, further analyses of demographic trends, including this one, remain tentative.[42]

Second, historians must sort out the multiplicity of social, economic, and political factors that bolstered or weakened the integrity of Indian identity and institutions. In this regard, a broad distinction can be drawn between colonial modes of Indianness and mestizaje versus "modern mestizaje," for want of a better term. Put simply, during the colonial era, the Spanish state played a major role in upholding a dual caste society through its judicial, social, and fiscal imperatives, even if reality was a lot messier. The republican state withdrew from the business of regulating caste categories, and a host of impersonal forces—the market, resource pressures, liberal ideology, and class—slowly began to work on Indian attitudes, lifestyles, and social structures.[43] Thus the nineteenth century is notable not only as a break from the centuries-old erosion of Indian

41. Kubler himself stresses the social definition of Indian status over the biological definition and (less convincingly) a stiffened informal caste hierarchy after independence. Part of this paradox—that Indians stabilized in the absence of strict caste definition by the state—is explained by elements of choice explored subsequently.

42. For fragments of local demographic and family data, see "Población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo," pt. 3, "Estadísticas vitales," 95–118; and for 1876–1940, "Factores determinantes del crecimiento de la población," *Informe demográfico del Perú.* The sole detailed studies of birthrates, morbidity, and family concern Lima and are found in Christine Hünefeldt's 1984 manuscript, "Esclavitud urbana y vida familiar en un contexto multiétnico: Lima, primera mitad del siglo 19"; for the 1830s, see Mario Cárdenas Ayapoma, "Demografía del pueblo de Santiago de 'Cercado,' " *Revista del Archivo General de la Nación* 8 (1985):79–111.

43. The social reality of caste delineation was always more complex than Spanish legal norms. For an evaluation, see Herbert S. Klein, "The State and the Labor Market in Rural Bolivia in the Colonial and Early Republican Periods," in *Essays in the Political, Economic, and Social History of Colonial Latin America,* edited by Karen Spalding (Newark: University of Delaware, 1982), 95–106; on social realities, see Oscar Cornblit, "Society and Rebellion in Eighteenth-Century Peru and Bolivia," in *St. Antony's Papers,* edited by R. Carr, vol. 22 (1970):9–44. As with Andean demographic history, the most trenchant work on historical definition of Indian status analyzes the conquest era. See Steve Stern, *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

society but as an interregnum concealing the little-studied shift to new modes of ethnic assimilation.

Third, for varied social contexts, historians and others have begun to discern the power relations that contribute to the marked fluidity of Indian status. For example, when specific advantages accrue to being Indian (say, protection from rapacious landlords or consolidation of land and labor rights), peasants may voluntarily embrace it. Such self-styled Indianness is a hallmark of peasant politics. Alternatively, conscious adoption of mestizo traits has been so ubiquitous in the Andes that an entire vocabulary—that of the *cholo*—has enveloped the transitional social type. At the local level, these dynamics reveal themselves even in the ethnic identifications adopted within the work force of a particular estate or within the class structure of a village community. At the broadest level, traditional Indian society tends to flourish when Europeanized groups are weakened, economically and socially, and to recede during periods of expansion by white society and its allies.[44] Typically, these pretensions of dominant society have swelled during phases of commercial or capitalist dynamism, against the pretensions of a largely "precapitalist" peasantry. Ethnicity, if not governed, is related in the Andes to modes of production. Such generalizations do not even consider pathbreaking approaches to the entrenched Andean ideology of the highland peasantry, which add yet another active dimension to complex understandings of Indian status.[45]

While the new quantifications are helpful, little can be said yet about the timing and causes of modern mestizaje in Peru. These issues are hobbled by the dearth of caste census data between 1827 and 1876 and between 1876 and 1940 and by the scant state of research on the nine-

44. See especially Juan Martínez Alier, *Los huacchilleros del Perú* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1973); Geoffrey Bertram, "New Thinking on the Peruvian Highland Peasantry," *Pacific Viewpoint* 15, no. 2 (Sept. 1974):89–111; Carlos Samaniego, "Peasant Movements at the Turn of the Century and the Rise of the Independent Farmer," in *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru*, edited by Norman Long and Bryan R. Roberts (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978), 45–71; see also aspects of Pablo Macera, "Feudalismo colonial americano: el caso de las haciendas peruanas," in *Trabajos de Historia* 3:139–228. See the general overview of social factors in Erwin Grieshaber, "Hacienda-Indian Community Relations and Indian Acculturation: An Historiographic Essay," *LARR* 14, no. 3 (1979):107–28. The finest empirical work demonstrates such class-ethnic dynamics in predominantly mestizo regions: see Florencia E. Mallon, *The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860–1940* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983); and Brooke Larson, *Colonialism and Agrarian Transformation in Bolivia: Cochabamba, 1550–1900* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988).

45. See Alberto Flores Galindo, *Buscando un inca: identidad y utopía en los Andes* (Lima: Instituto de Apoyo Agrario, 1987); or his synoptic *Europa y el país de los incas* (Lima: IAA, 1986). See also Steve J. Stern, "The Struggle for Solidarity: Class, Culture, and Community in Highland Indian America," *Radical History Review* 27 (1983):21–45, or the essays in Stern's edited collection *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World: 18th to 20th Centuries* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), especially Stern's opening chapter. See also *La participación indígena en los mercados surandinos: estrategias y reproducción social, siglos xvi a xx*, edited by Olivia Harris et al. (La Paz: CERES, 1987).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

teenth-century indigenous community. Overall, however, the foregoing analysis suggests two points. First, Peru's criollization prior to 1876 was nascent and belated, reflecting "ecological" (global) conditions as much as local ones. In other words, the remarkable regional demographic stability evident beyond the 1850s reinforced colonial norms of ethnic identity by fostering the regional societies in which change had to occur. Second, in the absence of change in "ancien régime" demographic behavior, historians should focus on the social and political elements of Indian-mestizo status.[46] Any picture of global stasis, however, must not conceal often deep-seated and subtle republican transformations in the ways of Indian life.

For the early republic, two specific periodizations and views currently dominate thinking about social change and the Indian community. The now traditional view holds that Indians suffered immediate threats with republicanism: from the 1820s abolition of paternalistic caste distinctions, the liberal mid-1820s Bolivarian land decrees (to privatize community land use), and the suppression of traditional Indian leadership. All this legal change was allegedly followed by a wave of expropriations by ambitious white and rising mestizo landlords, the benefactors of land-dispensing caudillos. At least one historian attempted perilously to correlate this "neocolonialism" with the social map of nineteenth-century ethnicity. In the newest neo-Marxist formulation, the initial republic witnessed the rapid consolidation of local ruling classes ("feudal" or otherwise), armed for the first time with political autonomy to exert their own solutions to the "Indian problem."[47] This view is clearly mistaken, as shown by Indian persistence far into the republic. Historians might have suspected this reality already because Peru rapidly rescinded its initial liberal proclamations and restored colonial fiscal-caste categories until the mid-1850s, at least. Nor does genuine evidence exist of aggressive moves against Indian property and labor by Peru's economically and politically beleaguered ruling cliques, particularly in the sierra. Even on their own faulty terms, liberal integrationist ideals failed. More than paper decrees of "Piruvianization" were needed to cajole or coerce Indians into new lives.

46. A simpler (but unsubstantiated) third inference is that global stasis was maintained by higher Indian birthrates that evenly compensated historically consistent losses through migration and mestizaje. The pioneering social approach appeared in Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, *Indios y tributos en el Alto Perú* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1978).

47. For examples, see Jean Piel, "The Place of the Peasantry in the National Life of Peru in the Nineteenth Century," *Past and Present* 46 (Feb. 1970):108–33; Davies, *Indian Integration*, chap. 2; Ernesto Yepes del Castillo, *Perú, 1820–1920: un siglo del desarrollo capitalista* (Lima: IEP, 1973), chaps. 1–2; and Henri Favre, "El mundo andino en tiempos de Bolívar: los Asto entre 1780 y 1830," *Revista del Museo Nacional* 47 (1983–1985):259–71. For the strained analysis of Kubler's mapping, see Jean Piel, *Capitalisme agraire au Pérou* (Paris: Anthropos, 1975), 1:290–316 and 312–13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As an alternative, other historians now suggest strong continuities with colonial caste society. Primarily for fiscal reasons (continuing dependence on native tribute), the feeble national states of the Andes continued to uphold Indian corporate rights, particularly access to protected community lands. Tributes, redubbed *contribuciones,* supplied more than a third of government funds. This "reciprocal pact" was reinforced at the regional level by *gamonales,* caudillos, and priests with vested interests or even cultural affinities with the sierran populace. In Peru, the turning point in this balance came with the official abolition of tribute in 1855, which according to some quickly turned into renewed liberal and landed assaults on Indian prerogatives.[48] One virtue of this explanation, which has been developed highly for the Bolivian experience, is the vibrant role restored to Indian communities, who seized opportunities to assert their interests and culture. It is also more consistent with population trends, scattered impressions of undisturbed Indian lifestyles late into the republic, and other social evidence—such as the surprising half-century of peasant quietism in the Andes. Not one major rebellion rocked Peru between 1815 and the late 1860s.[49]

Still, this tributary-state model, and its explanation of ethnic stability, remains weak for the Peruvian case. Above all, it shares with the "liberal-rape" school the assumption that republican "states" (or their grass-roots surrogates) were coherent or strong enough to affect social change. Yet for all practical purposes, governance of the Peruvian countryside evaporated until at least the 1860s. A tributary-state model narrows complex issues of ethnicity and power to fiscal relations and generalizes from fairly special Bolivian circumstances.[50] In most of Lower Peru,

48. For a Bolivian model, see Tristan Platt, *Estado boliviano y ayllu andino: tierra y tributo en el norte de Potosí* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1982); and Sánchez-Albornoz, *Indios y tributos,* chap. 5. For Ecuador, see Andrés Guerrero, "Curagas y tenientes políticos: la ley de la costumbre y la ley del estado (Otavalo, 1830–1875)," *Revista Andina* 7, no. 2 (Dec. 1989): 321–63, or Martha Moscoso C., "Comunidad, autoridad indígena y poder republicano," 481–501. For Peru, two recent studies are María Isabel Remy, "La sociedad local al inicio de la república: Cuzco, 1824-1850," *Revista Andina* 6, no. 2 (Dec. 1988):451–84; and Glave, "Demografía y conflicto social," 24–31. For the prevailing view of tribute abolition, see Macera, "Plantaciones azucareras," 191–97.

49. For an overview that includes the Andean pattern, see John H. Coatsworth, "Patterns of Rural Rebellion in Latin America: Mexico in Comparative Perspective," *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico,* edited by Friedrich Katz (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), 21–64; and Piel, "Place of the Peasantry."

50. As Platt's work demonstrates, the Bolivian "tributary" state enveloped a fairly coherent mercantilist economy of poverty that involved local grain trades, protectionism, monetary policy, and land policy. No such pattern is evident for Peru, where agrarian protectionism revolved around coastal elites. See Paul Gootenberg, *Between Silver and Guano: Commercial Policy and the State in Postindependence Peru* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), chap. 3. Even for Bolivia, such sociopolitical circumstances were confined to the Potosí area. For interesting regional comparisons, see Larson, *Colonialism and Agrarian Transformation,* chap. 9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

corporate landholding and Indian authorities (caciques, *curacas, alcaldes,* and *varayocs*) were too disrupted by 1821 to support this kind of indirect rule. Nor did forced tributary payments bring tangible benefits, as attested by the irregular course of Peru's Indian "policy." Emerging studies suggest instead idiosyncratic adjustments at the community level (as in Cuzco and Puno), or by the 1840s, an active peasant shift toward cheaper "casta" status, as typified by the emerging associative communities of the Mantaro Basin.[51] By the late 1840s, the sudden affluence of the Peruvian treasury from guano all but eclipsed these tributary vestiges. Yet the resulting national abolition of the *contribución de indígenas* represented no visible watershed in Indian-white relations.

A third interpretation, based on recent social history of the period, might integrate ethnic trends with the region's broadest currents of social change. Specifically, this periodization might link delayed mestizaje to Peru's halting patterns of creole state-building and capitalism. In a long-term comparative sense, the Peruvian pattern reflected the larger political and economic marginalization of the Andes by the Bourbon era, tempered with dynamic Indian responses. Three discernible stages emerge here: a prolonged post-independence stalemate; limited change between 1860 and 1880, and rapid rural transformations after the War of the Pacific. Such a scheme is only suggestive. Periodization must abstract from a perplexing array of obscured local detail, and here it highlights the initial developments between 1820 and 1860.

During the first half-century of republican rule in Peru, neither liberal decrees nor tributary status significantly affected Indian communities. Naturally isolated and sheltered by the breakdown in national politics, communications, and markets during the caudillo era, indigenous communities were left mainly to themselves. No army of local officials entered their hamlets, and the local *hacendado* was reduced to first among equals. Thus Indians were freed from the traditional (or increasingly intrusive) oppressions of the colonial regime, and enjoyed, if by default, a penurious respite from the market pressures of emerging capitalism. During this period, many quietly resisted the encroachments and appeals of Hispanic society, and few stopped or cared to stop being "Indians." Tales abound of *mistis* (provincial whites) adopting Quechua ways, of puna settlements rebuilding themselves. This trend was, above all, a voluntaristic movement: recent studies discern few social blocks to peasant mobility. This concerted withdrawal was reflected in the hopeless

51. See especially Contreras, "Estado republicano y tributo indígena," and Christine Hünefeldt, "Poder y contribuciones: Puno, 1825–1845," *Revista Andina* 7, no. 2 (Dec. 1989):367–409. See also the already cited works by Glave and Remy on Cuzco. I do not mean to downplay the important insights into local power and ethnic arrangements arising from this new research.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

efforts of landed elites, highland and coastal, to recruit native labor by force or monetary incentives. Indeed, throughout the century, the roots of creole Peru's vexing "falta de brazos" problem were more social than quantitative, given the fact that rural populations were expanding briskly.[52]

Broad economic conditions also fostered Indian stabilization. One of them was widespread poverty. Almost by definition, indigenous peoples are poorer than others (at least in monetary terms); in fact, they were on average twice as poor in the 1820s.[53] Their ranks were to swell as markets receded and fragmented in the following forty years. Recourse to subsistence strategies, apart from forestalling hacienda expansion, would also have tempered the internal differentiation of indigenous groups. Yet what allowed the self-sufficient withdrawal of communities were abundant physical resources resulting from persisting low man-land ratios in much of the Andes. This advantage has been shown, for example, even in the relatively populated central highlands, where surplus *tierras vacías* cushioned conflict between estates and villagers for much of the nineteenth century. In distant puna pastoral lands and tropical frontiers, a veritable safety valve emerged.[54] In general, estimates of Indian landholdings run high. For example, one observer guessed that roughly 40 percent of all Indians possessed land in the mid-1840s. In the altiplanos of Puno, native peasants controlled the "majority" of pastures and livestock well beyond the 1850s. In short, such were the extensive conditions underlying old-style demographic growth in Peru, which for varied reasons spelled an efficient revival of Andean ways.

A regional survey reveals that many early economic developments positively enhanced Indian circuits and cultures, inversely to the decay of core Hispanic mining, market, and urban pursuits. In some extreme cases, such as the southern Colca Valley, the colonial elite misti society of

52. This period has been the least studied. The only regional work is Jacobsen's highly detailed study of Azángaro, although important research on communities is now in progress by María Isabel Remy, Marcela Calisto, Christine Hünefeldt, and Cecilia Méndez. For the better-known Bolivian case, see Erwin Grieshaber, "Survival of Indian Communities in Nineteenth-Century Bolivia," Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1977. For a social analysis of the elite's labor shortage, see Macera, "Plantaciones azucareras," 150–98; and a contrasting "resistance" view in Mallon, *Defense of Community,* chap. 2.

53. Recall that on the national level, Indians earned a taxable income of 22.8 pesos annually versus the casta figure of 45.5, as calculated from the 1827 *estadísticas.* Magnus Mörner interprets the Kubler data as the simple concomitant of rural poverty and marginalization. See Mörner, *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America* (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, 1967), 108.

54. See Nelson Manrique, *Mercado interno y región: la sierra central, 1820–1930* (Lima: DESCO, 1987), chap. 3; Jean Piel, "Pastoreo andino y espejismos de eternidad telúrica: la prueba en contrario de la historia demográfica de Espinar (Cusco) de 1689 a 1940," *Revista del Museo Nacional* 47 (1983–1985):280–84; Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in Azángaro," 255; and Juan Bustamante's estimate of landholding, cited in Macera, "Plantaciones azucareras," 277. The most dramatic Indian frontier was the tropical valley of Chanchamayo, where until the 1860s, Campa Indians were actively expelling Spanish settlers. See S. Varese, *La sal de los cerros* (Lima: Retablo de Papel, 1973).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hacendados and miners practically vanished with independence. Indians took to hawking their alpaca wool directly to Arequipan merchants. Ayacucho suffered the long-term collapse of white commercial activities, save for coca production, with its obvious dependence on the peasant economy. This trend helped spark a dramatic resurgence of ancient ethnic politics and autonomy, as played out in the Iquichana revolt in the 1820s.[55] Further south, historians now emphasize how the opening stage of the new wool export trades, which saw particularly high prices for native alpaca, was easily amenable to indigenous herding communities, who bypassed Hispanic intermediaries at revived regional fairs. Recent studies of Cuzco following independence (or the Mancha India at large) belie notions of a move toward regional latifundismo. The picture at mid-century of provinces like Quispicanchi is instead one of villages sharing space with sundry smallholder groups, who enjoyed little edge in technology or resources. A particularly rich study of Espinar (Canas), an overwhelmingly Indian herding zone, reveals how natives "reconquered" their punas while cleverly exploiting emerging wool markets in their "autonmist strategy." This area was one of dramatic long-term Indian population growth and a magnet of flight from nearby haciendas.[56] The town of Cuzco, a former bastion of Spanish control, continued to shrink in size and influence throughout the nineteenth century. In short, Cuzqueño Indianness did not arise from enforced isolation by monopolistic *gamonales*.

In the central sierra, where the eminently Hispanic activity of silver mining enjoyed a comeback in the post-independence years, the Cerro de Pasco mines quickly came to depend on willing part-time Indian mi-

55. See Nelson Manrique, *Colonialismo y pobreza campesina: Caylloma y el valle del Colca, siglos xvi–xx* (Lima: DESCO, 1986), chap. 9; Cecilia Méndez's intriguing political study, "Los campesinos, la independencia y la iniciación de la república en el Perú," FLASCO, Quito, 1990; and Jaime Urrutia, "De las rutas, ferias y circuitos en Huamanga," *Allpanchis* 21 (1983): 47–64.

56. See Karen Spalding, "Class Structures in the Southern Peruvian Highlands, 1750–1920," in *Land and Power in Latin America,* edited by Benjamin Orlove and Glynn Custred (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980), 79–98; Nils Jacobsen, "Desarrollo económico y relaciones de clase en el sur andino, 1790–1920: una réplica a Karen Spalding," *Análisis* 4 (May–Aug. 1979):67–81; María Isabel Remy, "Gamonalismo: tierra y poder local en el siglo xix cuzqueño," B.A. thesis, Universidad Católica del Perú, 1985); Magnus Mörner, "La distribución de ingresos en un distrito andino en los años 1830," *Estudios Andinos* 13 (1977); Michael Gonzales, "Neo-colonialism and Indian Unrest in Southern Peru, 1867–1898," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 6, no. 1 (1987):5–6; and Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in Azángaro," chaps. 4–5. The most explicit and compelling study of Indian economic autonomy is Piel's "Pastoreo andino y historia demográfica de Espinar"; for an account of a similar migratory withdrawal, see Henri Favre, "The Dynamics of Indian Peasant Society and Migration to Coastal Plantations in Central Peru," in *Land and Labour in Latin America,* edited by K. Duncan and I. Rutledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 257–61. Favre is now explicitly researching "Indianization" processes in Huancavelica; see his research report in *Estados y naciones en los Andes,* edited by J. P. Deler and Y. Saint-Geours (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1986), 169.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

grants. Significantly, the mining industry itself had to adjust production schedules to the needs of agrarian rhythms. This arrangement was "articulation," not subordination or proletarianization, in the words of one historian.[57] Aside from tribute demands, Indian workers used their earnings to bolster their exchange networks and elaborate fiesta systems. In this zone of extremely mixed cultural and institutional stocks, resurgent Indianness was pronounced; the flourishing Indian trade center of Huancayo contrasted markedly with the decaying colonial Hispanic town of Jauja. Population grew fastest outside the hacienda, which housed less than one-tenth of the valley's inhabitants. Even in areas where small groups of traditional haciendas dominated land tenure (such as northern Cajamarca, with few corporate villages), recent research has stressed the impact of peasant alternatives. The nineteenth-century labor market was anything but a regional feudal manor. Peasants competed in a number of markets—the plantation coast, Amazonian tropics, and mines—or they invested in their own artisanal and agrarian pursuits.[58] Here a freer assimilation developed toward mestizo status.

This periodization and survey suggest a host of ethnographic questions on the internal makeup and evolution of the republican Indian "community," about which so little is known. The sole true baseline study—from scattered locales on the eve of colonialism (1800–1830)—presents these communities as radically variegated amalgams of social types: traditional Indians, Hispanicized caciques, *yanaconas,* and mestizos mixing in a messy cauldron of internal ethnic, class, and land-related tensions. One historian has depicted them as "Indian only in name," because contrary to Spanish law, whites had injected themselves into the communities, exerting mounting control.[59] Did the subsequent relaxation of external pressures allow for more cohesive community relations, along with resistance to or expulsion of foreigners? Did poverty and lapsed enforcement lead to a general leveling of colonial social categories? Particularly interesting here is the scant reference for nineteenth-century Peru to the ancient colonial dichotomy of *originario* versus *forastero,* which still marked many Bolivian communities. A century earlier, landless forasteros comprised more than a third of natives in some zones,

57. See Contreras, *Mineros y campesinos en los Andes,* pt. 3; Contreras, "Estado republicano y tributo indígena," 19–26; and Manrique, *Mercado interno y región,* chap. 3 (based largely on José María Arguedas's anthropological classic "Evolución de las comunidades campesinas"). Mallon makes valuable close comparisons of Indian-style and mestizo village structures in *Defense of Communities,* chaps. 2–3.

58. Lewis Taylor, "Earning a Living in Huaygayoc, 1870–1900," in Miller, *Region and Class in Peruvian History,* 103–24. The northern highlands remain one of the least studied areas of Peru.

59. See Christine Hünefeldt, *Lucha por la tierra y protesta indígena: las comunidades indígenas del Perú entre colonia y república* (Bonn: Bonner Amerikanische Studien, 1982); and Favre, "El mundo andino entre 1780 y 1830."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such as Cuzco and Trujillo. Their continuing flight underlay viceroyal Peru's tardy stabilization of Indian populations. Historians know that the republican state, at least, assumed a more homogenous view of Indianness. Were the former forasteros informally creating or blending into fixed voluntary communities? If so, was this tendency a major cause of advancing Indianness? Around Canas, this process appears to have been in progress, with or without official guidance; the proportion of forastero Indians grew rapidly after independence, at least until 1845, when recorded distinctions end.[60] At the other end of the spectrum, did near-whites take advantage of independence to leave mestizo roots behind, adding to the more dichotomous ethnic structure captured in nineteenth-century censuses?

The murky evidence suggests overall the consolidation of more "pseudo-Indian" villages, exemplified in the Mantaro region, where all sorts of peasants mimicked many of the norms of cooperative labor and resources of indigenous folk, whether out of necessity or advantage. This behavior is consistent with Andean microeconomics, in which reciprocal tasks (*minkas*) support rational or efficient exploitation of extensive resources, given traditional technologies. But it is not the same as propertied communalism, that erroneous conception of Indianness vaunted by early *indigenistas*. One must stress that even in the most indigenous zones, like Puno, little core agricultural land was actually communally owned or worked by the mid-nineteenth century, unlike pastoral commons. In most cases, one wonders whether communalism ever dominated.[61] If nothing else, this individualism suggests possible effects from early liberal decrees and declining bureaucratic props to corporate property rights once embedded in the colonial regime. At the same time, historians have detected, even among integrated hacienda residents, an informal spread of horizontal ties of "*comunalidad*," which evolved into a

60. See especially Glave, "Demografía y conflicto social," app. tables and 22–24. See Sánchez-Albornoz, *Indios y tributos*, 51–53, 60–64, and chap. 2; and Contreras, "Estado republicano y tributo indígena," 26, 33. Distinctions among forasteros were still made in Peru's 1830 "Memoria de Hacienda"; subsequently, they appear very rarely.

61. For a description of features, see Manrique, *Mercado interno y region*, chap. 3, 152–55; as a social model, see Florencia Mallon, "Microeconomía y campesinado: hacienda, comunidad y coyunturas económicos en el valle de Yanamarca," *Análisis* 4 (1978); for detailed analysis of types of community land tenure, see Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in Azángaro," 675–92. For analysis of horizontal ties, see Nelson Manrique, *Yawar mayu: sociedades terratenientes serranas, 1879–1910* (Lima: DESCO, 1988), esp. chap. 4; and Carlos Contreras, "Mercado de tierras y sociedad campesina: el valle del Mantaro en el siglo xix," paper prepared for the meetings of the Latin American Studies Association in Miami, 4–6 Dec. 1989, 20–23. On these issues, the most useful economic model is that of Daniel Cotlear, *Desarrollo campesino en los Andes: cambio tecnológico y transformación social en las comunidades de la sierra del Perú* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1989), chap. 2. This work exhibits unusual specificity about Andean land-use and the historical relationships among demographic, technological, and institutional change.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pervasive form of cultural resistance by the late nineteenth century. Significantly, all these developments were occurring during the waning or complete absence of traditional curaca leadership.

Whatever the case, it is clear that "Andean" behaviors and institutions were adapting in a radically confused and unstable judicial context, which was neither the sanctioned "Indian Republic" communitarianism of colonial courts nor the freehold individualism announced on paper in republican commercial codes. In some sense, the Indian community was developing, despite its evident vibrancy, in that vulnerable social netherworld reserved for mestizos in the colonial era. In short, study of nineteenth-century communities should prove of utmost interest to ethnohistorians seeking patterns of autonomous Andean consciousness, during this long interval between enforced versions of community and the capitalist erosion of highland culture during the twentieth century.[62]

Given this resilience, the second major phase—beginning with consolidation of a stable creole national state in the 1850s—barely affected Peru's rural stasis. Two broader structural factors also inhibited change. First, the state during the guano era remained highly localized around Lima, anchored as it was in the booming coastal economy of guano. Given the peculiar fiscal wealth and autonomy it generated, no pressing political need registered to integrate peasants or provincial elites into wider efforts at state-building.[63] For example, regional elites appear to have been largely ignored in their local struggles with recalcitrant peasantries. For these reasons, Peru did not suffer a revived liberal offensive against Indianness, such as Bolivia experienced in the 1870s. The abolition of tribute in the 1850s was not followed by positive institutional or integrationist developments, and if anything, loosened ties further between white and Indian society. Second, the locus of the capitalist development that did emerge was mainly confined to the new commercial plantations producing sugar, cotton, and wine on the coast, a world apart from Peru's Indian hinterlands. The planters' massive recourse to an imported variety of proletarians (coolies or uprooted workers) further slowed efforts to involve or induce flows of national labor.

62. Alberto Flores Galindo encapsulates the nineteenth century as one of shrinking national consciousness of the Andean peasant, more reason yet to examine such autonomous rural politics, an important element of "lo andino." See Flores Galindo, "In Search of an Inca," in Stern, *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness,* 207. See also Efraín Kristal's *The Andes Viewed from the City: Literary and Political Discourse on the Indian in Peru, 1848–1930* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987). This study pushes indigenismo origins back to this era but is consciously sparse on social realities.

63. For fiscal analysis of this limited national scope, see Gootenberg, *Between Silver and Guano,* 132–37. For the only study of elite-state interactions outside Lima, see Mallon, *Defense of Community,* chap. 2. On coastal planters and labor recruitment, see Juan Rolf Engelsen, "Social Aspects of Agricultural Expansion in Coastal Peru, 1825–1878," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1977.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nevertheless, the first tangible signs of post-colonial change registered in the 1860s and 1870s. The pace of rural migrations quickened to Lima and a scattering of lowland enterprises. Here and there, moribund provincial power holders began to take more concerted interest in markets and landholdings, as registered in the south. In this sense, whites, or those who might pass as such, were unassimilating from the folk, and with this awakening came ad hoc and localized revivals of petty labor and racialist demands, such as "*enganche*."[64] Strained traditional balances suggest the emergence of a more defensive Indianness, which in the extreme expressed itself in the "caste" explosion of Huancané in 1867. By 1876 a modestly smaller share of Peruvians regarded themselves as Indians, and regional demographic weight was shifting away from the Indian south. But slowly, the social effects of the guano era—the first railroad stops, recovering commercial haciendas, formalized markets, Europeanized high culture, and its trickle of new local officials—were penetrating profounder Peru. For the first time, economic trends were enforcing the anti-Indian liberalism heralded in 1824, although there still would be no Peruvian Porfiriato.

By all recent accounts, the climax of pressures on Indian and rural communities had to wait until after the wrenching disruptions of the War of the Pacific. Historians might ponder why the social and ethnic impact of this second militarism (1879–1895) ran so much deeper than the first (1815–1845). Whatever the explanations (and there are many), by the opening years of the twentieth century, new forms of regional development, foreign investment, vigorously reconstituted provincial elites, and an operational national state all had combined to promote rapidly expanding communications, government, markets, and schools. The groundwork had finally been laid for a capitalist Peru and for successful creole state-building.[65] Massive land-grabs struck the Andes for the first time since the century of conquest, most dramatically in the south. Everywhere, direct control over land became synonymous with elite wealth and influence. Rebellions (and the ubiquitous daily signals of rural conflict) erupted on a scale comparable only with those of the 1780s, including the reactive, millennarian "Incan" kind. There was no lack of oppression,

64. On elite moves back to the haciendas, see Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in Azángaro," chap. 6. On local migrations, see Isabelle Lausent, *Acos: pequeña propiedad, poder y economía de mercado (Valle del Chancay)* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1983), chap. 3. On migration to Lima, see Alfredo Leubel, *El Perú en 1860 o sea anuario nacional* (Lima: Imp. de Comercio, 1860), 266. It would be interesting to know whether such social change followed the course of Peru's railroads prior to 1879, as was dramatically clear in Mexico.

65. This periodization follows Mallon, *Defense of Community,* pt. 2, supported by virtually all the dozens of recent regional studies. On landed expansion, see Jacobsen, "Landtenure and Society in Azángaro," chap. 6. On interior elites, see Manrique, *Yawar mayu.* On social reactions, see Manuel Burga and Alberto Flores Galindo, *Apogeo y crisis de la república aristocrática* (Lima: Richay Peru, 1979), pt. 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

even state-sanctioned violence, in these developments. On the land, a historic demographic threshold had also been crossed: land, not labor, had become the scarce, valuable, and conflict-ridden resource. Peru's century and a half of uninterrupted demographic recovery was definitively eclipsing the extensive institutional and technological customs integral to labor-short Andean agriculture.[66]

Mounting numbers of peasants, faced with diminishing and differentiating resources from within, had to make difficult individual and community choices. Capitalism was transforming Indians into mestizos as well as rural proletarians. In different settings and different ways, the disincentives to maintaining Indian lifestyles became overwhelming.[67] And while the Peruvian state was forced to reenter the business of shoring up indigenous villages by the 1920s (much as under the colonial regime), this time little could be done to quell the growth of modern mestizaje.

With the exception of the sixteenth century and the noble work of N. D. Cook, Peruvian sociodemographic history remains in its infancy. Historians continue to be hobbled by the lack of mid-colonial, republican, and early twentieth-century censuses or by their major flaws. These problems may never be fully rectified. This exercise has focused on the gap from 1790 to 1850 between colonialism and republic. As has been shown, the 1836 "census" never happened; however, Peru's unutilized 1827 fiscal surveys do make a comprehensive population census. These data permit a new estimate of post-independence population of one and a half million Peruvians, 62 percent of them Indian. These verifiable aggregates yield stable and plausible demographic rates for the era and open the way to further refinement of faulty figures.

New information on ethnic groups also underscores the continuities in republican Peru's fundamental social and regional structures. In particular, the country's Indian majority managed to maintain even more stability and autonomy than previously thought—throughout the century. This finding heightens our need to comprehend the persistence of "Indianness" during the first half-century of the republic, as well as the timing and causes of Peru's slow turn toward modern mestizaje by the start of the twentieth century. A synthesis of recent research shows that broad social forces—the halting, uneven movements of nineteenth-century creole state-building and capitalism—worked on extensive demographic condi-

66. Cotlear is the most explicit on the timing of this demographic-economic shift and dissolution of older community norms. See Cotlear, *Desarrollo campesino,* 46–49. For a sharp inside view of one experience, see Enrique Meyer, "Land Tenure and Communal Control of Land in Laros, Yauyos, Peru," manuscript, 1987.

67. After 1920, a massive anthropological (and indigenista) literature began to accumulate on the subject of mestizaje, although it contains surprisingly little historical analysis. See Charles Walker, "El estudio del campesinado en las ciencias sociales peruanas: avances, limitaciones y nuevas perspectivas," *Allpanchis* 33 (1989):165–205.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tions to produce these ethnic continuities. Yet at the same time, this view points to subtle and active changes in the ways of Indian life. But such observations are mere guesses at what is certainly the largest and least-trod topic in modern Andean history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERTRAM, GEOFFREY
1974 "New Thinking on the Peruvian Highland Peasantry." *Pacific Viewpoint* 15, no. 2 (Sept.):89–111.

BROWNING, DAVID, AND DAVID ROBINSON
1976 "The Origin and Comparability of Peruvian Population Data, 1776–1815." *Bulletin of the Society for Latin American Studies* 25 (Nov.):19–37.

BURGA, MANUEL, AND ALBERTO FLORES GALINDO
1979 *Apogeo y crisis de la república aristocrática.* Lima: Richay Peru.

CARDENAS AYAPOMA, MARIO
1985 "Demografía del pueblo de Santiago de 'Cercado.'" *Revista del Archivo General de la Nación* 8 (1985):79–111.

CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS DE POBLACION Y DESARROLLO
1972 "Aspectos históricos." Introduction to *Informe Demográfico del Perú, 1970,* 3–18. Lima: Centro de Estudios de Población y Desarrollo.

COATSWORTH, JOHN H.
1978 "Obstacles to Economic Growth in Nineteenth-Century Mexico." *American Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (Feb.):81–85.
1988 "Patterns of Rural Rebellion in Latin America: Mexico in Comparative Perspective." In *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico,* edited by Friedrich Katz, 21–64. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

CONTRERAS, CARLOS
1987 *Mineros y campesinos en los Andes: mercado laboral y economía campesina en la sierra central, siglo xix.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
1989 "Estado republicano y tributos indígenas en la sierra central en la postindependencia." *Histórica* 13, no. 1 (July):9–44.
1989 "Mercado de tierras y sociedad campesina: el valle del Mantaro en el siglo xix." Paper prepared for the meetings of the Latin American Studies Association, 4–6 December.

COOK, NOBLE DAVID
1981 *Demographic Collapse: Indian Peru, 1520–1620.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1981 "Eighteenth-Century Population Change in Andean Peru: Parish of Yanque." In *Studies in Spanish American Population History,* edited by David Robinson, 243–70. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.
1982 *The People of the Colca Valley: A Population Study.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview-Dellplain.

CORNBLIT, OSCAR
1970 "Society and Rebellion in Eighteenth-Century Peru and Bolivia." *St. Antony's Papers* 22 (1970):9–44.

COTLEAR, DANIEL
1989 *Desarrollo campesino en los Andes: cambio tecnológico y transformación social en las comunidades de la sierra del Perú.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

DAVIES, THOMAS M.
1970 *Indian Integration in Peru.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

DIAZ, ALIDA
1974 *El censo general de 1876 en el Perú.* Lima: Seminario de Historia Rural Andina, 1974.

ENGELSEN, JUAN ROLF
1977 "Social Aspects of Agricultural Expansion in Coastal Peru, 1825–1878." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FAVRE, HENRI
1977 "The Dynamics of Indian Peasant Society and Migration to Coastal Plantations in Central Peru." In *Land and Labour in Latin America,* edited by K. Duncan and I. Rutledge, 257-61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1983–1985 "El mundo andino en tiempos de Bolívar: los Asto entre 1780 y 1830." *Revista del Museo Nacional* 47:259-71.

FISHER, JOHN
1970 *Government and Society in Colonial Peru.* London: Athlone.

FLORES GALINDO, ALBERTO
1986 *Europa y el país de los incas.* Lima: Instituto de Apoyo Agrario.
1987 *Buscando un inca: identidad y utopía en los Andes.* Lima.
1987 "In Search of an Inca." In STERN 1987, 193–210.

GLASS, D., AND D. E. C. EVERSLEY, EDS.
1965 *Population in History.* London: E. Arnold.

GLAVE, LUIS MIGUEL
1988 "Demografía y conflicto social: historia de las comunidades campesinas en los Andes del sur." IEP Documento de Trabajo no. 23. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

GONZALES, MICHAEL
1987 "Neo-colonialism and Indian Unrest in Southern Peru, 1867–1898." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 6, no. 1:5–6.

GOOTENBERG, PAUL
1981 "Artisans and Merchants: The Making of an Open Economy in Lima, Peru, 1820 to 1860." M.Phil. thesis, Oxford University.
1989 *Between Silver and Guano: Commercial Policy and the State in Postindependence Peru.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

GRIESHABER, ERWIN
1977 "Survival of Indian Communities in Nineteenth-Century Bolivia." Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
1979 "Hacienda-Indian Community Relations and Indian Acculturation: An Historiographic Essay." *LARR* 14, no. 3:107–28.

GUERRERO, ANDRES
1989 "Curagas y tenientes políticos: la ley de la costumbre y la ley del estado (Otavalo, 1830–1875)." *Revista Andina* 7, no. 2 (Dec.):321–63.

HARRIS, OLIVIA, ET AL., EDS.
1987 *La participación indígena en los mercados surandinos: estrategias y reproducción social, siglos xvi a xx.* La Paz: CERES, 1987.

HÜNEFELDT, CHRISTINE
1982 *Lucha por la tierra y protesta indígena: las comunidades indígenas del Perú entre colonia y república.* Bonn: Bonner Amerikanische Studien.
1984 "Esclavitud urbana y vida familiar en un contexto multiétnico: Lima, primera mitad del siglo 19." Manuscript, Lima.
1989 "Poder y contribuciones: Puno, 1825–1845." *Revista Andina* 7, no. 2 (Dec.): 367–409.

JACOBSEN, NILS
1979 "Desarrollo económico y relaciones de clase en el sur andino, 1790–1920: una réplica a Karen Spalding." *Análisis* 4 (May–Aug.):67–81.
1982 "Landtenure and Society in the Peruvian Altiplano: Azángaro Province, 1770–1920." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley.

KLEIN, HERBERT S.
1982 "The State and the Labor Market in Rural Bolivia in the Colonial and Early Republican Periods." In *Essays in the Political, Economic, and Social History of Colonial Latin America,* edited by Karen Spalding, 95–106. Newark: University of Delaware.

KRISTAL, EFRAIN
1987 *The Andes Viewed from the City: Literary and Political Discourse on the Indian in Peru, 1848–1930.* New York: Peter Lang.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

KUBLER, GEORGE
1952 *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795–1940: A Population Study Based upon Tax Records and Census Reports.* Institute of Social Anthropology Publication no. 14. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

LARSON, BROOKE
1988 *Colonialism and Agrarian Transformation in Bolivia: Cochabamba, 1550–1900.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

LAUSENT, ISABELLE
1983 *Acos: pequeña propiedad, poder y economía de mercado (Valle del Chancay).* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

LEE, R. D., AND R. S. SCHOFIELD
1981 "British Population in the Eighteenth Century." In *The Economic History of Britain since 1700,* edited by R. Floud and D. McCloskey, 1:17–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MACERA, PABLO
1977 "Las plantaciones azucareras andinas (1821–1875)." In *Trabajos de historia,* edited by Pablo Macera, 4:9–310. Lima: Instituto Nacional de Cultura.
1977 "Feudalismo colonial americano: el caso de las haciendas peruanas." In *Trabajos de historia,* 3:139–228.

MACERA, PABLO, COMP.
1972 *Tierra y población en el Perú (ss. xviii–xix).* Lima: Seminario de Historia Rural Andina.

MALLON, FLORENCIA E.
1978 "Microeconomía y campesinado: hacienda, comunidad y coyunturas económicos en el valle de Yanamarca." *Análisis* 4:39–53.
1983 *The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860–1940.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

MANRIQUE, NELSON
1986 *Colonialismo y pobreza campesina: Caylloma y el Valle del Colca, siglos xvi–xx.* Lima: DESCO.
1987 *Mercado interno y región: la sierra central, 1820–1930.* Lima: DESCO.
1988 *Yawar Mayu: sociedades terratenientes serranas, 1879–1910.* Lima: DESCO.

MARTINEZ ALIER, JUAN
1973 *Los huacchilleros del Perú.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

MENDEZ, CECILIA
1990 "Los campesinos, la independencia y la iniciación de la República en el Perú." Manuscript, FLASCO, Quito.

MEYER, ENRIQUE
1987 "Land Tenure and Communal Control of Land in Laros, Yauyos, Peru." Manuscript.

MILLER, RORY
1988 "The Population Problem in Nineteenth-Century Lima." Manuscript, Amsterdam.

MÖRNER, MAGNUS
1967 *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America.* Boston: Little, Brown.
1977 "La distribución de ingresos en un distrito andino en los años 1830." *Estudios Andinos* 13.
1977 *Perfil de la sociedad rural del Cuzco a fines de la colonia.* Lima: Universidad del Pacífico.
1985 *The Andean Past: Land, Societies. and Conflicts.* New York: Columbia University Press.

MOSCOSO C., MARTHA
1989 "Comunidad, autoridad indígena y poder republicano." *Revista Andina* 7, no. 2 (Dec.):481–501.

PIEL, JEAN
1970 "The Place of the Peasantry in the National Life of Peru in the Nineteenth Century." *Past and Present* 46 (Feb.):108–33.
1975 *Capitalisme agraire au Pérou.* Paris: Anthropos.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1983– "Pastoreo andino y espejismos de eternidad telúrica: la prueba en contrario de la
1985 historia demográfica de Espinar (Cuzco) de 1689 a 1940." *Revista del Museo Nacional* 47:280–84.

PINI RODOLFI, FRANCISCO
1972 "La población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo, 1785–1884." In *Informe Demográfico del Perú, 1970,* 19–125. Lima: Centro de Estudios de Población y Desarrollo.

PINTO, H., AND A. GOICOCHEA
1977 *Ocupaciones en el Perú, 1876.* 4 vols. Lima: Universidad de San Marcos.

PLATT, TRISTAN
1982 *Estado boliviano y ayllu andino: tierra y tributo en el norte de Potosí.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

REMY, MARIA ISABEL
1985 "Gamonalismo: tierra y poder local en el siglo xix cuzqueño." B.A. thesis, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
1988 "La sociedad local al inicio de la República: Cusco, 1824–1850." *Revista Andina* 6, no. 2 (Dec.):451–84.

ROBINSON, DAVID, ED.
1981 *Studies in Spanish American Population History.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

ROWE, JOHN
1947 "The Distribution of Indians and Indian Languages in Peru." *Geographic Review* 37, no. 2:202–15.

SAMANIEGO, CARLOS
1978 "Peasant Movements at the Turn of the Century and the Rise of the Independent Farmer." In *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru,* edited by Norman Long and Bryan R. Roberts, 45–71. Austin: University of Texas Press.

SANCHEZ-ALBORNOZ, NICOLAS
1974 *The Population of Latin America: A History.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974.
1978 *Indios y tributos en el Alto Perú.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

SMITH, CLIFFORD T.
1987 "Patterns of Urban and Regional Development in Peru on the Eve of the Pacific War." In *Region and Class in Modern Peruvian History,* edited by Rory Miller, 77–102. Liverpool: Institute of Latin American Studies.

SPALDING, KAREN
1980 "Class Structures in the Southern Peruvian Highlands, 1750–1920." In *Land and Power in Latin America.,* edited by Benjamin Orlove and Glynn Custred, 79–98. New York: Holmes and Meier.

STERN, STEVE J.
1982 *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
1983 "The Struggle for Solidarity: Class, Culture, and Community in Highland Indian America." *Radical History Review* 27:21–45.

STERN, STEVE J., ED.
1987 *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World: Eighteenth to Twentieth Centuries.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

TANTALEAN A., JAVIER
1983 *Política económico-financiera y la formación del estado: siglo xix.* Lima: CEDEP.

TAYLOR, LEWIS
year "Earning a Living in Huaygayoc, 1870–1900." In *Region and Class in Peruvian History,* edited by Rory Miller, 103–24. Liverpool: Institute of Latin American Studies.

TUTINO, JOHN
1986 *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982.

URRUTIA, JAIME
1983 "De las rutas, ferias y circuitos en Huamanga." *Allpanchis* 21:47–64.

VARESE, STEFANO
1973 *La sal de los cerros.* Lima: Retablo de Papel.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press

WALKER, CHARLES
1989 "El estudio del campesinado en las ciencias sociales peruanas: avances, limitaciones y nuevas perspectivas." *Allpanchis* 33:165–205.

YEPES DEL CASTILLO, ERNESTO
1973 *Perú, 1820–1920: un siglo del desarrollo capitalista.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100023955 Published online by Cambridge University Press