Introduction

It was January 1881, and Manuel González Prada had locked himself in his home. González Prada had begun to visit Lima more often when the War of the Pacific erupted two years earlier in 1879. Soon thereafter he completely abandoned a life of reading and translating on a hacienda in the Malab valley, moved to Lima, and joined the effort to defend the country against the invading Chilean armed forces. During his youth González Prada spent time in the Chilean port city of Valparaíso in the mid-1850s, so this was by no means his first time engaging with Chileans. Still, the Chilean invasion brought out elements of González Prada’s national pride. In 1881 he decided on a way of resisting the Chilean occupying forces: a self-imposed house exile. In the almost two years of his exile, González Prada left his home on only a few occasions. Once he ran into a former classmate from Valparaíso. He refused to acknowledge the classmate. For Luis Alberto Sánchez, the compiler and editor of González Prada’s complete works, “from this incident arose González Prada’s nationalist and patriotic vocation.”

In the years after the War of the Pacific came to a close, González Prada wrote and presented his work to the public in Lima, becoming one of the most influential writers on politics and literature of his generation. The War of the Pacific awoke something in him. He turned to Spain’s invasion of the Peruvian coastline in the mid-1860s to help him think through what it meant to be Peruvian. Although the Spanish attack “gave us our own life, renown, and raised the national spirit,” many in Peru remained “intellectually dependent” on the legacy of the Spanish literary tradition. For González Prada, this created “the indefinite prolonging of childhood.” If the Spanish invasion produced a Peruvian “national spirit,” it was one that confronted a different, and perhaps more unified, nation in the War of the
Pacific in the form of Chile. The war revealed both the limitations of the concept of the Peruvian nation and the deep internal hierarchies across the country. While the Chilean military brought with them their “araucanian ferocity” and “instinct of race” to fight against Peruvians, both suggestive of the internal coherence of the Chilean nation, Peruvians confronted the invaders as “a series of individuals attracted by their individual interests.” The Chileans arrived with the name of their country in their mouths, only to find Peruvians fighting in the name of a caudillo: local strongmen associated with personal, not national, power and politics.

González Prada’s interpretation of the War of the Pacific, and the place of nationalism more broadly, shifted dramatically in the following decades. In the direct aftermath of the war, he recognized the inequalities built into the economic system in Peru. There existed “two patrias” and two classes in Peru: the rich and the poor, owners and the dispossessed. After traveling through Europe, González Prada moved toward an explicitly anarchist political orientation. And he now looked toward Chile with new eyes. Rather than a solidified national body full of “araucanian ferocity,” the Mapocho River crossing Santiago, Chile split social classes similar to how the Rimac River did in Lima. Rather than poor soldiers and marines of one country fighting poor soldiers and marines of another, they would do better to turn their guns around, for their “real enemies are not in front of them.” Instead of a war between states, the real conflict involved internal inequalities and hierarchies. By turning the popular conception of the war around, González Prada linked together nonelites in Peru and Chile, showing nonelites that their “real enemies” might share their national affiliation. This foray into González Prada’s life and writings offers a way into thinking about the relationship between Peruvians and Chileans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, it is suggestive of the two central arguments of this book.

From an emphasis on nationalist divisions to envisioning parallels that connected nonelite Peruvians and Chileans, González Prada’s political trajectory reveals the possibility of cooperative relationships across the Peru-Chile border. Many people in both countries held onto a nationalist view built in part on antagonism toward the people of the neighboring country during and after the War of the Pacific. Within the scholarship on Peru-Chile relations, this perspective centering national conflict has been a structuring element, a presupposition upon which historical inquiry rests. Yet starting from the premise of conflict necessarily forecloses the idea that cooperative
relationships could have existed in the past, or implies that they are not worthy of study. This book, though, begins from the idea that Peruvians and Chileans interacted and thought of each other in many other forms. From everyday interactions at work to transnationally organizing through labor unions, some Peruvians and Chileans created their own relationships that were not bound by the ideological prerogatives of the nation of their birth. That historians and other scholars have viewed Peru-Chile interactions through antagonism is partly a result of perspective and not necessarily how some Peruvians and Chileans lived before and after the War of the Pacific. By not assuming conflict, this book tells the story of people who were unconcerned with the national origins of their coworkers, who collaborated with professionals across the border, or who developed class solidarity regardless of location. The historiographical emphasis on the war and antagonism in the following decades overlooks their lives from the outset.

This reimagining of the Peruvian-Chilean relationship requires an additional, prior step. An underlying argument of this book is that Peruvians and Chileans created what I call a South American Pacific world that allowed for the production of relationships not bound by nationalist divisions. Maritime and port workers, medical professionals, and police in Peru and Chile all relied on the labor and methods of people from across the world. These relationships, moreover, developed in large part through the Pacific Ocean. In calling attention to the South American Pacific, this book uncovers quotidian forms of circulation between Peruvians and Chileans in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By circulation I mean the movement of people, ideas, and diseases, among other things, primarily between Peru and Chile through port cities along the littoral, but also connected to other places across the Pacific. From the nineteenth century onward, these connections increased and created a more linked system than in previous centuries. Even when not directly connected through, for instance, a job site, remarkably similar processes played out in both countries in similar situations. This geographical framework pushes a transnational and oceanic perspective as essential for understanding Peruvian-Chilean relations. While transnational history of Peru-Chile is nothing new, much of the time it has been used as a way of assigning blame in the War of the Pacific. The Peru-Chile relationship also tends to be studied from the contested land border, the Tacna-Arica region. But a transnational and oceanic perspective interested in the construction of the cosmopolitan world created through the Pacific brings into focus people and processes that otherwise would be
overlooked. The South American Pacific, then, is the base through which the book builds historical circulation and the possibility of imagining non-conflictual relationships between Peruvians and Chileans in a history so heavily marked by conflict.

By centering circulation and not assuming antagonism, *Beyond Patriotic Phobias* opens new routes of scholarship, offering a more complete vision of the South American Pacific in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Manuel González Prada’s story is well known as a literary figure, involved in politics from numerous angles, with connections to the labor movement, and as a director of the National Library; it would be difficult to study Peru and not at least read about him at a minimum. Those involved with the War of the Pacific and its aftermath, too, have received plenty of attention from scholars. But so many more Peruvians and Chileans lived and labored across the decades of the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than those directly connected with the war. Some worked the ships connecting trade between the two countries, others read with interest the criminological strategies of the police in the neighboring country, and a few followed cholera’s travels and the doctors researching how to impede its spread. Many of these stories have not been told; when they have, it has often been as a self-contained history focused on one particular topic, such as the history of cholera. But when brought together under the umbrella of the South American Pacific, their sum shows a new way of conceptualizing Peruvian-Chilean relations, one that emphasizes circulation as a foundation and cooperation as a possibility. And considering how much has been written and spoken about the relationship between Peru and Chile centered on division and conflict, this is a significant reevaluation.

## The War of the Pacific

The War of the Pacific is indeed a central part of Peruvian-Chilean relations, and it is no coincidence that much of the field has studied it and its aftermath in such depth. Although this book charts a different path, a brief review of the history will help to put into relief the central arguments on circulation and cooperation. With independence from Spain, many former colonies accepted boundaries determined by Spain under the concept of *uti possidetis*, or “as you possess.” In the 1820s the desert running from northern Chile through Bolivia’s access to the Pacific was not of particular importance
for either state, which meant that neither state was interested in defining the exact border. By the mid-nineteenth century, however, the importance of this region changed with the mining of guano and then nitrates. Despite successive negotiations in the midst of a large Chilean migration to southern Bolivia and Peru and one instance in 1861 of Chilean forces occupying the Bolivian port of Mejillones, the governments of Bolivia and Chile could not come to an agreement on the location of the border. Meanwhile, in 1873 the Bolivian government signed a secret military treaty with the Peruvian government. In August 1874 the Bolivian government set the border at the twenty-fourth parallel south, which the Chilean government agreed to as long as the Bolivian government did not raise taxes for twenty-five years. A new government in Bolivia, combined with complaints by Chileans of unfair treatment and a difficult economic scene, resulted in new taxes on Chilean mining; in turn the Chilean military occupied the Bolivian port of Antofagasta on February 14, 1879. Bolivian President Hilarión Daza declared war on Chile less than two weeks later. Although the Peruvian government tried to help mediate to avoid a war, by April the Chilean government had declared war on Bolivia and Peru, and the War of the Pacific had begun.

The War of the Pacific proved to be especially violent, shocking, and important for all countries involved. The Chilean Navy and Army, which had gained experience in military combat during colonization efforts against indigenous people in the Araucanía region of southern Chile, quickly moved north, securing Bolivian and then Peruvian territory. As the Chilean military occupied cities, they pillaged, razed buildings, and raped women. In at least one case they followed advice from above to not take prisoners; in other words, to kill the wounded and those who had surrendered. This style of warfare did not change much when the Chilean military took over Lima after the battles at Chorrillos and Miraflores, south of downtown Lima. The Peruvian military planted mines to help protect Lima, which according to historian William Sater angered the Chilean military and pushed them to continue with their take-no-prisoners approach. Less than sixty years after expelling the Spanish from Lima, limeños found themselves occupied by a foreign power yet again. At the same time, political forces within Peru split along a few lines. In the north, Miguel Iglesias, a general with war experience at Chorrillos, warmed to the idea of signing a treaty with Chile, called the Treaty of Ancón (1883). Another political line followed the path of Andrés Cáceres, a general who fled into the Andes and helped lead a guerrilla insurgency against the Chilean forces. The Treaty of Ancón brought official peace.
between Peru and Chile, but the resistance led by Cáceres continued beyond the signing of the treaty. The campaign in the Andes was particularly brutal. Chilean soldiers were given the green light to “exterminate” Peruvians involved with the resistance: they inflicted collective punishment on towns, razed churches and towns, and took hostages. Peruvians in the resistance engaged in their share of violence, too, sometimes killing soldiers and then mutilating their bodies.\(^{13}\)

The Treaty of Ancón and a peace settlement with Bolivia in April 1884 would forever change the South American Pacific. Bolivia lost its access to the sea, becoming one of two landlocked countries in South America. The Treaty of Ancón gave the department of Tarapacá to Chile and temporarily handed over the department of Tacna and the province of Arica as well. The Tacna-Arica portion of the treaty loomed large in the minds of those negotiating it, as well as among the populace of both countries, and would continue to be a bitterly contested issue in the postwar world. Although the treaty laid out a path that required a plebiscite to determine which state would permanently hold the territories, when that vote would take place—at the ten-year mark or at some point after ten years—was less clear. In addition, Chilean efforts to chileanize the region through changes to schooling, nationalist newspapers, and reducing the power of Peruvian priests—not to mention mass violence by patriotic Chileans against Peruvians—made the entire process much more akin to a second war than anything else.\(^{14}\) Both states signed the Treaty of Lima in 1929, allowing Tacna to return to Peruvian hands and Arica to officially become Chilean. But the Chilean annexation of previously Peruvian territory and the war more broadly remained on the minds of many.

Beyond the physical territory that switched hands after 1884, the war also changed political, economic, and cultural elements within and across Peru and Chile. Many Peruvians began the search to reconstruct the idea of the nation through political writings, speeches, and cultural production in the aftermath of the war, as José Luis Rénique has shown. For Carmen McEvoy, the war changed the character of republicanism in Peru. While occupying Lima, the Chilean forces confiscated, stole, and sent back to Chile thousands of documents, books, statues, and artwork. Some of these pieces made their way to cities across the country to be displayed in plazas; Luis Montero’s 4.2-by-6-meter oil painting *Los funerales de Atahualpa*, for instance, was taken all the way to the Chilean senate before being returned to Peru in 1885. Some books remained in Chile well into the twenty-first century; in 2007 the Chilean state returned close to four thousand books
to Peru. The war also brought to the fore racist and masculinist ideas of the other: white Chileans had a duty tocivilize the racially other Peru, a Peru filled with effeminate men involved in sexually deviant behavior. Some of these ideas already held sway in the minds of people prior to the war; the war simply helped solidify and enact them in a way unimagined before. Economically, the Peruvian state lost its access to valuable nitrates, from which Chile now profited on a global scale. The war also deeply damaged the Peruvian banking system, and “exports bottomed out at a quarter of prewar levels.” To this day, “memory jolts of the war” continue to play out in Peru and Chile around issues of Chilean companies operating in Peru, the debates on the origins of the brandy pisco, and the YouTube comments on a Chilean-produced documentary miniseries on the War of the Pacific.15

Academics and popular writers have produced libraries’ worth of material on the War of the Pacific and its aftermath. Contemporaries of the negotiations over Tacna-Arica complained of the inability to read the vast amount of literature produced on the topic. A writer for the Valparaíso-based South Pacific Mail wrote in 1925:

In the course of forty years, Tacna-Arica literature has accumulated to an unmanageable extent. It is not the kind of question in which the average man takes interest and nobody would deliberately wade through the flood of books, pamphlets, political documents and newspaper articles dealing with it for pleasure. A really complete study of the history of the problem—it began long before the War of Independence and is still “going strong”—would require, in the first place, a competent knowledge of Spanish (including Peruvian, Bolivia and Chilean variants), very considerable geographical and historical information, and an acquaintance with Latin-American mankind that could only be attained by a life adventure spent in the Southern continent.16

Although the writer certainly wades into hyperbole, the overall sentiment rings true even for 1925. But perhaps one of the most classic examples of debate centers on the Chilean military’s success in their campaign in the Andes when confronting the insurgency. Similar to González Prada’s writings directly after the war, historian Heraclio Bonilla has argued that elite class fractures and vast inequalities in Peru meant that those oppressed by elite Peruvians felt no allegiance to Peru as a concept; while some peasants fought against the Chileans, they were just as likely to confront local elite landowners.17 Responding to Bonilla, historians Florencia Mallon and Nelson Manrique agreed in large part about the inequalities within Andean society and peasant organizing against both Chileans and Peruvian elites.
But they pushed further, suggesting that these moments and actions were connected to a longer history of rural, peasant, and indigenous organizing that proposed its own form of nationalism, one produced locally and that included their hopes and desires.\(^8\)

Despite these differences in opinion, the discussion points to a foundational problem in the literature on the subject: much of the time continual conflict between Peru and Chile is presupposed as the baseline from which to begin. The literature on the War of the Pacific—while adding much to our knowledge of the social history of the war; the political discussions before, during, and after it; and the ins and outs of how both states managed to engage in the war—has largely reproduced an image of Peru and Chile as two states inevitably on a path toward repeated conflict. This body of work also extends this state of conflict beyond the War of the Pacific, stretching from the early nineteenth century to the present. In many of these cases, the War of the Pacific functioned as the central node in making sense of binational relations, with far-reaching consequences for how scholars think of the pre- and postwar eras. Such scholarship, and the memory of the war, seeped deep into the lives of people across Peru, too; one need look no further than José María Arguedas’s 1958 novel *Los ríos profundos*, in which schoolchildren in Abancay, a city in the Andes between Cusco and Ayacucho, played “Peruvians versus Chileans,” a performance of nationalism in which “the Peruvians always had to win.”\(^9\) Recent Chilean fiction also returns to the War of the Pacific as a key marker in national history for both adults and schoolchildren. These accounts critically tell of the ways the War of the Pacific is used to continually teach young people about the “never ending battle with Peru and Bolivia.”\(^10\) In a sense, the war has largely determined the relations between the two countries, and in turn how each country is conceptualized before the study even begins.

But there are other ways of writing the connected histories of Peru and Chile. González Prada’s critique of the internal hierarchies within Peru and his comparative approach to thinking through these inequalities, for instance, point to a different understanding of the historical relationships between Peruvians and Chileans. In this view differences *within* each country sowed the possibility for oppressed groups to rebel against the elite in their respective countries and, perhaps, forge bonds of solidarity across state lines.\(^11\) Even within some of the literature emphasizing conflict, moments of international cooperation emerge.\(^12\) Union organizing by Chilean, Peruvian, and Bolivian miners during a mining strike in the province of Tarapacá in
1907 is one episode many have pointed to as an example of internationalist solidarity. Scholars today are pointing to the need to see both the differences and similarities between the two countries and to write histories with “wider perspectives and more positive directions that do not necessarily negate the past” of war and occupation. This is a project that cannot simply wish away the War of the Pacific, yet it also cannot allow “this past [to] occupy the entire horizon of possibilities for future generations.”

Beginnings matter. How a historical project is conceived and where that history begins influence the types of histories produced. By centering the transnational and oceanic circulations between Peru and Chile and not positing conflict as foundational, Beyond Patriotic Phobias brings together many histories that help to overturn the traditional narrative on Peruvian-Chilean relations. One might, for instance, read an 1864 letter sent from Chile to Peru in a different light. Written in the midst of the Peruvian and allied South American governments’ efforts to fend off the Spanish government’s attempt to retake guano islands, the letter’s Chilean author offered support in the form of a place to repair the Peruvian Amazonas frigate. Given the “sympathies that the Republic of Chile has manifested to Peru,” the author wrote, it should not prove difficult to speed up the repair process in Valparaíso. Although the Peruvian state did not take up the offer, the letter reveals an attempt to show the cooperative relationship between the two states. What makes this exchange even more significant is the author of the letter, one Patricio Lynch. Lynch had just rejoined the Chilean Navy, having worked in the British Royal Navy during the Opium Wars and later with the Chilean Navy up to 1851. After composing the 1864 letter, he became the maritime governor of Valparaíso in 1867. And most important, Lynch would become the commander in chief of the occupation of Peru in the middle of the War of the Pacific. Or we could call attention to a 1922 letter from the Santiago branch of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) directed to the workers of Peru. Armando Triviño, the author of the letter and an active member of the IWW, had recently met the young Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, a student organizer exiled from Peru and future founding member of the American Popular Revolutionary Alliance (APRA). Triviño and the IWW recognized the crimes of the War of the Pacific. Instead of resorting to nationalist division, his analysis led him to write of the “affinity and sympathy with the workers of all regions and countries, including all of you, [rather] than with the capitalist governments of this world.”
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Beyond Patriotic Phobias brings together stories like those of the younger Lynch and Triviño and Haya de la Torre to build the South American Pacific. Peruvians and Chileans did not always push for transnational collaboration against global capitalism; sometimes they simply labored alongside one another. The War of the Pacific certainly was important for many of them. But it also did not have the same meaning for all, and the necessity of working to live meant that sometimes they shared space on a ship or in the city. Even if the people populating this book represent somewhat atypical experiences, they are the ones who “cut across or swam against” the “fundamental currents” of what a historian might expect to find when studying Peru-Chile relations.31 To help decenter the war as the central element in this relationship, the book begins in the 1850s and ends in the 1920s, a time frame that runs counter to much of the literature, which either leads up to the war or begins directly afterward. This periodization reveals a certain amount of continuity of circulation and collaboration that undercuts the war as the major historical event of the era.32

OCEANS AND ANARCHISM AS METHOD

Influential in how I approach this book is the recent turn toward oceans as sites of historical study. By centering oceans, scholars are producing new work that crosses terrestrial borders, studies that take into account politically, culturally, socially, and economically intertwined stories. While oceans connect, they also do not necessarily form a united, total unit; as Braudel suggested in reference to the Mediterranean, the sea can simultaneously “share[] a common destiny” and be thought of as a space in which “there is hardly a bay . . . that is not a miniature community, a complex world in itself.”33 These miniature worlds of the bay that are part of the broader sea are connected, for Braudel, “not by the water, but by the peoples of the sea.”34 For this study, circulation between Peruvians and Chileans was facilitated, at least in part, by the Pacific Ocean. The transnational framework provided by a Pacific lens brings into the story the everyday people, ideas, and organisms of this world: maritime and port workers, doctors, cholera, and criminological theories, among others. It also reveals how these people, ideas, and organisms helped produce transnational relationships without losing the specificity of place. If they created a transnational scale, they did so in particular places. The approach, then, is one of
multiple, simultaneous scales built by a variety of actors, who traversed both land and oceanic spaces.35

The South American Pacific offers a geographic opening up of the study of Peru and Chile as well. Much of the work on Peru and Chile treats both countries as states wherein history occurs on land, and much of the historical narrative in this study does indeed take place on land. But it is also a land that is deeply influenced by the ocean.36 To take one example, the point in the War of the Pacific wherein the Chilean state turned the tide of the war is generally seen as the Battle of Angamos and the Chilean capturing of the Peruvian ironclad Huáscar.37 The ocean, and in this case the military battles on it, is central to understanding the trajectory of the war. For both Peru and Chile, exporting goods overseas was a key aspect of their economic growth—however unequal across society—in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.38 Even more to the point, Peruvian guano, perhaps the key export in the nineteenth century, depended on birds that lived off the fish from the ocean. The ocean also extends the national borders outward into the Pacific, connecting Peruvian and Chilean history to slavers in Oceania, the colonization of Rapa Nui, later called Easter Island, and the many people and ideas that crossed the Pacific in any number of ways. In order to fully think through the oceanic connections and geography of cooperation, the narrative moves from littoral to island, from port to port, and from capital back to sea.

The oceanic perspective also questions some of the emphasis on nationalism so prevalent within Latin American historiography. For years scholars wrestled with the concept of nationalism, of why people in disparate parts of what would become the nation might join together in a common feeling of belonging.39 Rightfully so, many critiqued earlier studies for an elitist approach to the topic, and some began to put forward nonelites as the producers of a particular kind of nationalism in their own right.40 Although one might enter the archive and look for and find nonelite nationalism, this search inadvertently reproduces nationalism as a central category of analysis. One of the major challenges to this convention has been the study of anarchism, an ideology that by definition is antagonistic toward the nation-state. Even when anarchists have written or acted in favor of national liberation, they have done so out of an anti-colonial politics and with an eye toward the inherent contradictions within and across nation-states.41 Oil workers in the Mexican Huasteca, for instance, developed a class consciousness based in part on their placement in a job site hierarchy built on national identity and in part on their differences with labor politics emanating from Mexico.
City. As a marker of the end of their anarcho-syndicalist union organizing, they exchanged their red and black flag for the green, white, and red flag of Mexico. “One by one, hundreds of reds pricked their fingers with a pin and let their blood drip onto the white middle stripe of the flag around the eagle and the serpent.” It was, as historian Myrna I. Santiago points out, the “death of anarcho-syndicalism in favor of nationalism.” Their collective identity formed around a common anarcho-syndicalist idea over and above a nationalist one—indeed, their protest showed that these were two incompatible allegiances.

Methodologically, the anarchist struggle helps with what we might term a suspicion of the nation (and state). Although anarchism is not the subject of every chapter, the entirety of the study takes this suspicion seriously. All of the people in the book labored and lived within national laws, had state police around the corner from them, and were affected by the economic situation in their country. They were not nation- or stateless. But some did find ways of relating to people from other parts of the world that were built on professional contacts, similar interests, or a politics based on destroying the state. In other words, instead of assuming nationalism and the nation—and thus reifying them—the ocean, transnationalism, and anarchism come together to methodologically find other ways of belonging.

CHAPTER BREAKDOWN

The chapters do not represent a chronological movement: the first two cover the 1850s to 1920s, the third the 1880s, the fourth the 1910s and 1920s, and the fifth the 1870s to the 1920s, and the epilogue jumps to the 2000s. Rather, each chapter focuses on a particular analytical slice with built-in connections to other chapters. These bridges across chapters will hopefully draw the reader into the overlaps between the people, ideas, and ideologies that shaped this period. More broadly, the entirety of the book is connected through two central claims: first, that Peruvians and Chileans created a shared space through circulation; and second, that their co-created space produced the possibility of collaboration and parallel developments.

The first two chapters dive directly into the Pacific Ocean and Peru and Chile. Taking a somewhat synchronic form, I bring together a variety of archival materials, including ministry reports, working-class newspapers, ship rolls, judicial cases, and novels, to explore what it meant to live and