tation, and from that day he ate in fellowship and love with the dog and cat.

And . . . And . . . And . . . Still you don't believe! Well, I have to leave.

Note

1 In other words, Martín was not a full priest, but rather a member of the so-called third order of lay brothers under the Dominicans.

THE REBELLION OF TÚPAC AMARU

Alberto Flores Galindo

More than a hundred Indian rebellions rocked the Andes of Peru and Bolivia between 1720 and 1790. The largest was led by José Gabriel Condorcanqui, a prosperous trader and Indian noble who took the name of Túpac Amaru II after the last Inca executed by the Spaniards, from whom he claimed direct descent. While the rebel chief professed loyalty to Christianity and the Spanish king, testifying to heavy European influence on the native elite, he also wanted to build what historian Alberto Flores Galindo calls an "Andean utopia" through a restoration of Inca rule. The threat of this Indian nationalism to white supremacy was reflected in the violence of the final suppression of the rebellion by the colonial authorities.

On November 4, 1780, the Indian leader Túpac Amaru II captured the Spanish *corregidor*, or administrator, Antonio de Arriaga; he would execute him two days later. This took place in Peru's southern Andes in a village called Tinta with a population of about two thousand. It was in Tinta that Indian rebel leaders from Cuzco, Puno, and other villages in the region would gather to come up with a plan not only to end exorbitant taxation by the Spaniards, but to drive out the Europeans and restore an Inca monarchy.

Túpac Amaru's decrees and proclamations would reach across Peru's highland cities. Later, his followers would destroy Spanish estates (*haciendas*) and textile mills (*obrajes*) all the way to Cuzco itself. Nevertheless, five months after Arriaga's execution, the rebel chief and eight other leaders would be arrested and put to death in Cuzco's main square.

But the Great Rebellion—as the colonial authorities called it—did not end with their deaths. It continued in Puno under the leadership of Diego Cristóbal Túpac Amaru, and in parts of present-day Bolivia, northern Argentina, and Chile. The city of La Paz was taken twice

by Julián Apasa Túpac Katari (first for 109 days, then for 64 days). Confronted with the difficulty of subduing the revolt and the tremendous cost of mobilizing troops (against Túpac Amaru alone they sent 17,500 soldiers), the Spaniards negotiated peace with the rebels. Still, conflicts continued. In June 1781, Felipe Velasco Túpac Inca, who regarded himself as Túpac Amaru's brother, tried to organize a rebellion in the mountains of Huarochirí, near the capital of the viceroyalty in Lima. Only the execution of Diego Cristóbal in August 1783 ended this convulsive period of Andean rebellion, which lasted more than three years.

The upheaval covered the entire southern Andes, roughly 200,000 square miles of strategically vital territory. At the very center of Spain's South American dominion, this area included cities such as Arequipa, Cuzco, and La Paz, mining centers such as Potosí, and ports such as Arica, an expanse that cut across key lines of communication between Lima and Buenos Aires. With a dense indigenous population, it was economically varied. Coca was grown in both the upper Amazon valley of Cuzco and the Bolivian lowlands, or *yungas*. Abancay had sugar; Arequipa, wines and liquor; Cochabamba, wheat; Ollantaytambo, corn. Textile mills operated in Cuzco's upper provinces. Trade knit these cities with mule trains, trading posts, and great annual markets like Copacabana, Tungasuca, and Cocharcas.

According to historian Boleslao Lewin, about 100,000 Indians participated in the rebellions, some 40,000 rebels in La Paz alone.[1] If we take into account that insurgent peasants were usually accompanied by their entire families, and if we add to this the people living in rebel-controlled areas, then the number is even higher. To be sure, one should not exaggerate. In Cuzco, for example, there were both rebel and loyalist towns. Divided allegiances sometimes fractured even neighborhoods within towns, as appears to have been the case in Chucuito. The reasons for disunity are complicated. Although there were earlier plans for a rebellion dating from 1770 and the leaders appear to have known each other (Túpac Amaru and Túpac Katari, both muleteers and traders, traveled from one extreme of the southern Andes to the other), the events were not synchronized and each revolt had its own character.

Everyone referred to Túpac Amaru as the Inca. But while in Cuzco, his proclamations were interpreted to call for respect for the property and lives of mixed-bloods (*mestizos*) and creoles (*criollos*); in La Paz it was believed that the Inca wanted all non-Indians put to death in a kind of ethnic cleansing. Some leaders in Atacama held the same opinion. In Arequipa in 1789 and in Oruro in 1781, by contrast, rebel leaders were actually creoles with urban followers composed of a mix of Indians and mixed-bloods. There was not just one, in short, but many faces to the rebellion.

At the moment when these rebels attempted, by one way or another, to transform their world, the Bourbon dynasty under the reign of Charles III (1759–1788) was looking for a way to reorganize the imperial state and to streamline an antiquated colonial system. Andean colonial rule in the mid-eighteenth century followed the same model as that employed in other parts of the hemisphere by both the British and the Spanish. The metropolitan center siphoned off colony surpluses through commercial monopolies, the mining of precious metals, and heavy taxes. It was a system, as one observer has concluded, set up "to obtain the greatest amount of precious metals with the smallest investment possible."[2]

The distinction between colonizers and colonized, at first strictly drawn around the concept of separate "republics" of Spaniards and Indians, blurred with time. After all, unlike the Portuguese colonists in Africa and Asia, the Spaniards did not stay on the coast. To the contrary, they made their way into the interiors of the American continent. There they established mining centers, cities, and estates. Along with colonial administrators came merchants, landlords, and people who simply wanted to "do the Americas." These Spaniards often intermarried with Indians, creating the racial category of *mestizos*. There were also the creoles, of Spanish descent yet born in the Americas. As the lines between colonizers and colonized became less clear, so did the colonies' relation to Madrid. Initially, both Spaniards and creoles could occupy public office. By the first half of the eighteenth century, however, creoles were the majority in municipalities, religious orders, and even in the viceregal administration. Peru was part of the Spanish polity, just like any other imperial province. Together with its European aristocracy, a parallel aristocracy—that of the supposed descendants of the Incas—helped to maintain an illusory image of Peru's equal status within the empire.

To understand Spain's American rule, historian Richard Morse has adopted Max Weber's concept of "patrimonial society."[3] The king occupied the apex of multiple hierarchies whose counterbalances checked secessionism, yet muddled the system's operation. His au-

thority was based on a civil supremacy sealed by church backing. In Peru, this political demarcation divided territory into parishes (*curatos*), magistries (*corregimientos*), and chieftainships (*curacazgos*). Thus Indians had over them a magistrate (*corregidor*), a priest (*cura*), and a chief (*curaca*), and none of them had clearly defined functions. A magistrate might also be a merchant and a priest own lands, the same as a chief, who also might be a merchant. Not surprisingly, conflicts were frequent—often ending in a crossfire of accusations about who exploited Indians worst.

But the advent of the Bourbon dynasty to Spain's crown in the eighteenth century threw the patrimonial system into crisis. Divided was the immense viceroyalty of Peru. The viceroyalties of New Granada (1740) and then Río de la Plata (1776) were created. The Jesuits, who had achieved economic autonomy through their numerous estates and urban properties, were expelled in 1767. The state seized their holdings. In addition, the Bourbons tried to regulate access to public office to streamline bureaucracy. New administrators came from the Iberian peninsula. Creoles began to be displaced from government positions. Crown-appointed inspectors (*visitadores*) were sent to the colonies to limit the power of the viceroys. New taxes were instituted, including a 12.5 percent tax on alcohol. Other taxes increased. The sales tax (*alcabala*) on produce and merchandise, for example, jumped from 2 percent in 1772 to 6 percent in 1776. Customs controls were established, and the accounting system reformed. The government also clamped down on contraband and, in general, on the corruption so common under the patrimonial system. Historian John Lynch calls the Bourbon reforms a "second conquest" of America.[4] Indeed, this was how they must have been viewed by local merchants, artisans, and even Indian tributaries, subjected to a new head count to crack down on tribute evasion. The reforms affected everyone. "Finally," writes historian Timothy Anna, "Spain was exercising a classic commercial imperialism."[5]

The reforms opened an irreparable breach between colonial society and the Crown. Understanding the outbreak of rebellion, however, requires an attention to the particularities of the southern Andes. Among other transformations, mining in Potosí had begun to recuperate in 1740 after a long decline. Together with the development of other mining centers and a gradual demographic recovery after

the cataclysmic conquest, trade intensified across the southern Andes, reflected in the growing number of muleteers. A number of cases illustrate this process. For example, the Cuzco estates of Pachaca, which produced sugar, and Silque, which produced corn, stepped up production. So did textile mills. Increased production and commerce, however, soon overwhelmed the markets of a society ill-equipped to absorb new wealth because of continuing poverty. Between 1759 and 1780, as historians Enrique Tandeter and Nathan Wachtel explain, "the Indians found themselves in a flooded market and had difficulties in obtaining the money needed to pay taxes and for *repartos* (forced purchases of commodities from the government)."[6]

Fully a third of the viceroyalty lived in the southern Andes, and the region's indigenous population was more concentrated than in other colonial territories. Depending on the place, Indians were anywhere from 60 to 100 percent of the population. By the 1780s, as we have seen, they were left to face the ill-fated encounter of economic crisis and political changes. All of this occurred in a space articulated in a manner that almost guaranteed a regional response. The mines of Potosí and cities like Cuzco and La Paz were not just scattered points on the long route between Lima and Buenos Aires. To the contrary, the mercantile economy fostered regional interdependence. Together with peasants and artisans were local merchants like the Ugartes, the La Madrids and the Gutiérrezes as well as Indian traders, some as prosperous as Túpac Amaru and others as poor as Túpac Katari. Many of these traders' names surface in the trials opened against the rebels in 1780. Listed in these records as among Túpac Amaru's closest collaborators, for example, were eight other muleteers. So, too, were some government administrators in Chuquisaca and Cuzco, among them some of the creoles who accompanied the rebels as scribes.

In short, conditions allowed an alternative to colonial domination to emerge in the southern Andes. For this to happen, however, the image of the absolute authority of the Spanish king and the monarchy had to shatter. Inadvertently, the Bourbons had prepared the way for the break-up of Spanish authority through their rapid reforms, but in the southern Andes the process occurred faster than in other places because this was precisely the region where a major sector of the population held to the concept of continuity with a different dynasty: the Incas, not the Bourbons. As the mixed-blood Ramón Ponce, one of Túpac Amaru's main commanders, declared in his confession:

"He said that the kingdom belonged to him, because in the titles and decrees he was the fourth grandson of the last Inca."[7]

At the start of the rebellion, Túpac Amaru had his portrait painted holding the symbols of Inca royalty. Peasants who came to see him treated him as an Inca; and he was received under a canopy in the towns he visited, supervised by a Spanish priest in Andahuaylillas. His orders were to be obeyed because he was the heir to the Inca empire and thought by some even to possess divine powers like the ability to resurrect those who died in his service.

From the beginning, Túpac Amaru was surrounded by a clique of close followers, including his wife Micaela Bastidas, their children, and cousins. This made up the core of an authority structure to supplant the Spaniards. Within the hierarchy were colonels and captains around whom Túpac Amaru hoped to organize an army like that of the Spanish, though various difficulties were to develop with this effort.

The Indians drafted for this new army were summoned by Túpac Amaru himself, or through the intermediacy of his chiefs or newly appointed authorities. As they arrived, sometimes with their wives and children, two immediate problems arose: how they were to be armed and how they would be fed. In addition, according to the European model, soldiers were to be paid a salary as well as provided with coca and alcohol. But the uprisings interrupted trade routes and blocked roads. As months passed, these logistical problems led to desertions, which were severely punished. At one point, León Ponce—Túpac Amaru's lieutenant—was told "to return to his province and bring back as many deserters as could be found there, Indians and Spaniards alike."[8]

Túpac Amaru's army replicated the hierarchy of colonial society. In fact, this restoration of the "authentic" Inca monarchy demonstrated the influence of European concepts on the indigenous aristocracy. Besides the regular army, however, there were also spontaneous uprisings and a multitude of small confrontations. These became more common with the passing months, as the revolution spread south, becoming widespread in the high moors, or *altiplano*. When the followers of Túpac Amaru arrived in Pucara near Lake Titicaca, for instance, they found that an insurrection had already erupted. In places like this, there was a local dynamic to organizing and decision making.

The Spaniards found it difficult to believe that someone like Túpac Katari would assume the title of viceroy without possessing aristocratic

Túpac Amaru II triumphant at the Battle of Sangarará, from a painting on goatskin by an anonymous early-nineteenth-century artist. (Photograph by Pablo Macera)

blood, all the more so since he was poor, dressed in worn clothes, and spoke no Spanish. Truly, the world seemed to have turned upside down. They were, however, better able to understand Túpac Amaru. Some colonial officials were certain that the name of the Incas was itself enough to unite the multitudes. During the rebellion, royal treatment was afforded Túpac Amaru not just by Indians, but also by the Spaniards who followed him. This treatment makes it easier to understand the particular cruelty of the final sentence against the rebel leader. The executions of Túpac Amaru and eight of his followers—the "show," according to a document from the time—lasted from 10:00 A.M. to past 5:00 P.M. on the afternoon of May 18, 1781. The spectacle was meant as a lesson to the Indians. It was supervised by the Crown's new representatives, including Visitor General (Visitador General) José Antonio de Areche and Judge Benito de la Mata Linares, the same people who wanted to reform the region's bureaucracy and increase revenues. The execution occurred within a society where rule would be increasingly based on brute coercion. From 1780 onward, military budgets increased as did the number of soldiers and militiamen. From 4,200 in 1760, the militia in particular grew to 51,467 immediately after the rebellion and finally to 70,000 by 1816. The militarization of the colonies resulted from Túpac Amaru's uprising.[9]

In justifying the sentence, José Antonio de Areche not only mentioned the "horrendous crime" of plotting against the monarchy, but also condemned the fact that many, especially Indians, had treated Túpac Amaru as "his excellence, highness, and majesty." This is why his execution had to be public and the remains spread across the mountains to prove Túpac Amaru was really dead, countering "the superstitions that led the people to believe that it was impossible to kill him because of the nobility of his character, which made him the inheritor of the Incas."[10]

For those who viewed Túpac Amaru as an Inca, however, the body was not that of a prisoner. Rather, it stood for the Indian nation. To quarter and then burn Túpac Amaru's body was to destroy symbolically the Inca empire. Years later, when Diego Cristóbal made peace with the Spaniards, Cristóbal assembled the supposed remains of Túpac Amaru and with great pomp buried them in Cuzco's San Francisco church. Shortly thereafter, however, the Spanish judge Mata Linares had Cristóbal arrested and condemned him to be hanged. After the execution, his body was also quartered and his houses sacked and destroyed.

On Túpac Amaru's death, the colonial authorities prohibited Inca nobility from using titles, ordered the destruction of paintings of the Incas, and forced the Indians to dress in Western clothes. According to Areche, these practices would eventually wipe out hatred toward things European. But the effect was the opposite: the measures accentuated the division between Spaniards and Indians. For Areche, the rebellion's defeat was part of the reorganization of the colonial system. Inca nobility and the Quechua language obstructed political centralization. Yet the rebellion had destabilized hopes for a return to the integration of the Andean population under Spanish rule. The massacres of Spanish immigrants, especially of those who had lived among the Indians, further widened the gap between the colonizers and the colonized. Old images of imperial authority and king had begun to dissolve.

The German baron Alexander von Humboldt journeyed across America about twenty years after the rebellion of Túpac Amaru. From the northern extreme of the viceroyalty, Humboldt made his way to Lima, remaining for several days. There, the renowned biologist and traveler spoke with local aristocrats and both creole and Spanish intellectuals. Interested in colonial government and ethnic relations, he was fascinated by the Great Rebellion of 1780. Humboldt felt sympathy for the Indians and was critical of the Spanish magistrates. Yet after careful study—he even claimed to possess documents signed by Túpac Amaru—he ended up backing the Spaniards' position in the conflict.

Humboldt believed that Túpac Amaru's initial aim of Inca restoration had devolved into a vicious caste war with no middle ground. The battle of Americans against Europeans, in other words, slid into a struggle of Indians against whites. Spaniards and Americans of Spanish descent were ultimately brought together on the same side, supported by Humboldt because, he believed, they stood for "civilization" against "barbarism."

Civilization and barbarism. These terms also appeared in the "Report of the Government of Viceroy Jáuregui," which sought an explanation for the rebellion deeper than a hatred of colonial magistrates. Ultimately, the report attributed colonialism's failure to the fact that "it is common among the Indians to have an inclination toward their ancient barbarous customs and also to venerate the memory of the Incas."[11] The same language appears in another report that recom-