

RECENT RESEARCH ON ANDEAN PEASANT REVOLTS, 1750–1820

Leon G. Campbell
University of California, Riverside

The phenomenon of peasant revolt in the Andean area of South America has been both sustained and violent from Spanish colonial times to the present. The revolt of Túpac Amaru II, who led a rebellion against Spanish colonialism near Cuzco in 1780, has been the best-known incidence of this phenomenon, although the southern highlands region, sometimes known as the *mancha india* ("Indian stain"), was the center of numerous local revolts during the period 1860–1920, and the focus of several peasant land invasions during the two decades 1950–70.¹

Today scholars generally agree only that the revolts that took place in the Andean highlands during the latter part of the colonial era are worthy of study. Beyond this, they tend to disagree violently over the question of whether Túpac Amaru was a reformer and concerned with social justice or a heroic precursor of independence. The insistence by the Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces, which took power in Peru on 3 October 1968, that the Túpac Amaru revolt be considered the first forerunner of independence reflects the ongoing debate. More political than historical in context, the government's position is designed to counter the assertions of antiestablishment historians that the independence of Peru in 1821 simply transferred political power from the Spanish *peninsulares*, or European-born whites, to Peruvian Creoles, or whites born in America. By developing Túpac Amaru as a revolutionary hero and his movement as the first vestige of an anti-imperialist struggle uniting all classes and ethnic groups, the generals hope to identify themselves symbolically with the continuation of the struggle.² Ironically, as Boleslao Lewin (1960) points out, both masses and elite groups in and out of Peru have utilized the figure of Túpac Amaru in support of their struggles against injustice. The Argentine and Uruguayan Tupamaros are but the latest exponent of this symbolic identification that also attests to the durable tradition of Andean peasant rebellion.

Given the importance of and enduring interest in the subject, it is surprising that no one has attempted to survey the growing literature on Andean peasant revolts since Carlos Daniel Valcarcel's (1949a) short survey of the documentation and published materials available for the study of the Túpac Amaru revolt. This inattention may reflect John H. Rowe's (1957) judgment that the secondary literature on the subject was abundant but undistinguished. Whatever the reasons, a considerable number of good works have reached print since Rowe issued his dictum, making it much less applicable today. Although both James Lockhart and Karen Spalding (1972) have indicated how much remains to

be done in the fields of Spanish and Indian colonial social history, they also point out the achievements made during the years since Rowe's comment.

First, advances in ethnohistory and historical demography, among other fields, have shed new light on the colonial Indian. Although it continues to be most difficult to write the history of peoples who did not write their own, impressive work has been done recently by anthropologists with historical training and historians with strong backgrounds in anthropology, indicating that the multi-disciplinary approach to the Indian past may be required to fully understand it. Second, research in colonial social history has helped to clarify many aspects of life and society in the Andean area, especially towards the end of the colonial period when record groups are fuller. As patterns of continuity and change emerge, it is now evident that the Túpac Amaru revolt was simply the largest and most visible example of several regional, multi-class uprisings against Spanish authority. Moreover, as research is focused upon specific regions and phases of Andean rebellion, local and distinct aspects emerge that can be placed within the more universal framework of mass rebellion and anticolonialism. It is also possible for historians to use the commotions taking place in the south-central highlands of the viceroyalty of Peru after 1750 to shed light on other areas, social groups, and times. By utilizing peasant revolts to produce "back reflections on normal processes," as Lockhart has suggested, scholars can understand better how the Peruvian social system functioned in peacetime and how the Indians for so long accommodated themselves to a dangerously imbalanced economy.

According to the data compiled by Carlos M. Rama, over 62 percent of all the revolts taking place in Spanish America during the colony occurred between 1700 and 1810, and 32 percent of these took place after 1750, when Bourbon enlightened despotism reached its apogee. Furthermore, the fact that Andean peasant rebellions were largely confined to the poor, overwhelmingly Indian regions of the central and southern highlands indicates that they were manifestations of an intense regional rivalry between the poor, nonwhite interior (represented by Cuzco, the former Inca capital), and the wealthier, politically connected coast (represented by Lima, the capital of the Spanish viceroyalty). Finally, the growing incidence of revolt between 1750 and 1820 suggests that anomie and economic dislocation were creating conditions that would precipitate a crisis in the Spanish *ancien régime*. This overview of recent research in the field of Andean peasant rebellion suggests that further attention be given to the concepts outlined above and points out directions in which fruitful future investigations might be undertaken.

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ANDEAN PEASANT REVOLT, 1750-1820

Indian rebellion against the intrusions of Spaniards in the Andean area began with the conquest in 1524. Immediately following the death of the emperor Atahualpa, the surviving Inca chieftains rose in revolt against the legions of Francisco Pizarro. With the retreat of Manco Inca to the mountain fastness of Vilcabamba in 1539, Spanish control over Peru was finally secured, although an

Inca government in exile survived until the 1570s, when this neo-Inca state was destroyed by Viceroy Francisco de Toledo. With the fall of Vilcabamba in 1572 and the death of Túpac Amaru I, the Inca protest was finally silenced.

John Rowe (1954) has traced the genesis of the rebirth of Inca nationalism in Peru from the 1640s until its culmination in the revolt of Túpac Amaru II in 1780. He sets the revolts of 1780 and afterwards apart from their predecessors by virtue of the fact that the latter were not confined to the frontier regions of the viceroyalty but rather were centered in the southern and central highland regions in or near the important commercial and administrative centers of Cuzco and La Paz. Second, the later rebellions involved Indians from throughout the Andean area rather than tribes from a particular locality. Finally, Rowe distinguishes the revolts of 1780 from their predecessors in that they were not local and particularistic in nature. Their leaders were opposed to the Spanish system of government and advocated a separatist solution to these abuses.

As background for the study of Andean peasant revolt it is useful to remember that following the conquest, the viceroyalty of Peru evolved into an ethnic duality. The “republic of Spaniards” was located primarily along the coastal littoral, with its center in Lima, the seat of the royal court whose seaport of Callao connected Peru to the rest of the Indies and with the maritime trade from Spain. On the other hand, the highland regions of the Andes and the jungle (*selva*) east of the Andean crest constituted a virtual “republic of Indians,” with its center in Cuzco, the former capital of the old Inca empire. Not only were the economies and political features of the two “republics” dissimilar, the regions diverged socially as well. A majority of Spaniards and Creoles were concentrated along the coast. This relatively wealthy and politically connected group bore little resemblance to the poorer mestizos (mixed-bloods of Indian and white parentage) and Indians who inhabited the highlands of the *sierra*. Regional antagonisms were accentuated by these ethnic differences.

The recent study of Peruvian population data made by David G. Browning and David J. Robinson clearly illustrates the magnitude of ethnic divisions within the viceroyalty during the later colony and warns of the hazards of using contemporary census data as a basis for establishing the nature of the Peruvian colonial population. Notwithstanding this advice, it is possible to form an approximate idea of the demographic structure of the viceroyalty from existing sources. Noble David Cook and Günter Vollmer indicate that during the period 1620–1754, the Indian population of Peru declined by about one-third, from 598,026 to 401,111, although no doubt some of this loss is attributable to migration induced by taxation and labor service requirements. By 1792, this trend seems to have been reversed, according to Vollmer, who revises George Kubler’s (1952) figures upwards. Out of a total population of 1,076,122 persons, approximately two-thirds, or 608,894, were classified as Indians. To be sure, as Karen Spalding points out (1975b), such a categorization of persons into self-contained racial groups is misleading because it fails to account for the social and economic differences that separated coastal and urban groups from rural interior-dwellers. Besides, changes taking place in highland society were blurring the distinction between the terms “Indian” and “European,” which by this time had

assumed the connotation of “poor” and “wealthy” instead.³ By whatever standard is employed, however, the Indian population of the Cuzco region ranged from 75 to 95 percent of the total, while the number of mestizos constituted from one-third to one-half of the total. The free colored and Negro slave population was concentrated heavily along the coast where the sugar and cotton plantations were located. Spaniards, both European and American-born, numbered 135,755 (excluding clergy), and constituted a distinct minority of the total population. Over 40 percent of this group was concentrated in the three cities of Arequipa, Cuzco, and Lima.

As Magnus Mörner’s (1969) perceptive study of Bourbon reformism in Spanish America makes clear, the modernizing activities of King Charles III (1759–88)—mining and commercial reforms, liberalized trade policies, increased tax measures, and the like—helped to bring about an economic crisis of unusual proportions in Peru. A prime reason for this, according to Guillermo Céspedes del Castillo (1947, 1953) was the Crown’s elevation of the Río de la Plata to viceregal status in 1776, which placed the silver mining areas in the *audiencia* of Charcas (today Bolivia) under the control of the viceroy in Buenos Aires. After this time, goods were imported from Europe into the River Plate and Chile more cheaply than from Lima, while silver was minted and exported to Spain without entering Peru, causing a shortage of specie. The studies of Oscar Febres Villaroel, Demetrio Ramos, and John TePaske (1970) all support the thesis of severe economic dislocation in Peru after midcentury although disagreeing somewhat on the causal factors involved.

There is a considerable amount of general information about Andean peasant rebellion during the colonial period, which reached endemic proportions after 1750 (Sotelo; Valcarcel 1946c; Rowe 1954, 1957; Lewin 1957a; Varese 1968; etc.). Aside from several Creole and mestizo-led tax rebellions, sizable Indian revolts erupted in areas such as Tarma (located east of Lima in a jungle region that was not formerly part of the Inca empire), in Huarochirí in the central highlands, in the province of Chayanta (located in the *audiencia* of Charcas in Upper Peru), in Cuzco, Arequipa, La Paz, and even in Lima. In addition, hundreds of smaller, largely unreported incidents emerge from the primary documentation of the period.

To a great degree, it can be argued that the revolts were outgrowths of the changing social and economic situation in the viceroyalty, although a discernible pattern to them is not always evident. In 1756 the Spanish Crown legalized the *repartimiento de mercancías* (forced sale of goods to native people) by the *corregidores de indios* (local officials with jurisdiction over the Indians), and, to be sure, enormous abuses stemmed from this practice. In 1779, for example, Tomás Catari, the Indian *cacique* (chieftain) of Chayanta, in Upper Peru, complained to the viceroy that the corregidor, Joaquín de Alós, had sold goods to the Indians valued at 400,000 pesos when the regulations only permitted merchandise with a total value of 100,000 pesos to be distributed. Similarly, Túpac Amaru, the *cacique* of Tinta, near Cuzco, accused Antonio de Arriaga, the corregidor of Tinta, of selling goods worth over 300,000 pesos when the law permitted no sales in excess of a total value of 112,500. In both cases, so the argument goes,

the Indians took the law into their own hands when they failed to obtain justice from the viceroy.

Viceroy Agustín de Jáuregui, who ruled Peru between 1780 and 1784, believed, as did many other royal officials, that the major cause of the revolts was the abuse of the *mita* system, the forced labor service that the Indians of certain districts were required to perform in the mines of Potosí, Cailloma, and Huancavelica. Other factors most often associated with peasant revolt are abuses in the *obrajes* (factories using Indian labor to produce cloth and other woven goods); repeated violations of the Indians' legal rights; the demand for an *audiencia* (appellate court) in Cuzco, in order that Indians might be spared the long trip to Lima to secure a redress of their grievances; and the Inca nationalism that developed as a partial result of these abuses. The emissaries dispatched by the Indian rebels to Spain to petition the Crown for relief emphasized the economic injustices above all others; thus, modern historians have tended to give great weight to them as causal factors.

Because of the discrete nature of Andean peasant revolt, it would be hazardous, if not impossible, to provide sufficient background information to acquaint the reader with the personalities and parameters of each rebellion. Instead, I have chosen below to provide some basic information about the most famous of these uprisings—that led by José Gabriel Túpac Amaru in 1780—in order that the context of these social protests can be better grasped.

BACKGROUND OF THE REVOLTS OF 1780

The progenitor and leader of the revolt in Cuzco was a mestizo, José Gabriel Túpac Amaru. The son of the cacique of Surimana and Tungasuca located in the bishopric of Cuzco, Túpac Amaru was a direct lineal descendant of the last Inca emperor, Túpac Amaru I, through his mother Rosa Noguera, whose families' noble rights had been recognized in 1618. In 1750, at twelve years of age, José Gabriel was sent to the Jesuit-run Colegio de San Francisco de Borja, a school for noble Indians in Cuzco. Although the specifics of his education are unclear, his noble birth and training permitted him to move in polite social circles of Cuzco during this period. Since his father and older brother had predeceased him, in 1766 he petitioned for and received from the Crown his father's title as cacique of Pampamarca, Tungasuca, and Surimana, in the province of Tinta, located southeast of Cuzco. Earlier, he had married Micaela Bastidas Puyacahua, a beautiful young woman of Pampamarca, who was reportedly a pure-blooded Spaniard; she soon bore him three sons.

The office of cacique was a responsible and honored position and one that was highly prized by the Incas (Spalding 1973). Besides governing the Indians and collecting tribute for the *corregidor*, the office carried with it several perquisites, including a fixed salary, immunity to arrest for serious offenses, freedom from the payment of tribute and personal service, and permission to wear the distinctive apparel of the Inca nobility, indicating the chief's legitimacy and authority among his people. Physically, Túpac Amaru was a striking figure. Taller than the average Indian at about five feet eight inches in height, he wore

the dress of a Spanish nobleman, including a black velvet coat, a gold waistcoat, a beaver dress hat, silk stockings, and shoes with gold buckles. Some sources mention his wearing an Inca insignia around his neck, but these modifications were probably subsequent to the outbreak of his revolt.

Túpac Amaru also had inherited 350 mules from his father which he used to carry merchandise throughout the viceroyalty. Popularly known as “the muliteer cacique,” he traveled widely throughout Peru and Upper Peru, visiting Potosí to deliver quicksilver and merchandise to the mines and there getting a first-hand view of the inequities of the mita system. As part of an effort to establish himself as a *primer inter pares* among the several caciques of the Cuzco area, Túpac Amaru initiated proceedings in 1770 to establish his title to the marquisate of Oropesa, traveling to Lima and receiving from the audiencia a confirmation of his claim. Although he possessed papers that linked him directly with a natural daughter of the last Inca sovereign, Túpac Amaru I, Túpac’s claim was rivalled by other pretenders, including the Betancur family of Cuzco and their lawyer, a Spaniard, Vicent José García (García Rodríguez 1933). In support of his claim, Túpac Amaru in 1777 provided to the court his genealogy (Loayza 1946) and other documentation to prove that his rival claimant was an imposter. Nevertheless, the case seems never to have been decided by the audiencia, at least until Túpac Amaru’s death, when Betancur’s claim was upheld on the grounds that Túpac Amaru’s seditious actions invalidated his legal rights to the title.

The tone of his lawsuit, dated 1777, indicates Túpac Amaru’s fierce desire to affirm his rights to being the first representative of the venerable Inca tradition through possession of the marquisate. During the nearly four years he spent in Lima, Túpac Amaru attended classes at the Royal and Pontifical University of San Marcos. It is likely that the Betancur case also proved to him the intransigence of the royal bureaucracy. At this same time Túpac Amaru also was busily engaged on behalf of several other caciques of the province of Tinta to obtain an exclusion of their areas from service at the Potosí mines. In a petition to the viceroy, he set forth the many abuses perpetuated by the mita system that required Indians to travel long distances to reach the mines (*Letras*). Túpac alleged that death from overwork or disease, usually induced by silicosis which affected their lungs, was a common occurrence. In addition, mita service disrupted the Indian family unit by removing its male members, thereby contributing to prostitution, concubinage, alcoholism, and migrancy.

Túpac Amaru’s arguments, however, failed to sway Visitor General José Antonio de Areche, who had arrived in Peru in 1777 with a mandate from the King to end corruption and increase revenues. For this reason Túpac Amaru began to lobby strongly with the Spanish priests in the Cuzco region who shared the belief that the Indians lived under inhuman conditions that were an affront to God. This fierce independence soon led him into conflict with Antonio de Arriaga who had been appointed corregidor of Tinta in 1776. The latter insulted and questioned the legitimacy of the Inca chieftain who in turn criticized the corregidor for violating the laws governing repartimiento by selling goods with a value over and above that permitted. Túpac Amaru also capitalized on

the hostility existing between Arriaga, a Spaniard, and the Creole Bishop of Cuzco, Juan Manuel de Moscoso y Peralta, whom Arriaga had publicly accused of treasonous conduct in a letter to the viceroy in Lima.

It might reasonably be inferred that any one of these events or, more likely, a confluence of circumstances, could have led to the outbreak of rebellion. Certainly Bishop Moscoso and Túpac Amaru both had good cause to attack the corregidor, who seems to have been the catalyst for rebellious action. Moreover, Túpac Amaru was aware of the outbreak of the Chayanta revolt in Upper Peru, although the rebellions were discrete and communications between their respective leaders were probably not extensive. In a fashion somewhat reminiscent of Catari's capture of corregidor Alós, Túpac Amaru ambushed Arriaga following a dinner at which both men were present. After obtaining Arriaga's signature on certain documents that asked for all the available funds in the Tinta treasury, ostensibly to use against an anticipated attack on Anta by English pirates, Túpac Amaru then held a summary trial of Arriaga and had him executed on 10 November, six days after his capture. Having executed Arriaga, Túpac Amaru spoke to the crowd in both Spanish and Quechua. He alluded to orders from a royal authority who allegedly supported his decision to execute Arriaga, although the rebel cacique later notified the town council of Cuzco that he had taken this action on his own initiative to dissuade other corregidores from mistreating the Indians. He promised the assemblage in Tinta that he would try to end the hated mita and other forms of forced labor, to reform the *corregimientos*, especially the corregidor's monopoly of trade, and would work to reduce tax levels. He also let it be known that he supported both the King and the Church. Thus assured, the crowd of Indians, mestizos, and whites began to help Túpac Amaru collect arms, mules, money, and ammunition to defend against an anticipated Spanish counterattack.

During the weeks following the execution of Arriaga, Túpac Amaru dispatched a variety of edicts to different areas, asking for the support of persons "of every quality and condition" to help his effort to end the tyranny of the *corregimiento*. He noted, in an edict to the inhabitants of Carabaya, that he had acted in response to numerous complaints from the inhabitants of his province and because legal remedies seemed inadequate to prevent future wrongs from being committed. On 16 November 1780, Túpac Amaru published an edict freeing the slaves of Tungasuca, probably as part of an effort to gain black support for the revolt. This act, however, alienated the Creole sugar planters, as did Túpac Amaru's attacks on the Creole-owned *obrajes* of Pocamanchi and Panapuquio, since many Creoles were merchants and were thereby tied into the *repartimiento* system through trade with the corregidores. Even so, the question of the degree of Creole support for the revolt remains an open issue, since other whites may have supported Túpac Amaru for personal reasons.

The organization of Túpac Amaru's military command proceeded rapidly following the execution of Arriaga. On 18 November, at Sangarará, his army of an estimated six thousand men annihilated a hastily assembled Creole militia dispatched from Cuzco the previous day, killing 576 persons and sparing the lives of only 28, all Creoles. News of the attack provoked panic in Cuzco and

prompted the viceroy in Lima, on 24 November, to order the abolition of the repartimiento without waiting for royal approval. The town council of Cuzco, once it was determined that the city was practically defenseless, abolished the repartimiento and the *alcabala* (sales tax), and proclaimed that faithful Indians would no longer be forced to work in the *obrajes*.

Following the battle, Túpac Amaru chose to return to Tungasuca rather than to attack Cuzco, as his wife, a member of his inner circle of advisors, urged that he do. Although this is sometimes regarded as the turning point in the revolt, Túpac Amaru increased the size of his army tenfold to an estimated sixty thousand men by early December, while Royalist recruitment in Cuzco was failing badly and people fled the city in large numbers. Yet the rebel had only the divided loyalty of the Indian caciques. Although he controlled several of the fourteen Cuzco provinces—Tinta, Quispicanchis, and Chumbivilcas—several others were only partially loyal and a few vigorously opposed the rebels. In the meantime, Spanish authorities in Lima and Buenos Aires were beginning to mobilize militarily to end the revolt that, prior to the rebel victory at Sangarará, had not been taken seriously.

On 19 December the rebel army departed from Tinta for Cuzco, five days before two hundred mulatto militiamen began a forced march from Lima to aid that beleaguered city. In the meantime, cuzqueño authorities had ordered provincial corridors to return to the city with their militias, an action that effectively prevented the pacifist wing of the town council from surrendering the city to the rebels. Túpac Amaru laid siege to Cuzco on 28 December, yet he refused to attack. Instead, he continued to negotiate with cuzqueño leaders, patiently explaining his objectives, fighting a series of small skirmishes against loyal Indians and Spanish militias sent out to dislodge his troops from the hills surrounding the city. On 1 January 1781, Colonel Gabriel de Avilés entered Cuzco with the militiamen sent from Lima and buoyed considerably the loyalists' spirit, since Avilés disclosed that a larger force under the command of Field Marshal José del Valle was en route from Lima to Cuzco and would arrive momentarily. Unable to sustain his army in the frigid climes of Cuzco and due to his dislike of combatting loyalist Indians rather than Spanish troops, Túpac Amaru withdrew from the heights of Picchu in early January and returned to Tinta. In the meantime, his brother, Diego Túpac Amaru, had also suffered a defeat at the hands of the loyal Indian caciques and their troops, which were under the command of Spanish and Creole officers. Various are the explanations for Túpac Amaru's lifting of the siege of Cuzco but it can hardly be disputed that his failure to attack the city allowed the Spanish to mount an offensive that led to his defeat three months later.

On 23 February Inspector General del Valle and Visitor General Areche reached Cuzco and immediately began to lay plans for an offensive against the rebel army in Tinta. Quickly dismantling the weak and supposedly perfidious Creole command structure, the Spanish military authorities created an army of fifteen thousand men by employing loyal caciques and their retainers and forming them into military units. It is notable that many of these caciques, such as Mateo García, Pumacahua, were drawn from the seven royal *ayllus* (Inca clans)

of the Cuzco region, whose relationship with the provincial caciques was sometimes strained. Early in March the Spanish expedition left Cuzco for Tinta, dividing into five separate columns that converged on the province in April. By means of information obtained from a traitor to the rebel cause, a group of mulatto militiamen were able to apprehend Túpac Amaru in the small hamlet of Langui on 6 April. The rebel and his family were then conducted to Cuzco for trial. Several of Túpac's lieutenants, including his brother, took alternate routes in fleeing from Tungasuca and thereby escaped capture.

The defendants were subsequently found guilty and sentenced to death. Túpac Amaru's fate was to be pulled apart bodily by four horses and to have his limbs exhibited on pikes next to those of former rebel chiefs. While this sentence indicates the cold fury that the revolt had produced within the Spanish administration in Peru, it is perhaps more illustrative of Spanish concern about the revival of Inca nationalism of which Túpac Amaru was the leading symbol. Areche's famous sentence prohibited the further use of other Inca nationalist symbols, among them claims of descent from the last Inca kings, hereditary caciqueships, the wearing of Inca royal garb, the display of pictures of the Incas, plays or other writings about the old empire, the use of the Quechua language and even of the ceremonial conch shell horns.

While the execution of Túpac Amaru and his family was intended to deter further outbreaks of Inca nationalism, his death seemed instead to provide further impetus to the movement. Nearly every part of the viceroyalty of Peru suffered from some form of rebellion, although not all of these were directly tied to the Túpac Amaru revolt. From Lower Peru the wave of Indian rebellion spread into Charcas, north into New Granada, and south to Chile, as well as into the eastern marches of the Río de la Plata. Major outbreaks of violence occurred in Oruro, La Paz, and Puno, among other areas. Although these rebellions differed both in structure and orientation from that of Túpac Amaru, all of them were carried on with the knowledge that his reform efforts had been horribly punished and out of a desire to avenge his death. While Túpac Amaru had sought to enlist and co-opt whites under his banner, his successors retaliated for his death by exterminating them. The war against colonialism thus devolved into a race war by the middle of 1781.

Utilizing the strong Spanish garrison troops of Lima and Buenos Aires, the viceroys of Peru and the Río de la Plata were able to prevent the fall of the major urban centers in the highlands and preserve Spanish lives. By confining rebel activity to the rural areas of each province, the Spaniards eventually launched a war of attrition against the surviving rebels by burning their fields and taking other actions that denied them the support of the land and the peasantry. The death of the Catari brothers and the surrender of Diego Túpac Amaru in 1782 overshadowed an uprising in Huarochiri in 1783.

With the capture and execution of the remaining rebel leaders and the dispersal of their armies, the Crown considered the last Inca revolts terminated and took a variety of steps to prevent their repetition. Several of the ranking administrators, including the viceroy and the visitor general, were removed from office for failing to deal properly with the rebels. Having somewhat ne-

glected Peru in favor of surrounding regions prior to 1780, the Bourbons accelerated the tempo of reform there after this date. The *corregimiento* was replaced by the system of *intendencias* and the *repartimiento de efectos* was abolished by 1784. Some formal changes were also made in the *mita* and an *audiencia* was established in Cuzco in 1787. Since many of these changes had been demanded by the rebels, their promulgation has sometimes been interpreted as evidence that the rebellions had succeeded in improving the Indians' lot.

On the other hand, the period of reconstruction that followed the close of the revolts reestablished Spanish authority in highland Peru. As mentioned earlier, many vestiges of Inca nationalism were eradicated in Peru after 1781. The eight *intendencias* created in 1784 were divided into fifty-seven districts, replacing the several hundred *corregimientos* that had existed before. This in effect created a series of provincial capitals where lines of authority converged in the hands of Spanish officials known as *intendants*. Their authority was buttressed by the dispatch and deployment of Spanish regular troops that garrisoned the several provincial capitals after 1783. The weak and suspect Creole militias were demobilized and replaced by fixed units from Lima that were trained to combat internal insurrections. These soldiers, the new missionaries of King Charles III, replaced the priests who for centuries had maintained Spanish hegemony in the largely Indian interior regions of Peru. The Crown's actions after 1783 indicated a willingness to make needed changes, both in the structure and function of the viceregal bureaucracy, to prevent the loss of Peru through social revolution. They also demonstrated a willingness to combat mass revolt with increased force of arms.

The revolts that had crested in 1780 were also mass movements comprised of Indians who acted with the support of many other social groups. Moreover, these peasant rebellions spread far and wide throughout Spanish America, across an area that was larger than certain theaters of combat in the world wars of the present century, and clearly demonstrated that many people were deeply dissatisfied with Spanish colonialism. The close of the revolts left this situation unchanged. Several of those *caciques* who had opposed the rebellions, such as Mateo García Pumacahua, later appointed as brigadier of the royal army and interim president of the Cuzco *audiencia*, eventually realized the perfidy of the Spanish and acted to end it. In 1814, Pumacahua and several other *caciques* joined their armies to a Creole revolt taking place in Cuzco, briefly uniting the groups that Túpac Amaru had earlier sought to join together. Their defeat at Umachiri, however, destroyed the remaining *cacical* leadership structure and brought the Inca nationalist movement to an end. The triumph of Creole nationalism during the independence movement constituted the antithesis of the earlier peasant rebellions and effectively prevented their reoccurrence.

PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS

The enormous scope of Andean peasant revolt during the colonial period has resulted in a voluminous body of primary source materials concerning these rebellions. Most of this documentation is located in the major Spanish and Latin

American archives, although important record groups also exist in North America and other parts of Europe.⁴ In reading the great number of secondary works on the subject of eighteenth-century Indian revolts, however, one is struck immediately by the narrow documental base on which these accounts depend. As Father Lino Gómez Canedo (1:536) notes, many scholars dealing with the Andean rebellion have hardly consulted the repositories located outside of Peru. Moreover, a considerable amount of material that can allow important events to be placed in a fuller perspective also awaits the researcher in provincial and other specialized archives.

A useful starting point is Francisco Morales Padron's recent compilation of the documentation on the subject of indigenous revolts in eighteenth-century Peru that is located in the immense Archivo General de Indias in Seville. However, it hardly begins to describe the holdings of this repository, generally considered to be the most complete in the world for the study of Spain and its empire, which pertain to the subject of peasant rebellion. Foremost among the other important repositories in Spain for this purpose is the Real Academia de la Historia in Madrid, which contains the 125-volume *Colección Benito de la Mata Linares*, compiled by the Spanish official who served as the trial judge in Cuzco in 1781 and performed a variety of other duties in Peru during the time of the rebellions and afterwards.

In South America, important record groups concerning peasant uprisings are located in the archives of Lima, Cuzco, Buenos Aires, La Paz, Santiago, Quito, and Asunción. Most scholars have worked almost exclusively with materials from the reasonably well-organized archives in these capital cities. As the several contributors to the forthcoming *Field Research Guide to the Andean Area* (TePaske) indicate, however, municipal, provincial, university, and parish archives throughout the Andes remain virtually unexamined and promise ample rewards for the patient investigator.

Far too often secondary histories of Andean Indian rebellions have been based almost exclusively on collections of edited documents published in Peru in the nineteenth century. While these collections are of exceptional importance for the researcher lacking direct access to the archives, it is useful to remember that they were frequently compiled by amateur historians who freely added a running commentary along with the transcriptions, and it is sometimes difficult to tell where the one ends and the other begins. More often than not these compilers accepted at face value the reports of Spanish officials to the Crown alleging that the revolts were separatist from the outset, since these sentiments coincided with their desire to locate the roots of Peruvian nationalism and to prove that the fires of liberty burned as brightly in Peru as they did in Chile or Argentina. Moreover, by stressing the indigenous, multi-class nature of Andean peasant revolt, independence could be seen as an event of true national significance that benefitted all social groups. As a mestizo, Túpac Amaru of course symbolized this unification perhaps better than any national figure before or since.

The aforementioned problems are quite evident in the collections of Dean Gregorio Funes, Pedro de Angelis, and Manuel de Odriozola, the three most

widely used sources for the study of the rebellions. For example, the documents published by Funes, the dean of the Cordoba, Argentina, cathedral chapter and a staunch defender of independence, viewed the uprisings in La Paz and Cuzco as manifestations of an indigenous desire for independence. These documents are tremendously important and subsequent writers have leaned heavily on them in interpreting the unfolding of the rebellions; but Funes' failure to divulge his sources makes their task harder and less subject to verification. The Angelis collection, the fifth volume of which deals with the Túpac Amaru revolt, reproduces many of the documents transcribed by Funes and likewise accepts many of his interpretations.

In 1863, Odriozola, then director of Lima's Biblioteca Nacional, re-edited the Angelis collection and published it in Peru as part of a general documentary history of the colonial period. Historians using any of these collections ought to remember that they were issued a century ago when standards of organization and editing were not what they are today. In each case, the editors simply took previously published documents and republished them along with a running commentary. Sometimes new documents were added, but not infrequently these were literary materials that hardly fit into the context of other works. As the products of creole and culturally Hispanic Peru, the editors stressed that independence had completed the struggles of the late colony in an obvious effort to offset the prevailing opinion that independence had been imposed on Peru from outside. An index to the Angelis collection, published by Emilio Romero, facilitates the use of this material. The collections of Vicente Ballivián y Roxas and José Rosendo Gutiérrez reproduce documents from the Bolivian archives, the latter materials taken from Gutiérrez' private archive housed in the Universidad Mayor de San Andrés in La Paz, which contains great amounts of information concerning the sieges of that city and other matters pertaining to the rebellion.

In addition, the memoirs and *relaciones* of the viceroys of Peru, edited by Manuel Fuentes (1859), Sebastian Lorente (1867–72), and Carlos A. Romero (1901), provide insights into Spanish perceptions of and responses to the Indian problem, the tremendous competition being waged by various sectors of the Peruvian bureaucracy for control of the movement to subdue the rebels, and of the postwar Peruvian economy and government.

Aside from the publication of a few documents dealing with certain revolts (*Revista Peruana*, *Revista de Archivos y Bibliotecas*), Peruvians were largely unaware of their Indian revolutionary past at the turn of the century. Unlike Mexico, whose revolution allowed national historians to write the history of past efforts of indigenous people to counter colonial oppression, Peru conservatively avoided developing the story of antigovernment mass revolts of earlier epochs, perhaps because of an unconscious desire to deny the people knowledge that might produce similar demands for increased political power.

With the emergence of Peruvian nationalism as a result of World War I, increased attention was given to the nation's proud Inca heritage that naturally focused upon events that demonstrated the fierce independence of these peoples. Under the dynamic editorship of Francisco A. Loayza, many works pertaining to the revolts of 1780 were published in an effort to develop national

consciousness of these events. Loayza published documents describing the important revolt of Juan Santos Atahualpa in 1742, the most ambitious and widespread rebellion prior to those of 1780; the extremely valuable accounts written by the Indian priest Rafael José Sahuaraura Titu Atauchi and by corregidor Arriaga's nephew; Túpac Amaru's literate and persuasive account of his genealogy, presented to the audiencia of Lima; and the memoirs of his half-brother, Juan Bautista Túpac Amaru. As a group, Loayza's collection offers descriptions of revolts by their literate participants who write from a variety of perspectives. To these have been added editorial comments that help to understand the documents but also betray Loayza's Hispanophobic orientation.

The tempo of documental publication dealing with the revolts of 1780 has increased markedly since World War II, as a new, more nationalistic generation of Peruvian historians had begun to study the colonial period. The documental publications of Loayza, Valcarcel, and Luis Antonio Eguiguren (1942, 1952, 1959), for example, have done much to explain the genealogy of Túpac Amaru and his attacks on the institution of mita, and provide continuity to the period covered by the rebellion. Eguiguren's (1952) publication of the memoirs of Melchor de Paz (the Creole secretary to Viceroy Manuel de Guirior [1776–80] and Agustín de Jáuregui [1780–84]), which he had located in the New York Public Library, was a coup of major proportions since they included hundreds of letters, reports, and other documents that were sent to and from the viceroy in Lima and helped form the basis for viceregal actions. Besides elites' reflections, Paz also reproduced the various *pasquines* (lampoons) that appeared on the walls of buildings in Cuzco, Lima, and Arequipa, berating the Spanish government in Peru. These speak of the North American revolution and other related events that indicate that the masses there were well-informed about these happenings and could connect them to their own lives.

Perhaps the most serious weakness of these documental collections has been the irresistible impulse of their editors to group together documents dealing with a variety of Indian revolts in an effort to trace the roots of Peruvian independence. There is a serious philosophic risk in trying to demonstrate that continuities exist among discrete but frequently overlapping events such as those taking place in eighteenth-century Peru, since it is made to appear that a common revolutionary tradition existed unbroken there from the sixteenth century onwards. This may or may not be true, but editorial responsibility requires that if these events are to be described together, their character, ideology, social composition, and objectives must be carefully described and differentiated to prevent the erroneous assumption that all revolts fall within a general schema whose objective is independence.

Recent publications of documents dealing with Andean peasant rebellions demonstrate a maturity of approach by focusing on lesser-known events, such as Julián Santiestéban Ochoa's (1944) account of the revolt in Oruro in 1781, which erupted out of a struggle between a Spaniard and a Creole over a vacant seat on the local town council. Another example is the publication (1966, 1974) of the memoirs of Alonso Carrió de la Vandra, a minor government functionary, which lay bare the tensions existing within society at the time

anterior to and after the rebellions. As historian Pablo Macera notes in the prologue to Carrió's *Reforma del Perú*, all Spanish and Creole political thought during the period 1780–1800 was developed in the shadow of the cuzqueño *caudillo*, who had caused them to ponder their own futures.

Documents dealing with the economic history of eighteenth-century Peru are also enlightening. Felipe Márquez Abanto's publication of the Spanish military account books during the period 1780–82 demonstrates the financial war being waged within the Bourbon bureaucracy over who should bear the major share of financing defense measures, and helps to show the burdens placed on the citizenry by the rebel sieges of major Spanish cities. Similarly, Carlos Ibarguen's publication of correspondence exchanged between a Spanish merchant in Buenos Aires and his factor in Jujuy in Upper Peru during the years 1779–86 offers insights into the economic repercussions of the revolts there and confirms the regional antagonisms that the rebellions laid bare. The letters also verify the critical economic impact on Peru of the creation of the viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata by demonstrating the shifts in trading patterns that ensued after 1776. So strong was the commercial rivalry between Cuzco and La Paz, for example, that cuzqueños were reluctant to send arms and men to help lift the rebel siege of La Paz. While admittedly partial and incomplete, these letters focus upon the other war being waged between the coastal and highland commercial and administrative centers and help to place the Indian revolts within the context of these bitter regional rivalries.

The most recent effort to publish the major documents dealing with the revolts of 1780 has been undertaken by the Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú. Four of these thirty volumes deal with the Túpac Amaru revolt and several describe other internal revolts occurring prior to independence in 1821. The virtue of the collection is that it assembles many documents that either have not been published or have appeared in inaccessible journals; this allows the scholar to study the revolts within a spatial and chronological context not permitted by the nineteenth-century efforts of Angelis and Odriozola. However, the selection of Carlos Daniel Valcarcel as the editor of the section dealing with the revolts has meant that no fresh viewpoint has been provided to the collection. Valcarcel, Peru's leading scholar of the 1780 revolts, has devoted his career to the study of Túpac Amaru. His annotations and prefatory materials help to correct the errors of Angelis and others, but Valcarcel's excessive concern with the separatist objectives of the rebellion has tended to obscure other social and economic factors of greater importance. In fact, the establishment of the commission in 1969 reflects the rising tide of Peruvian nationalism as well as the pressure being exerted by the Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces to establish the revolt as separatist and Túpac Amaru as a precursor of Peruvian independence. This forms part of a larger desire to link themselves to Peru's authentic revolutionary heritage and to eradicate the national inferiority complex that Peruvians have suffered as a result of being liberated by patriot armies from other countries in Latin America in 1821. In making 1780 the first year of national independence, Peru's military government also chose Túpac Amaru to symbolize its agrarian reform program as if to

indicate to the people that his revolt had finally been completed almost two centuries after it had begun.

SECONDARY WORKS AND UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

In surveying the secondary literature dealing with the subject of Andean peasant revolt, three distinct viewpoints emerge. The historians of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Peru were largely representatives of the coastal middle groups who wrested control of the country from Spain; thus, they often ignore the subject except as a short preface to the glorious period of Creole independence. Those writing in the post-World War II period, reflecting the rise of Peruvian nationalism, exhibit less of a chauvinistic, creolist view of the colony, but still argue strenuously over the reformist and separatist aspects of the rebellions. Finally, those historians writing since 1960 and especially in the wake of the coup of 3 October 1968, which brought into power the strongly reformist, if not revolutionary, Government of the Armed Forces, have begun to view the era since 1780 in terms of the current social and economic revolution taking place in contemporary Peru. At the same time, groups of younger scholars, both in Peru and elsewhere, have eschewed the perennial debate over Indian separatism in favor of exploring the social and economic matrix of the later colony that produced these revolts. This group is utilizing socioeconomic and quantitative data, as well as social historical techniques, to test traditional assumptions concerning this period of rebellion.

In 1949, Valcarcel published the first and only survey of the primary and secondary materials available for the study of the Túpac Amaru revolt and suggested five topics or areas that he deemed worthy of further study: (1) the personality, social status, and characteristics of Túpac Amaru and the members of his family; (2) the relationship between Túpac Amaru and other social groups, notably the Indian caciques, mestizos, blacks and Creoles, as a means of establishing the social base and ideological orientation of the rebellion; (3) the precise trajectory of the revolt as it developed in Cuzco, Upper Peru, and other areas, and its geographic extent and interrelationships; (4) research on the other rebels who carried on the rebellion after Túpac Amaru's death, including Diego Túpac Amaru, Andrés Mendigure, Julian Túpac Catari, and others, to determine their backgrounds and motives and the changes taking place in the movement after 1781; and (5) a study of the family members and rebel supporters who were exiled to Spain following the collapse of the revolt. Since these research priorities consisted of subjects on which Valcarcel was working, his subsequent publications tend to constitute a self-fulfilling prophecy and give the mistaken impression that the rebellion has been adequately researched. This is not the case, however, as the balance of this paper will attempt to show. Recent methodological advancements and the discovery of new document groups make it a propitious time to reevaluate these research priorities and to formulate new ones. Valcarcel's article, however, can serve as a useful benchmark to demonstrate what has been done in the last two and one-half decades and to clarify the reasons behind changing research priorities.

James Lockhart, in a research article devoted to the development of the field of colonial social history, describes the ways in which historians have moved from the writing of epic and institutional accounts of Latin America's colonial epoch towards the writing of histories that stress the social and economic aspects of past events and periods. Because Lockhart describes the uses to which older studies can be put for the writing of social history, I simply make reference in the bibliography to the several studies of Peruvian viceroys, corregidores, intendants, and institutions like the Merchants' Guild and the Town Council, mentioning specific works only insofar as they can continue to shed further light on the revolts themselves.

While Lockhart chose to organize his discussion of colonial social history in terms of histories that were primarily epic, institutional, administrative, economic, and social in nature, I have arranged my comments about the unpublished and secondary materials dealing with colonial peasant revolts by clearly defined themes, topics, or approaches in order to compare and contrast the ways in which historical interest has developed over time from the colonial era to the present. Besides, it seems to me fruitful to discuss materials of different kinds that are marked by similarities in technique and analysis in order that the reader might gain some idea of the newer methodologies being applied to the subject of late colonial insurrection.

Therefore, my discussion will first center briefly on the recent general studies of late colonial rebellion before moving to a consideration of specific topics, such as the rebellions as outgrowths of Bourbon administrative reformism, regional rivalries, manifestations of cultural nationalism, multi-class phenomena, and as evidence of changes taking place in the viceregal economy. Obviously, other aspects of the revolts might also be covered, while at the same time it is surely presumptuous to try to survey adequately even these topics in the space of a few pages. Therefore, several other topics and methodologies are alluded to only briefly and suggestions for future research are offered summarily.

GENERAL HISTORIES OF ANDEAN PEASANT REVOLT

As Fredrick Pike's discussion of Peruvian nationalism indicates, socioracial prejudice against the Indian in the nineteenth century not only inhibited nation-building but discouraged the writing of the Indian past, especially its revolutionary aspects. Not surprisingly, therefore, non-Peruvians, such as the English historian and publicist Sir Clements R. Markham, were the first to produce a sympathetic, separatist interpretation of the Túpac Amaru revolt, an approach later taken by Spanish historian Sebastian de Lorente.

During the nineteenth century Peruvians maintained close cultural ties with their former mother country although the two nations were briefly at war with one another. With Peru's defeat by Chile in the War of the Pacific in 1883, however, Peruvian intellectuals sought an alternative to what they began to regard as an outmoded and degenerate Hispanic tradition in order to rationalize this defeat and to provide Peru with a more adequate basis for the future. Out of

this new orientation gradually emerged the concept of *indigenismo*, or a nationalist consciousness of Peru's Indian heritage, which replaced the *hispanismo* that rationalized Indian socioracial inferiority as the cause of Peruvian misfortune.⁵

Indigenismo was exemplified by renewed interest in the culture and traditions of the Inca empire, a subject long neglected by criollo historians. The Peruvian essayist Ricardo Palma, a representative of the new coastal middle class that felt alienated from the older Hispanophile elite of Lima, mocked this group by satirizing the old Spanish order that they sought to preserve. Palma, while not an indigenista, often referred to Indian themes in his writings. Although he exhibited no interest in Andean revolt or the peasantry, his value-charged stereotypes of foppish, incompetent colonial elites and of humble, uncomprehending peasants are clearly in need of revision.

In the United States, historians Bernard Moses (1908, 1919) and Phillip Ainsworth Means (1919, 1932, 1942) first drew scholarly attention to the subject of Andean peasant rebellion as part of the gradual process of the decline of Spain in America during the last part of the eighteenth century. Means, a confirmed indigenist, recognized that the events of 1780 had a relatively slight connection with what had gone before and prefigured a final break with Spain some years later. Moreover, he found the Túpac Amaru revolt to be significant in itself since it confirmed his belief that Incaic society was morally superior to that of the Spanish and destroyed the myth of Indian passivity and adaptability that had persisted since the conquest.

Far less can be said about the quality of the histories about late colonial rebellion being written in Spain and Peru at this time. Joaquín García Naranjo's thesis, although based on primary documents located in the Archivo General de las Indias in Seville, is a pedestrian effort that betrays the author's unfamiliarity with Peru, while Emilio del Solar's thesis, written in Lima and based on materials collected by Odriozola, does little beyond recounting the details of the Túpac Amaru rebellion in a chronological fashion. In 1914, however, Peruvian historians expanded their focus on late colonial rebellions to include the revolt led by Mateo García Pumacahua in 1814. The books by Luis Antonio Eguiguren (1914) and Jorge Cornejo Bouroncle (1956) struggle valiantly with the fact that Pumacahua, the cacique of Chincero, had been instrumental in defeating Túpac Amaru in 1781 and, as a brigadier in the Spanish Army, had assisted José Manuel de Goyeneche in opposing rebellion in Upper Peru in 1811, before declaring himself in revolt against the government in Cuzco in 1814. In 1929, historian Jorge Basadre, speaking to an audience at San Marcos University in Lima, held that whereas the Túpac Amaru revolt was "an act of collective vengeance" against whites and was regressive in its rural, agrarian nature and its leader's refusal to accept the support of white, urban groups, Pumacahua's belated rebellion in 1814, which united Creole and Indian dissidents, rich and poor, in a movement for independence and social justice, was a more appropriate symbol of *peruanidad*, or prenational integration.

In recent years the attention to these later rebellions has shifted somewhat. Alipio Valencia Vega's (1950) study of the revolt of Julián Túpac Catari in Upper Peru has attempted to vindicate the Indian rebels of that area who have

long been characterized as brutes for the atrocities they allegedly committed against the white settlers of La Paz. Fortunately, two scholarly theses, by Leona R. Auld and Patricia C. Hutchins, reduce the level of polemic surrounding these rebellions, although neither offers any new information concerning the events themselves. Marcelo Grondin N. surveys the whole range of rebellion occurring in Upper Peru between 1780 and 1783 but suffers from both an excess of ambition and a lack of primary documentation. More recently, the studies of Manuel Jesús Aparicio Vega and Carlos Daniel Valcarcel (1971) have stressed the creolist nature of the revolts of 1814. Both contend that they were led by the prominent Creole family, the Angulos of Cuzco, who obtained the support of other social classes and of Pumacahua. By downplaying the role of the enigmatic Pumacahua, these consensus historians are better able to develop their thesis of a more unified, multi-class movement for independence that benefitted all sectors of society.

The study of late colonial peasant rebellions was immeasurably furthered, during the period 1946–57, by the appearance of Carlos Daniel Valcarcel, a young Peruvian scholar on the faculty of the University of San Marcos in Lima, and Boleslao Lewin, a Polish Jew who had become a naturalized Argentine citizen after fleeing the terrors of Nazi Germany. In the 1940s, Valcarcel had begun to use parochial records and other primary source materials to piece together the genealogy of Túpac Amaru and the other rebel leaders. After publishing a synthesis of colonial indigenous rebellion in Peru in which he stressed the spiritual unities between the revolts of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, he wrote a monographic study of the Túpac Amaru rebellion that was published in Mexico in 1947. In it, he argued that the revolt was reformist in nature, designed to end the repartimiento de mercancías, the mita, and the corregimiento system rather than to provoke independence.

As the tide of Peruvian nationalism crested during the postwar period, however, Valcarcel made an apparent *volte face*, finally concluding in 1957 that Túpac Amaru had begun to move for independence in the latter stages of his rebellion when it had become clear that his original limited attack against the Spanish administrative system had failed to produce social justice for the Indian. Basing his argument on documentation in the Spanish archives in which the rebel leader referred to himself as “King José I,” Valcarcel proclaimed that 1781 signalled the beginning of a new, “independent era” in Peruvian history that marked the demise of colonialism.

Writing in 1943 and 1957, Lewin closely identified the Indian rebels’ search for freedom and self-determination with the Jewish efforts to prevent a holocaust, both movements representing the universal struggle of oppressed peoples for human dignity. Refusing to view the Indians as helpless victims of Spanish tyranny as earlier writers tended to portray them, Lewin assembled two hundred pages of original documentation from the archives of Spain and Spanish America in support of his thesis that Túpac Amaru and his successors were valiant heroes willing to fight and die for their freedom.

While the efforts of these two men have advanced the field of study considerably, the two have quarreled bitterly over the correct interpretation of

the goals of the Túpac Amaru rebellion, even though Valcarcel has come quite close to accepting Lewin's separatist thesis in recent years.⁶ Nevertheless, both have drawn extensively on primary documentation throughout Spain and Spanish America developing the complete history of Andean peasant rebellion from its beginnings in Lower Peru and its spread into Upper Peru, the western marches of the Río de la Plata, Chile, and perhaps even Panama.

The appearance of two major contributions on the subject of colonial revolt undoubtedly inspired a rash of more superficial Peruvian studies claiming Túpac Amaru as the harbinger of Peruvian nationalism. Among these were works by the cuzqueño historian Jorge Cornejo Bouroncle (1949a, b), César García Rosell, Roger Luján Ripoll, Luis Velazco Aragón, and Luis Torres Almeyda, all of which are marked more by their declamatory patriotism than by any intrinsic analysis of the events in question.⁷ In the United States, Lillian Estelle Fisher, a Mexicanist by training, drew heavily from the Angelis and Odriozola collections, and more particularly from the earlier works of Valcarcel and Lewin, in her book on the last Inca revolts. Accepting Valcarcel's original interpretation, Fisher concluded that these rebellions were not separatist but were instead desperate efforts by the Indians to reform the Peruvian economic and administrative systems. To her credit, Fisher attempts to draw the disparate revolts of 1780 into a coherent whole and plays up the important distaff role in these rebellions. In my opinion, however, the work is seriously flawed by her refusal to see other causes for the revolts than the allegedly intolerable economic conditions under which the Indian suffered and her belief that the movement was triumphant because it forced Spanish authorities to make a series of administrative changes in Peru after 1783. Moreover, the book is replete with errors of fact and interpretation, is badly organized, and suffers from a lack of interpretive analysis that might have aided subsequent researchers. Hopefully, the late John Leddy Phelan's forthcoming study of the Comunero revolt, which took place in New Granada in 1781, will help to provide a fuller historical perspective for the Túpac Amaru rebellion, which is badly needed.

Since the appearance of Fisher's book, Argentine sociologist Oscar Cornblit has come forward in a provocative article on mass rebellion in Peru and Bolivia in 1780. He alleges that the economic situation of late colonial Peru affected non-Indians as well as indigenous peoples and denies that there is any direct correlation between economic abuses and Indian revolt as Fisher and others contend. The multi-class, interethnic aspect of the rebellions is also stressed in recent books by Juan José Vega (1969), Luis Durand Flores, and Julio César Chaves (1973), all of whom attempt, with varying degrees of success, to approach the rebellion of Túpac Amaru from a socioeconomic perspective by examining its social composition, economic orientation, and administrative demands.

In sum, the last two decades have been marked by the appearance of a few notable monographic studies dealing with the Túpac Amaru revolt, although far less work of a revisionist nature has appeared on the related rebellions taking place subsequent to that of the *gran precursor*. In recent years, scholars from the antiestablishment Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, notably Heraclio Bonilla, have begun to contend that it is misleading to represent Túpac Amaru's rebellion as

the harbinger of a new era in Peruvian history, preferring to view it as a failed attempt at liberating Peru from the neocolonialism that was fastened on the area with Creole independence. Marxist historians like José Bonilla Amado echo the same theme, using the revolt to illustrate their message of Spain's brutal capitalist domination of Peru and seeing Túpac Amaru's struggle as but the first round in the masses' battle for self-determination. Although these works are more suggestive than definitive, they mark the demise of the mawkishly nationalistic outpourings of Creole historians that flowered with the commemoration of the sesquicentennial celebration of Peruvian independence in 1969; and perhaps they signal the approach of a period of greater objectivity in considering the meaning of mass rebellion in the late colonial era.

BOURBON REFORMISM AND REVOLT, 1750–1808

As recent studies of the Bourbon reforms in Peru make quite clear, Creoles considered the eighteenth century to have been an aberration, with the later Bourbons attempting to, in John TePaske's words, "turn [the Creoles'] world upside down," by removing them from positions of power and authority and imposing ever higher levels of taxation and other restrictions on these faithful vassals. The works of Magnus Mörner (1969), John R. Fisher (1970), Vicente Palacio Atard, John Preston Moore, M. A. Burkholder and D. S. Chandler (1977), and Leon G. Campbell (1972a, 1978), among others, all indicate that the collective measures taken by King Charles III and his zealous Minister of the Indies, José de Gálvez, were devastating to all Peruvian social groups and that rebellion became more frequent and socially generalized after the arrival in Lima in 1777 of Visitor General José Antonio de Areche. These administrative historians feel the revolts must necessarily be placed within this context in order to be properly understood.

Fisher's study of the Peruvian intendency system, initiated in 1784 in the wake of the Túpac Amaru rebellion, provides the first full-scale examination of the structure and nature of the Peruvian governmental system during the period between this revolt and the later one of Pumacahua in 1814. In two articles (1968, 1971) devoted to the Túpac Amaru rebellion, Fisher explains the series of fruitless attempts made by the Indians of the Cuzco area to secure a legal redress of their grievances, which ultimately resulted in a sudden, unplanned, and violent outburst against the injustices of Spanish colonialism. Fisher's analysis of the revolts is marked by sensitivity towards the racial makeup of the insurrectionists. Creoles, he feels, remained ambivalent towards the rebellion: on the one hand they recognized that it offered an escape from a corrupt and unworkable system; on the other, they saw the necessity of crushing the rebellion in order to retain the system for their own purposes. This ambivalence, Fisher maintains, is evidence of the subtle nuances that mark the various protest movements punctuating Peru during the years 1780–1816, which researchers must first recognize in order to understand these revolts. Peasant rebellion represented a socioracial challenge to Creole elites; yet, as cuzqueños, smarting at the subservient position in which they were often placed by limeños, these events held out the promise of resolving their long-standing antagonism towards the coastal

region. Whatever the case, Fisher clearly demonstrates that Bourbon reformism after 1784 hardly decided the issue in the Creoles' favor and evidence of political discontent is strong in Peru from that time until the imposition of independence in 1821. Clearly, further research is required in order to clarify the process whereby Creole moderates who had helped to put down the Túpac Amaru revolt in 1781 became disenchanted with the failures of the postwar reforms and began to adopt the Indians' problems as their own, as some of them had done by 1814.

Certain other histories of Peruvian administration in the late eighteenth century can also shed light on the subject of Indian revolt and possibly point the way for future research. For example, Palacio Atard's study of the conflicting personalities of the creolist Viceroy Manuel de Guirior and the Spanish Visitor General Areche indicates the strength of the Bourbons' desire to reform the Peruvian bureaucracy and hints at the fissures that were produced within the government over the appropriate response toward highland peasant rebellion. My own work (1975; 1976a, b; 1978) on the Peruvian regular and militia forces also uncovers considerable evidence about the depth and breadth of conflict within the Peruvian bureaucracy, most notably between Creole militia officers and their regular Spanish counterparts, as well as between civil and military authorities, over the jurisdiction of the war effort and, equally importantly, the control of the highlands in the postwar reconstruction period. I have found, for example, that the Spanish military command and staff group in Cuzco effectively circumvented the Creoles on the Cuzco town council who were not, as Moore's study of the Bourbon *cabildo* suggests, responsible for suppressing the revolt. Clearly, the entire subject of viceregal authority during wartime needs to be reexamined so that it can be correlated with broader patterns of anti-Creole discrimination that have been identified by Burkholder and Chandler (1977) on an imperial scale.

Besides the new advances in the field of administrative history already mentioned, researchers should be aware of the opportunities for applying new techniques and perspectives to more venerable Peruvian institutions as a means of better understanding the nature of colonial revolt. For example, the studies by Carlos Castañeda and Guillermo Lohmann Villena of the Spanish corregidor might be utilized as starting points for developing a prosopographical analysis of the Peruvian *corregidor de indios*, the Spanish official against whom most of the insurrections were ostensibly directed. With the legalization of the *repartimiento de mercancías* in 1756, which allowed these officials to conduct forced sales of goods to the Indians, a new type of *corregidor* may have emerged, possibly more avaricious than his predecessors. If this is so, was the change pronounced enough to result in an alteration of social relationships between whites and Indians, and how were these patterns changed? More specifically, research into the character and personality of Antonio de Arriaga, the Spanish *corregidor* of Tinta, would be welcome to establish whether he was typical of his class or a brutal exception to the rule as the rebels maintained. Why, we might ask, did some *corregidores*, like the valiant Sebastián de Segurola in Puno, distinguish themselves against the rebels while others fled from their provinces or

refused to provide men and mules for the King's armies? Leaving aside personal and psychological differences within the group, it could be that the revolts offered certain opportunities for these officials to extend their bases of power or to oppose recent Bourbon efforts to tax their commerce with the Indians. In any case, a full study of the *corregimiento* and its occupants over time would serve as a fascinating adjunct to our understanding of the nature of Bourbon administration at its most immediate levels in Peru.

My work (1978) on the colonial armies provides yet another example of the ways in which the study of a particular institution can contribute to an understanding of social rebellion. For instance, the study of recruitment and career patterns of the Peruvian militias helps to define the precise social structure of the colony in the last part of the eighteenth century. The Spaniards' selection of certain units (e.g., free blacks, mestizos) to fight the rebels and their behavior in combatting insurrections led by persons of similar socioeconomic backgrounds can also help to provide clues to the social relationships among nonwhite groups. For example, Spanish military commanders largely overlooked and later demobilized mestizo militia units that they considered untrustworthy, in favor of free blacks from Lima, who rarely deserted and fought bravely against Indian soldiers. Following the rebellions of 1780, the Spanish demobilized these militias, often officered by Creoles, and replaced them with more loyal Spanish regular troops, emphasizing even more strongly Cuzco's status as a conquered province.

Several questions about indigenous rebellion have yet to be answered. For example, did militia service after 1763 develop in the Indians a military consciousness that manifested itself in 1780? Was the decision to establish veteran military garrisons in highland Peru in 1784 spearheaded by Spanish merchants who desired a return to economic normalcy? What military lessons did the Spaniards learn in subduing the rebels of 1780 that they may have been able to employ after 1808 against similar insurrections?

In a similar vein, investigators might profit from following up the suggestion made earlier by Joseph Bram that close parallels exist between the modes of Inca warfare in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and seeing if they apply to the late colonial revolts. By the eighteenth century, Indians were organized into auxiliary militia companies and familiarized with the modes and techniques of Spanish armaments and warfare. Whereas the revolts of Juan Santos and Túpac Catari indicate that these rebels retained the use of Inca guerrilla strategy and psychological warfare tactics that had been successful during the conquest, Túpac Amaru apparently adhered to a Hispanic mode of waging war. Work also needs to be done to determine the exact social composition and command structure of the rebel armies after 1780. This information might provide us with an idea of the groups and localities that supported the movements, the dynamics of these rebellions, and, by inference, a better understanding of Incaic society during the later colony. It may be that a military tradition of the Andean peasantry was established during this time that has continued unto the present day.

ANDEAN PEASANT REVOLTS AS REGIONAL STRUGGLES

In recent years, historians have begun to see in the peasant rebellions of the late colonial period evidence of the intense rivalries that divided the coast (symbolized and represented by Lima, the viceregal capital) from the interior (represented by Cuzco, the capital of the former Inca empire). Indications of regionalism are, of course, manifest throughout Peruvian historiography, but the revolts of 1780 tend to bring into sharper focus the social conflicts existing between the limeño and provincial elite groups and help to point up the nature of the economic mechanisms whereby the interior became a satellite of the coast.

José Sebastian Urquiaga's effort to describe the revolts' effects on Puno, the important city that controlled the overland route between Cuzco and La Paz, Ricardo Caillet-Bois' study of the revolts in Cochabamba, Carlos A. Romero's synthesis of Indian rebellions outside of Cuzco, and Hildebrando H. Sotelo's monograph on the revolts in the province of Huarochirí constitute the first generation of regional studies of indigenous rebellion, many of them based on local archival sources that had not been consulted previously by historians. Following World War II, this interest in regional history increased. Juan Manuel Chávez Torres' study of the revolts' impact on the important province of Arequipa was followed by Alberto García Fernández' monograph dealing with the same subject for the provinces of Condesuyos and Cailloma. More recently, Argentine historian Edberto Oscar Acevedo (1958, 1960) has completed several bibliographical and archival studies of the Chilean province of Cuyo and the intendancy of Salta del Tucumán, formerly part of the viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata, while Marcos Antonio Altamirano's book provides new data about the Gran Chaco in the colonial era. Although these studies vary in quality, they indicate that colonial Peru constitutes a large protonational structure with well-defined subregions that vary according to wealth and ethnic composition, proximity or isolation from the capital, and integration into the Spanish export economy. These regional histories provide us with an understanding of the socioeconomic bases of these subregions from which it may one day be possible to extract principles of variation and evolution of the phenomenon of indigenous revolt.

Regional studies already are bearing fruit. We now know, for example, that the revolts in La Paz and Oruro were closely tied to issues specifically linked to the mining economy there, issues that were of little concern to Indian groups in Lower Peru not directly affected by them. At the Fifth International Congress of the History of America held in Lima in 1971, Alejandro Malaga Medina, César A. Angeles Caballero, and Eusebio Quiroz Paz-Soldán delivered three papers dealing with the revolts' impact on Arequipa and Huarochirí. All were based on an impressive array of primary materials and developed the social and economic structures of these areas to support their contention that the Bourbon tax reform measures had served to unite Creoles and mestizos behind the movement to reform the viceregal economy. Lorenzo Huerta's companion study of Ayacucho held that these reforms had helped to cause a visible decline in the mining industry which in turn led the miners to occupy Indian communal lands, thus

creating the preconditions for indigenous revolt that ran parallel to these non-Indian movements. Huerta's documents portray the *ayacucheros* as an avaricious group who consented to lend support to Cuzco on the coldly economic grounds that their refusal to do so would disrupt the lucrative commerce between the two areas and the corregidores as men who sought to extort the Indians even as enemy forces approached their districts. Although such papers reflect the semi-official government position that independence was a broad-based and essentially harmonious class struggle against the Spaniards, astute use of provincial archives can point up varieties in the rebellious experience that provide valuable patterns of specific local reality.

PEASANT REVOLT AND THE VICEREGAL ECONOMY

It is evident to anyone caring to look at the several recent histories of the late colonial economy of Peru that these studies are of major importance in understanding the occasions of peasant revolt in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The several analyses of colonial mining, finance, landholding systems, merchants and commerce, as well as the related subjects of demographic structures and migratory patterns all provide a matrix into which the phenomenon of rebellion can be placed for analysis.

In two related research articles John TePaske (1972, 1975) has explained the salient developments taking place in the field of colonial quantitative history, while the forthcoming *Field Research Guide to the Andean Area* will continue the discussion of recent advances in this and other methodological fields. In them the author explains his collection of Peruvian treasury accounts that can help researchers to chart the long-range changes taking place in viceregal development over time. TePaske's data are enormously valuable for understanding the period of rebellion for they indicate clearly that the expenses incurred by the government in putting down these rebellions were considerable.

However, we still must search for the difference between the expenses incurred by the royal treasury and the price paid, in economic terms, by individuals and regions in Peru to put down the rebellions. Historians have passively accepted the phenomenon of material destruction and have too often made generalizations based on the numerous contemporary accounts describing burned haciendas, destroyed workshops, and families that had been ruined by these violent uprisings. Magnus Mörner (1976), in a provocative paper based on data from the bishopric of Cuzco, questions the uncritical acceptance of this personal testimony without specific information about the items that were destroyed. Mörner feels that the wanton destruction of property by Indian rebels hardly makes sense in a culture of poverty such as that of rural, eighteenth-century Peru and that former owners often magnified their losses in an effort to draw pensions and other government benefits. The opportunity presently exists for historians to use available census data to compare the number and quality of landholds and businesses in each area before and after periods of peasant revolt in order to determine levels of physical destruction. Since the value of goods was often inflated and some properties were presumably recovered, this meth-

odology is not foolproof, but the question of economic impact is an important aspect of rebellion that needs further study. My own research on the military, for example, indicates that the Royalists used Sherman-like tactics, burning Indian crops and stealing livestock in order to inhibit peasant support for the rebellion, yet no full-scale economic history of the revolts has yet been written that might test the accepted idea that the rebels alone laid waste to the viceroyalty.

Another area that offers insights of value to the historian of late colonial rebellion is historical demography. Recent studies by Günter Vollmer and Nicolás Sánchez Albornoz (1974) indicate that census figures for the colonial Indian population, originally derived from the writings of Cosme Bueno and later George Kubler (1952), may be in error. Herbert Klein's analysis of the 1786 census in the districts of Chulumani and Pacajes in Upper Peru, for example, contends that population levels there had returned to normal by that time, bringing into question Visitor General Jorge de Escobedo's statement that as many as one hundred thousand Indians perished in the revolts of 1780, the most destructive waste of human life to occur in the colonial era. Klein's findings are supported by Mörner's (1976) recent study of census data for ten provinces in the Cuzco district, which indicates that even if substantial margins of error are allowed for, losses of human life during the period 1780–83 could not have reached the levels estimated by contemporary accounts. Obviously, more work with census materials and other demographic data is called for to assess properly the impact of colonial revolt in human terms.

One of the more provocative subjects dealing with the colonial Indian in the Andean area has been his migratory patterns. Chilean historian Rolando Mellafé has stressed the importance of understanding the direction, rhythm, and social results of this migration, while local studies by Horacio Carrillo for Jujuy and Claudio Esteva Fabregat for Chinchero make it clear that the Indians helped create an unstable economic situation by fleeing to avoid mita service in the mines.

As these works infer, the relationship between migration and Indian revolt is a topic in need of further study. For example, the Catari movement in Upper Peru seems, on the one hand, to have been a protest of *originarios* (persons native to a region) against *forasteros* (migrants) who were occupying their lands, allegedly with the aid of local authorities, since the corregidores were willing to sell them these lands whereas local Indian communities would only rent them on a limited basis. Oscar Cornblit maintains that because the exactions of the Spanish fell most heavily on these migrants, who had been displaced from their homes by rising tribute levels and mita service obligations, they logically came to constitute the strongest supporters of the Túpac Amaru rebellion. Mörner (1976), however, evaluating the degree of in-migration into the bishopric of Cuzco, notices that these levels were lower in the rebellious provinces of Tinta and Quispicanchis than in the areas of Calca y Lares and Paucartambo, where support for the rebels was badly divided. Moreover, Indian revolts erupted in 1780 in districts that were not subject to providing mita service in the mines of Potosí and Huancavelica but not in those regions that were liable for these levies, which raises questions about Cornblit's hypotheses. On the

other hand, areas such as the Upper Peruvian province of Chayanta, the setting of the Catari revolt, had been marked by unusually high levels of in-migration after 1754, with forasteros outnumbering originarios in two of the three repartimientos. All of this evidence prompts the conclusion that migratory patterns, mita service, and the phenomenon of peasant rebellion may not necessarily be causally connected and that the subject does not lend itself to facile generalization. Yet causal connections need not be established of necessity. Migration itself may indicate opposition to illegitimate economic demands and other forms of discontent. Besides, mass migration forced the Crown to exact greater amounts of tribute from settled Indians having access to community property and to place available individuals on mita rosters. Might this have prevented Indians from commuting their service obligations by means of cash payment and, if so, how did they react to such changes? The answers to these and other related questions are crucial not only to the study of colonial rebellion but to an understanding of colonial Indian life in general.

A spate of recent works dealing with the economic history of late colonial Peru also leads quite naturally to the subject of peasant rebellion. J. R. Fisher's (1975) article on Peruvian mining, extracted from his forthcoming book on the same subject, contends that silver production was increasing in the years posterior to the revolts of 1780, bringing into question Guillermo Céspedes' (1947) earlier contention that the creation of the viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata in 1776 had ushered in a period of severe economic depression. Oscar Febres Villaroel and others believe that Peru did suffer from declining production levels in the agrarian sector after midcentury, a subject explained more fully by Demetrio Ramos, but the degree and specificity of this downturn is debatable. There is little doubt that the limeño economy, based as it was on the export trade, was hard hit by the new viceroyalty, which changed commercial patterns as silver minted in the audiencia of Charcas was exported from Buenos Aires rather than Lima. But French economic historians, notably Marie Helmer (1950), contend that the cuzqueño economy was relatively unaffected by these events and the region continued to provide textiles, its primary export, to Charcas as before. Cuzco's superiority in the textile trade, explains Fernando Silva Santiesteban, stemmed from the numerous obrajes and the abundance of artisans in the area who produced cloths and hats of fine quality.

In an unpublished paper delivered at the International Congress of Americanists Meeting in Paris, Mörner (1976) explains that the revolts of 1780 broke out along El Camino Real, the important commercial highway linking Lima with Potosí. Along both sides of this highway, and especially in the Cuzco region, were located sugar haciendas, workshops, and other cottage industries. Not only was the population located along this commercial artery growing rapidly, it may have been changing as well from a settled, more traditional peasantry to one closely tied into the Potosí commercial axis and linked by it to the larger European productive system. This phenomenon was certainly more true for southern Peru and Bolivia than for the central and northern regions of the viceroyalty, areas that conform much more closely to the observations about an economic structure that was contracting considerably since the mid-eighteenth century.

Using this frame of reference, how can the revolts be explained in economic terms? Might it not be profitable, as Juan José Vega (1969) has begun to do, to examine the rebellions in terms of the support given to the rebels by various economic groups—miners, merchants, muleteers, owners, and petty tradesmen? Túpac Amaru, as is well known, was an *arriero* (mule trader), an occupation that carried him the length and breadth of the viceroyalty. In his travels along El Camino Real, he established a network of contacts and may well have observed that these peasants were far more susceptible to the fluctuations of the colonial economy as a whole than were the more traditional, basically subsistence peasantry who were integrated into the colonial system only indirectly through taxation, labor service, and extra-legal exactions. Did support for the revolt come from the laborers in the workshops, from the largely mestizo muleteer class, or from the *jornales* (day-laborers)? How did mestizos receive the revolt? The late Emilio Choy (1967b), a pioneer in the investigation of the social and economic history of late colonial rebellion in Peru, feels that Túpac Amaru's unfortunate actions against the landholds and workshops in Cuzco cost him the support of many mestizos except for the poorest, most rootless elements, such as Nicolas Apasa and Julian Túpac Catari. The rebel cacique's failure to notice this erosion of support, Choy feels, led to his indecision over which groups to cultivate and helps to explain many of the ambiguities of the rebellion itself.

Túpac Amaru always contended that his revolt was not anticommercial in the least and explained to the Cuzco town council that increased trade was "the principal means of preserving the kingdom." Yet even though he won the support of certain merchants such as the limeño Miguel Montiel, Spanish merchant groups formed the backbone of the civil militias sent against the rebels, and the Merchants' Guild served as the viceroy's largest creditor during the rebellions. Afterwards, the cuzqueño merchants moved quickly to force the government to garrison the highlands in order to revive the region's trade. Obviously, a full study of Peruvian merchant groups and their responses to reformism and revolt would provide the colonialist with valuable insights into the workings of the old order when faced with the challenges of the new.

Our knowledge of the agrarian structure of Peru, notably of the southern highlands, has been improved considerably by the recent studies of Mörner (1970b; 1975a,b). They outline the structure of the population, landholds, markets, and commercial patterns in the Cuzco region during the period covered by the rebellions and provide (1975a) important bibliographical material for future study of these topics. His work supplements the earlier studies by Pablo Macera (1971) and María Encarnación Rodríguez Vicente (1973–74), which largely concern certain haciendas and the valuation of goods produced on them. More recently, Karen Spalding (1975a, b) has begun to question the traditional interpretation of the history of Andean agrarian structure, which portrays the great estate as the dominant unit of production. Noticing the dynamic economic activities of selected Indian communities, Spalding indicates that in the latter part of the eighteenth century these communities may not have been in a uniformly dependent relationship with the haciendas, as is often believed to be the case. Yet a remarkably consistent pattern of alliances between village peasants and

urban dwellers against the large landowners emerges from the revolts of the late colonial period and seems to remain intact until the present century. Collectively, these studies, which admittedly barely begin to scratch the surface of the complex history of agrarian structures and rural relationships, indicate that although great changes occurred in the Indian marketing system after 1750, including the obvious commercialization of agriculture after that time, the economic causes of peasant revolution are often more apparent than real and may not fully account for groups joining or opposing these protests. For example, Brooke Larson's recent dissertation, dealing with productive, market, and class structures in the Cochabamba region of Upper Peru before and after the Catari revolt of 1781, utilizes the rebellion as a means of dealing with issues of stratification and social differentiation. Unlike some other regions of Peru, she has found status differentials to outweigh economic grievances as a cause of revolt in certain Indian communities.

In any event, the complex, and often paradoxical, rural world outside of urban and Spanish Peru remains, for all practical purposes, a *tierra incognita*, the explanation of which is of crucial importance for an understanding of late colonial society. The remarkable work being done with surviving Nahuatl documentation by Arthur J. O. Anderson, Frances Berdan, and James Lockhart, and Ida Altman and Lockhart's companion study of several colonial Mexican provinces offer appropriate examples of history that deals with the regional evolution of rural peoples. Such an approach to the study of late colonial Peru would complement nicely the preliminary work of French historian Jean Piel (1967–68, 1970, 1975), who has studied the peasantry in postindependent Peru in the context of an agrarian structure that, to use his words, "had an inherent and surprising faculty for adaptation" to changing times.

PEASANT REBELLION AND CULTURAL NATIONALISM

One of the real problems of understanding and explaining indigenous rebellion during the colonial period stems from our lack of knowledge about the colonial Indian. While the research of historians such as Charles Gibson and Spalding is beginning to rectify this situation, put simply, we still know far more about colonial Spaniards, who left voluminous written records, than about the colonial Indians, who did not. As Spalding (1972) has noted in a recent research article devoted to this subject, the whole topic of colonial peasant revolts might profitably be studied in terms of cultural factors contributing to the development of planned directed rebellions. These same factors can also help to explain the development of Inca cultural nationalism during this same era.

We have progressed a great deal from the early works of anthropologists of the stripe of Luis Valcarcel, who attempted to portray Túpac Amaru as a symbol of the growth of a distinctly Peruvian culture and his movement as a unified Indian-mestizo-criollo nationalist effort to replace Spanish colonialism with home rule. Following World War II, anthropologically trained professionals, such as George Kubler, John H. Rowe, and John V. Murra, contributed greatly to our understanding of the growth of and permutations in Inca cultural develop-

ment; but much remains to be done. For example, how did the Incas keep alive the concept of *incario*, or “Incaship,” from the sixteenth century onwards? Moreover, how did they succeed, as they apparently did, in increasing the legitimacy of this concept by the eighteenth century and broadening it to include groups that, in the sixteenth century, were part of the empire only by virtue of having been conquered? The works of Horacio Villanueva Urteaga (1958, 1964) explore this subject but fail to define the means by which *incario* was to be revived and how these ideas were translated into action. Luis Martín’s short study of Indian education in colonial Peru hints that the concept may have been kept alive in schools for the Indian nobility, but additional work on the growth of Incaship should be a high priority among Andean ethno-historians. Recently, Soviet scholar Yuri A. Zubritski has analyzed the political content of the writings of several Quechua poets of the late colony, finding them to be anticolonialist and highly reflective of a Quechua national culture. This provocative work emphasizes the value of studying the revolts from a literary perspective in the same way that late colonial Spanish society has been viewed through the pens of poets, satirists, and social critics.

No one has provided more of a cultural anthropological understanding of the subject of peasant revolt in general and of the Túpac Amaru rebellion in particular than Berkeley anthropologist Rowe, who has examined colonial portraits of Inca nobles and studied Inca wooden cups as part of a larger effort to trace the origins of Inca nationalism well back into the seventeenth century. Rowe held that Inca cultural nationalism stemmed not only from their initial failure to resist militarily Spanish penetration into the empire in the sixteenth century but also developed as a means of preserving Inca culture in a modernizing world. Rowe (1954) briefly sketched the history of Inca nationalist revolt, distinguishing the local, particularistic rebellions of the early eighteenth century from the more broadly generalized uprisings of 1780 and afterwards. All of these he felt represented Inca separatist aspirations rather than mestizo reformist movements designed to end social and economic abuses, as Peruvian consensus historians have contended. Although not all researchers will accept Rowe’s unequivocal thesis of Inca separatism, his bold conceptualization of a dynamic and bellicose Inca culture can only inspire colonial scholars to reexamine the Inca world, which the Spaniards in Peru found ever more difficult to control.

The key to Inca nationalism, Rowe believes, is to be found in the persons known as *kurakas* (caciques), hereditary chieftains holding a variety of formal powers within Indian society and, as heirs of the Inca Empire, possessed of a certain status in the Spanish world as well. As Rowe and Spalding note, the position of *kuraka* became increasingly difficult to obtain during the eighteenth century, as is attested to by Túpac Amaru’s torturous effort to secure his rightful claim to the title of Marqués de Oropesa before the judges of the *audiencia* of Lima. Required to collect the *repartimiento de efectos* for the *corregidores* after this device was legalized in 1756, the *kuraka* increasingly became a marginalized member of both Spanish and Inca cultural communities.

Considerable disagreement exists over the precise attitude of the approximately two thousand *kurakas* of Peru towards the Túpac Amaru revolt in 1780.

Some historians, such as Kubler, conclude that the revolt lacked a formal indigenous cultural content, primarily because of Túpac Amaru's failure to surmount the weaknesses of the hereditary cacical group; this led the rebel chief to adopt a reformist orientation that appealed to a broader, non-Indian constituency. This thesis is unacceptable to Rowe, Lewin, and Arlene Eisen (Sarfatti and Eisen), all of whom contend that support from the kurakas was sufficiently strong to allow the rebels to campaign for aid among non-Indians. As proof of this they point out the Spaniard's vigorous attempt to destroy Inca nationalism after 1781 by eliminating these hereditary kurakaships and forbidding Indians to retain any trappings or symbols of the old empire. My research indicates that the Spaniards of Cuzco recruited most successfully among the seven sacred ayllus of the Cuzco region, whereas Túpac Amaru drew strong support from the provincial kurakas. This suggests that the revolt might be interpreted as a war between these kurakas for regional autonomy rather than simply as a struggle between whites and nonwhites. It was both of these to be sure, but we need to know why kurakas like Pumacahua and Choqueguanca opposed Túpac Amaru, to whom they referred as a bastard and usurper, instead of joining him. A full social history of this important class would not only help to define the spatial and human basis of peasant revolt, but would illuminate important status differentials within Indian society. Also, because the death or subsequent elimination of these individuals nearly robbed Indian society of its leadership after 1783, the histories of these leaders are well worth writing as part of the effort to understand how Indians adapted to a colonial system in crisis. As José Tamayo Herrera demonstrates, the Spaniards' success in dividing the kuraka class in 1780 served them well in combatting Indian insurrection in 1814. Both then and during independence Spaniards capitalized on Indian rivalries and desires for status to obtain information and military recruits, a pattern that has continued ever since.

In recent years, the influence of the sesquicentennial and the pervasive desire of Peru's Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces to develop Túpac Amaru as an authentic nationalist figure have prompted certain Peruvian historians like Luis Durand Flores to develop the rebel cacique as a mestizo conationalist, representing both the kurakas and the mestizo middle groups, rather than as an Inca nationalist. Others, such as the noted Peruvian scholar Pablo Macera (1955, 1964), reject this effort to create a harmonious interpretation of independence. Macera's work contrasts Inca nationalism, characterized by its rural, agrarian, and messianic features, with the urban and ideologically European nature of Creole nationalism that triumphed with Túpac Amaru's defeat. It was hardly accidental, Macera contends, that at the battle of Ayacucho in 1824 Creole officers and *cholo* soldiers from the central and northern parts of Peru were arrayed against peninsular Spaniards and their Quechua and Aymara-speaking peasant-soldiers, many of whose forebears had fought earlier alongside Túpac Amaru. Also, Macera feels that the defeat of the indigenous armies in 1780 provided the Creoles with, among other things, a rationale for white supremacy that forever precluded the unification of these nationalist movements.

It now seems clear that enough of the Inca social structure remained intact for Túpac Amaru to capitalize on the phenomenon of Inca nationalism in

developing his rebellion. It is also apparent that non-Indian and white social groups also chose to join several of these revolts, especially the tax rebellions that erupted in 1779–80. Oscar Cornblit believes that the rebels of 1780 were eminently successful in securing the support of non-Indians, which effectively transformed these revolts into mass movements that only broke apart when the mestizos feared that they would be supplanted in positions of influence and leadership by politically conscious Indians. As Spalding (1972) has noted, in order to get a clearer idea of both the origin and disintegration of these rebellions, it behooves historians to study the conditions, attitudes, and aims that might permit a fuller understanding of rebel recruitment of cadre for the revolts. This presupposes a knowledge of class and regional differentials that might have interfered with the alliance of Indian elites and peasants and of acculturated urban artisans with members of rural communities, as well as of factors that could possibly have bridged, however temporarily, these socioeconomic divisions.

My research (1976a, b, 1978) indicates that certain Creoles could see the advantages of linking themselves to Indian rebellions as a means of countering the Bourbon efforts to alter the traditional patrimonial system that had been so profitable for them. It remains to be seen, however, just how typical were the few demonstrable examples of these Creole-Indian alliances. We need to know which Creole families supported the revolts, what forms of opposition they suggested, and why they chose to respond as they did. Were the whites joining an Indian revolt in the hope of controlling it, which seems to have been the case in Oruro, or were they the real instigators of these tumults, as the Spanish officials in Peru and the Ministry of the Indies believed? How long did this “Creole connection” exist and what factors caused it to dissolve? Rather than cheerfully assuming racial unity against tyranny, it is time for historians to support their hunches with specific data and to assess the meaning of such interethnic co-operation that can be found to exist.

I have recently begun a study of the enigmatic Creole Bishop Moscoso who figured so prominently on both sides of the revolt. His writings shed considerable light on the attitudes of the cuzqueño hacendados who were struggling to survive against the Spanish merchants and who, apparently for this reason, withheld important economic aid to the Royalist forces, which they considered to be an army of occupation. But biographical studies such as this cannot provide the insights that a prosopographical examination of the cuzqueño priesthood would allow. Moreover, the clergy served as the most important source of intelligence for the government, and as intermediaries they maintained a voluminous correspondence with the rebel leaders. In addition, priests formed militias and helped guard the important network of bridges linking the Spanish cities of Upper and Lower Peru. An investigation of the priests and their activities could help to explain not only rebel motivation but the circulation of commerce and ideas, indeed the full history of communications throughout the Andean viceroyalty; it would also complement the work that has already been done on the limeño clergy.

Creoles and clergymen are only two of the groups that promise to shed

additional light on late colonial rebellion. The study of blacks and of women in colonial Peru during the eighteenth century is still in its infancy. We do know, of course, from Luis Millones (1973) and Emilio Harth-Terré, that blacks were never closely aligned with Indians whom they despised and distrusted. In 1780, the only militiamen on whom the viceroy could depend were the mulattoes and free blacks from Lima; yet Túpac Amaru made a special effort to free the black slaves of the Cuzco region who were in bondage to Spanish masters, perhaps for tactical as well as ideological reasons. As immigrants themselves, perhaps blacks had as much to lose as Spaniards by an Indian victory in 1780, but this did not keep several of them from revolting in Huamanga and Oruro or from joining Túpac Amaru's standard. A full study of black rebellion in Peru remains to be made, although a recent study by Wilfredo Kapsoli E. has begun to address the question.

From surviving records of the revolts of 1780, we know that Indian women served both in the ranks and as officers, recruiting males and leading them in battle, while others held trade fairs, ran farms, and performed essential civilian tasks in support of the war effort. Just recently, brief pieces by Daisey Irene Nuñez del Prado Béjar examining the role of the Quechua peasant woman and Eleanor Burkett dealing with females in colonial Peru have begun to define the field somewhat. Studies by César A. Angeles Caballero (1974) and others concerning Túpac Amaru's indomitable wife, Micaela Bastidas, suggest her strengths as a military tactician and advisor. It is time that similar studies of the entire range of distaff leadership, touched upon by Lillian E. Fisher, be made with an eye towards determining whether or not a common female experience can be said to have existed during the colony and the ways in which rebellion may have altered female roles and expectancies.

CONCLUSIONS

As the foregoing discussion of the historiography of Andean peasant rebellion indicates, scholars remain vitally concerned about both the inner logic and structure of indigenous revolt. Today many of them tend to view the past in quite different terms than did earlier students of social protest and their attitudes towards the desirability of social change and the proper means of attaining it are evident in their studies of social revolution. Often they refuse to accept the linear, progressive, and socially harmonious interpretation of the origins of Peruvian independence presented by earlier generations and, instead, view the defeat of the peasant rebels as part of a larger pattern of exploitation of non-whites by neocolonial elites.

The task of determining the true nature and meaning of these late colonial insurrections will not be easy. To begin with, virtually all of them were conceived, planned, and operationalized in secret, often by word of mouth. As a result, neither the objectives nor the social structure of rebel movements is completely defined. The indigenous leadership continued to frame and execute their plans within an Incaic cultural tradition that still defies analysis by Western urbanites. Aware of the problems of attracting non-Indian support, rebel lead-

ers may have voiced false demands and aspirations in order to ameliorate anticipated opposition. Finally, the history of peasant revolt has often been written from Spanish sources and perspectives, some of these being accounts of colonial administrators fearful of revealing the fissures existing within their ranks and anxious to present a side of the struggle that might help further their careers.

Certainly the historical net must be cast wide to embrace the totality of peasant protest and to identify its real significance. Why has the phenomenon of peasant rebellion been more pervasive in the Andean area than in New Spain, for example, where it occurred on a much smaller scale, when both were former Indian empires with many shared characteristics? To understand better the exceptional aspects of Andean peasant revolt, scholars should draw upon the numerous methodological and heuristic devices that are available to them. Certainly social psychological, quantitative, ethnohistorical, and prosopographical techniques can be used to examine aspects of late colonial society, politics, culture, and economics, which in turn may provide keys to the questions of the leadership, motivation, and social composition of the rebellions.

Assuming for the moment that more comprehensive units of Inca civilization endured in eighteenth-century Peru than in Mexico—including a persistent idolatry, use of native religion, and millennial themes, which the French anthropologist Nathan Wachtel (1967, 1971) and the Peruvian anthropologist Juan M. Ossio feel appear more frequently in Andean than Mesoamerican folklore—might not a comparative study of Peru and New Spain help to explain why eighteenth-century Inca culture was more complete than native cultures elsewhere? Phelan's (1960) earlier effort to link up neo-Aztecism with the genesis of Mexican nationalism can serve as a model in this regard. Such a study would also help us to understand how the stability of colonial elite groups was maintained and the means by which Indian and Hispanic cultures were integrated, both of which in turn could further an understanding of peasant responses to these conditions. More specifically, we ought to determine whether Túpac Amaru considered himself a mestizo or an Indian and, on the basis of this self-definition, explore his revolt within the appropriate cultural context before raising hypotheses that might only be appropriate in another setting.

I am beginning to explore the possibilities of applying concepts of charismatic authority—which have been applied by Carl J. Friedrich, Richard Fagen, and Robert Tucker, among others, in the study of contemporary Latin American political leadership—to colonial rebel leaders. Andean mythology is replete with heroes of charismatic and overriding proportions who arise at critical junctures from prehistoric times onwards. Studies of the caudillo Juan Santos by Stefano Varese (1967), José A. Vallejo, and Mario Castro Arenas (1973), allude to his charismatic qualities, which seem to have attracted the support of *montaña* Indians of the Gran Pajonal region east of Lima. It might be profitable to examine the revolts of 1780 and after to determine whether or not millennialism was employed and to what uses this concept was put. My research reveals, for example, that Túpac Amaru recruited successfully in rural areas by promising Indians eternal salvation if they were to die in battle, a tactic about which the Spaniards complained bitterly. Moreover, Túpac Amaru's charismatic qualities were ap-

parent to nearly all who came in contact with him, yet we have little idea whether this form of authority was as effective amongst a settled Indian population, with different cultural traditions than their northern and central counterparts, as it had been for Juan Santos earlier.

Recent research in colonial Peruvian history, especially that of a social and economic nature, suggests that there are overwhelming continuities over time from the mid-sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, including the dominance of the coastal and urbanized areas as compared to the rural highlands, commercial currents linking the mining centers to urban areas and from there to maritime ports across the ocean to Europe, the range and function of social types, and the like. It is within this context of continuity that the great changes initiated by the later Bourbons can best be explained and the peasant revolt evaluated. The almost exponential growth of the Bourbon bureaucracy in Peru, for example, may have diminished the traditional right of Indians and non-Indians alike to resist unjust laws and thereby have increased the likelihood of armed revolt. Scholars who undertake specific, microhistorical studies of groups and institutions in late colonial Peru will inevitably begin to separate out fragmentary forces and characteristics of peasant rebellion that hopefully can be synthesized at some later date into a general history of this phenomenon. Again, to draw on personal experience, my study of the Peruvian army and militias has uncovered considerable information about recruitment, tactics, personalities, and responses within both the Spanish and rebel armies that, when combined with other information, can further our knowledge of these insurrections. The ways in which each side recruited supporters, the military targets selected for capture and destruction, and the strategies devised to secure military goals have an importance that goes well beyond military history as reflections of the disparate mentalities and value structures of different cultures.

It should today be possible to seek connections and interrelationships among seemingly discrete incidents of peasant rebellion prior to 1780, not as a means of locating the roots of cultural and political nationalism even further back in colonial times, but rather to discover previously unarticulated patterns within these events and the way their forms varied over time. Similarly, efforts should be made to trace the process of colonial rebellion after 1781 until its appearance again in the early nineteenth century when political and social attitudes were undergoing change.

In sum, the subject of Andean peasant rebellion offers the colonialist as well as the historian of contemporary Andean history a rewarding field of study. Not only are these individual revolts significant for their ability to magnify tensions and grievances, they also constitute virtual laboratories in which to study the process of change that oftentimes led to their appearance. This overview of recent research indicates that scholars have begun lately to eschew the nationalistic approaches that characterized earlier studies of protest against Spanish colonialism and have started to review the rebellions through the lens of empiricism. Less concerned with revolt per se than their predecessors, revisionist scholars value rebellion as a means of examining larger themes of regionalism and ethnicity and understanding the socioeconomic conditions that

Andean peasants have sometimes found it necessary to combat by means of force.

NOTES

1. The region today includes the Departments of Ayacucho, Ancash, Apurímac, Cuzco, Huancavelica, and Puno. For an overview of Andean peasant revolt, 1750–1970, consult the studies of Rowe (1954), Millones (1967), Cornblit (1970), Piel (1970), and Campbell (1973b). None is comprehensive, but all of them allude to the longevity of the phenomenon and provide specific instances of these uprisings.
2. Primarily because of space limitations, I have not dealt with the very interesting question of the reasons behind the rise of scholarly, social, and political interest in the subject of peasant revolt, especially that manifested by Peru's Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces towards the Túpac Amaru rebellion. Interest in these rebellions, however, has remained high throughout the twentieth century, beginning with the indigenists during the dictatorship of Augusto B. Leguía. This approach could be an excellent way of organizing and interpreting the literature. For example, William F. Sater's forthcoming study of heroes and heroism in the Andean area finds that changing political currents have greatly influenced this phenomenon over time. I have chosen instead to focus on recent advances within the historical profession—new materials, new techniques of analysis, and new applications of theory—and to apply them to the general body of primary and secondary source materials as a means of organizing this discussion of the topic of Andean peasant revolt.
3. For a detailed answer to the question "Who is an Indian," see Fuenzalida et al. Piel (1970) expresses the belief of many radicals that the term "Indian" is one of convenience, a concept developed by Peru's white ruling elite to refer to the rural, largely indigenous masses whom they sought to control.
4. For example, see the guides of Temple (1974) for the British Museum in London and those for Peru by Valcarcel (1949a, 1951a, 1957a, 1966).
5. For a synthesis of the development of indigenism, see Marjory Urquidí's translation of José Carlos Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971).
6. Valcarcel's hostile reviews of Lewin's books are printed in *Documenta* 1 (Lima, 1948), pp. 511–13 and in the *Boletín Bibliográfico de la Universidad de San Marcos* 32: 1–4 (Lima, 1959), pp. 115–24.
7. Valcarcel's review of Cornejo's book is located in *Documenta* 3 (Lima, 1955), pp. 510–12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS AND EDITED WORKS

- ACADEMIA NACIONAL DE HISTORIA (ECUADOR)
1959 "Noticias de la rebelión del Perú por Túpac-Amaru." *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Historia* 39:93:98–100.
- ANDERSON, ARTHUR J. O., FRANCES BERDAN, AND JAMES LOCKHART, EDS. AND TRANS.
1976 *Beyond the Códices: The Nahua View of Colonial Mexico*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- ANGELIS, PEDRO DE
1836 *Documentos para la historia de la sublevación de José Gabriel Túpac Amaru, cacique de la Provincia de Tinta, en el Perú*. Buenos Aires.
- ARCHIVO HISTÓRICO DEL CUZCO
1950 "Documentos sobre la rebelión del Inca José Gabriel Túpac Amaru." *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco*, año 1, no. 1, pp. 197–203.

Latin American Research Review

- 1951a "Documentos referentes a la revolución de 1780." *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco* 2:2:75–90.
- 1951b "Escudo de los Túpac Amaru." *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco* 2:2:393–98.
- 1957 "Dos escrituras de Túpac Amaru." *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco* 8:8:111–14.
- BALLIVIÁN Y ROXAS, VICENTE DE**
1872 *Archivo Boliviano. Colección de documentos relativos a la historia de Bolivia, durante le época colonial*. Paris.
- BELTRAN Y RÓZPIDE, RICARDO**
1921 *Colección de las memorias o relaciones que escribieron los virreyes del Perú acerca del estado en que dejaban las cosas generales del reino*. Madrid.
- BROWNING, DAVID G. AND DAVID J. ROBINSON**
1976 "The Origin and Comparability of Peruvian Population Data, 1776–1815," *Bulletin of the Society for Latin American Studies* 25:19–38. London.
- CARRIÓ DE LA VANDERA, ALONSO**
1966 *Reforma del Perú*. Transcripción y prólogo de Pablo Macera. Lima.
1974 *El Lazarillo. A Guide for Inexperienced Travelers between Buenos Aires and Lima, 1773*. Translated by Walter D. Kline. Bloomington.
- COMISIÓN NACIONAL DEL SESQUICENTENARIO DE LA INDEPENDENCIA DEL PERÚ**
1974 *Colección documental de la Independencia del Perú*. 30 vols. Lima.
- CRUZ SALAS, JOSÉ DE LA**
1943 *Mi kuraka Túpac Amaru*. Hualuro.
- EGUIGUREN, LUIS ANTONIO**
1935 *La sedición de Huamanga en 1812*. 2d ed. Lima.
1942 *Guerra separatista del Perú, 1777–1780*. Lima.
1952 *Guerra separatista. Rebeliones de indios en Sur América. La sublevación. Crónica de Melchor de Paz*. 2 vols. Lima.
1959 *Hojas para la historia de la emancipación del Perú*. 2 vols. Lima.
- FUENTES, MANUEL**
1859 *Memorias de los vireyes que han gobernado el Perú durante el reyno coloniaje español*. 6 vols. Lima.
- FUNES, DEAN GREGORIO**
1816 *Ensayo de la historia civil de Buenos Aires, Tucumán y Paraguay*. 4 vols. Buenos Aires.
- GARCÍA RODRIGUEZ, VICENTE JOSÉ**
1933 "Arbol genealógico . . . que ocupa doña María Gertrudis de Abendaño, Betancur, Vargas, y Túpac Amaru . . ." *Revista Universitaria* 22:65:31–102. Cuzco.
- GÓMEZ CANEDO, LINO**
1961 *Los archivos de la historia de América*. 2 vols. México.
- GUTIÉRREZ, JOSÉ ROSENDO**
1879 *Documentos para la historia Antigua del Perú*. La Paz.
- IBARGUEN, CARLOS**
1967 "La rebelión de Túpac Amaru a través de la cuadra a Juan Esteban de Anchorena." *Revista trimestral de historia argentina americana y española* 12:49 (oct.–dic.):79–105. Buenos Aires.
- LETRAS**
1946 "Documento sobre la gestión del cacique Túpac Amaru ante la Audiencia de Lima." *Letras*, 3rd cuatrimestre, pp. 452–66. Lima.
- LOAYZA, FRANCISCO A.**
1941 *Cuarenta años de cautiverio. (Memorias del Inka Juan Bautista Túpac Amaru)*. Lima.
1942 *Juan Santos el invencible*. Lima.
1944 *Estado del Perú*. Lima.
1945 *Mártires y heroínas*. Lima.
1946 *Genealogía de Túpac Amaru*. Lima.
1947 *Preliminares del incendio*. Lima.
1948a *La verdad desnuda o las dos faces de un obispo*. Lima.
1948b *Fray Calixto Túpac Inca*. Lima.

- LORENTE, SEBASTIAN
 1867– *Relaciones de los vireyes y audiencias que han gobernado el Perú*. 3 vols. Madrid.
 1872
- MACKEHENIE, C.
 1909 “Un inédito sobre Diego Cristobal Túpac Amaru.” *Revista Contemporáneos* 4.
 Lima.
- MÁRQUEZ ABANTO, FELIPE
 1960– “Preocupaciones y gastos ocasionados al gobierno español con motivo de la
 1962 sublevación de Joseph Túpac Amaru. Gestiones a favor de la corona por el visi-
 tador don José Antonio de Areche.” *Revista del Archivo General de la Nación* 24
 (enero-dic. 1960):146–90; 26 (enero-jun. 1962):63–108. Lima.
- MILLER, WILLIAM
 1828 *Memorias del General Miller al servicio de la República del Perú*. 2 vols. London.
- MORALES PADRON, FRANCISCO
 1971 “Documentos en el archivo General de Indias referentes a sublevaciones indi-
 genas en el siglo xviii.” *Anales del V Congreso Internacional de la Historia de América*.
 5 vols. Lima.
- ODRIOZOLA, MANUEL DE
 1863– *Documentos históricos del Perú en las épocas del coloniaje después de la conquista y de la*
 1867 *independencia hasta la presente*. 10 vols. in 6. Lima.
- REVISTA DE ARCHIVOS Y BIBLIOTECAS NACIONALES
 1900 “Documentos relativos a la rebelión de Túpac Amaru.” *Revista de Archivos y Bib-*
liotecas Nacionales 4, 5:501–32. Lima.
- REVISTA DEL ARCHIVO HISTÓRICO DEL CUZCO
 1957 “Dos escrituras de Túpac Amaru.” *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco* 8:8:111–
 14. Cuzco.
- REVISTA INKA
 1932 “Colegio de caciques: libre de fundación.” *Revista Inka*, pp. 10–12. Lima.
- REVISTA PERUANA
 1879 “Historieta instructiva aunque concisa de la rebelión de Túpac Amaru.” *Revista*
Peruana. Lima.
- ROMERO, CARLOS A.
 1901 *Memoria del Virrey del Perú Marqués de Avilés*. Lima.
- ROMERO, EMILIO
 1946 “Índice de los documentos de Odriozola.” *Boletín Bibliográfico*. Biblioteca Central
 de la Universidad de San Marcos. Lima.
- SANTIESTÉBAN OCHOA, JULIÁN
 1942 “Aclarando sobre la revolución de 1780.” *Revista Universitario*, año 31, no. 83
 (segundo semestre):7–15. Cuzco.
 1944 *Sublevación de Oruro, 1781*. Buenos Aires.
- TEMPLE, ELLA DUNBAR
 1949– “Documentos sobre la rebelión de Túpac Amaru.” *Documenta* 2:1:112–56; 656–
 1950 62. Lima.
 1974 “Prólogo.” *Revolts of Huanuco, Panatahuas, and Huamalies (1812)*. In *Colección*
documental de la Independencia del Perú. 3:1:iii–xcvii. Lima.
- TEPASKE, JOHN, ED.
A Field Research Guide to the Andean Area. Durham, N.C.: Duke University. Forth-
 coming.
- VALCARCEL, CARLOS DANIEL
 1944 “Documentos sobre la rebelión de Túpac Amaru.” *Boletín Bibliográfico*, Biblioteca
 Central de la Universidad de San Marcos, no. 3–4:202–21. Lima.
 1946a “Un documento sobre la rebelión del cacique Túpac Amaru. *Letras* 33:122–31.
 Lima.
 1946b “Documentos sobre gestiones del cacique Túpac Amaru ante la Audiencia de
 Lima.” *Letras* 35:452–66. Lima.
 1947 *La familia del cacique Túpac Amaru*. Lima.

- 1949a *Índice de documentos referentes al juicio sobre legítima descendencia del Inca Túpac Amaru*. Lima.
- 1949b "Estado de la investigación histórica sobre la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Mar del Sur* 3:7 (sep.–oct.):42–53. Lima.
- 1951a "Índice del Archivo del Colegio de Ciencias, Cuzco." *Archivo del Universidad de San Marcos* 2:5 (enero–jun.):518–48. Lima.
- 1951b *Geografía del Perú virreinal (siglo xviii)*. Lima.
- 1957a *Documentos de la Audiencia del Cuzco en el A.G.I.* Lima.
- 1959a *Biografías hispanoamericana en el Archivo General de Indias*. Lima.
- 1959b "Dos inéditos sobre Fernando Túpac Amaru." *Revista del Instituto Americano de Arte* 9:77–80. Cuzco.
- 1959c "Acerca de un libro sobre la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Boletín Bibliográfico, Biblioteca Central de la Universidad de San Marcos*, no. 104:115–24. Lima.
- 1960a "Un inédito para el estudio descriptivo de la rebelión de 1780." In L. E. Eguiguren, ed., *La causa de la emancipación del Perú*, pp. 3–4. Lima.
- 1960b "Información de méritos del obispo Moscoso." *Revista Universitaria del Cuzco* 118:32–35. Cuzco.
- 1966 "Guía de índices." *Revista del Archivo General* 1:1–2:118–31. Lima.
- VARGAS UGARTE, RUBÉN
- 1948 *Títulos nobiliarios en el Perú*. Lima.
- 1951a "Documentos de la emancipación americana (tercera serie). Sublevación de Túpac Amaru, 1781." *Cuadernos de Estudio* 3:8 (enero):84–91. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. Lima.
- VILLANUEVA URTEAGA, HORACIO
- 1947 "Documentos inéditos sobre la sublevación de Túpac Amaru." *Revista Universitaria* 93(segundo semestre). Cuzco.
- 1974 "Prólogo" to *Revolution of Cuzco (1814)*. In *Colección documental de la Independencia del Perú* 3:6:xi–xxi. Lima.
- ZAMALLOA ARMEJO, RAÚL, ED.
- 1961 "Informe de D. Gabriel de Avilés sobre las causas de la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Cuadernos de Información Bibliográfica* 4:6:8–20. Lima.

II. SECONDARY SOURCE MATERIALS AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS

ACEVEDO, EDBERTO OSCAR

- 1958 *La rebelión de Túpac Amaru*. Mendoza, Argentina.
- 1960 "Repercusión de la sublevación de Túpac Amaru en Tucumán." *Revista de Historia de América* 49:85–119. México.

ALTAMIRANO, MARCOS ANTONIO

- 1973 *El Gran Chaco y la rebelión de Túpac-Amaru*. Resistencia, Argentina.

ALTMAN, IDA AND JAMES LOCKHART, EDS.

- 1976 *Provinces of Early Mexico: Variants of Spanish American Regional Evolution*. Los Angeles.

ANGELES CABALLERO, CÉSAR A.

- 1971a "El levantamiento tupacamarista de 1783." *V Congreso Internacional de la Historia de América* 2:24–29. Lima.
- 1971b "El heroísmo revolucionario de Micaela Bastidas." *V Congreso Internacional de la Historia de América* 2:30–38. Lima.
- 1974 "Túpac Amaru y Micaela Bastidas." *Cuadernos Americanos* 33:193:140–59. México.

APARICIO VEGA, MANUEL JESÚS

- 1971 "José Angulo, según los documentos de la revolución de 1814." *V Congreso Internacional de la Historia de América* 2:172–75. Lima.

AULD, LEONA RUTH

- 1963 "Discontent with the Spanish System of Control in Upper Peru, 1730–1809." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

- BANDELIER, ADOLF F.
1906 *The Siege of La Paz*. New York.
- BASADRE, JORGE
1929 "Conferencia en la Escuela de Ingenieros de la Universidad Nacional de San Marcos." *Letras*, año 1, vol. 2, no. 2. Lima.
1961–1964 *Historia de la república del Perú desde sus orígenes hasta el presente*. 5th ed. 10 vols. Lima.
- BONILLA, HERACLIO
1972 *La independencia en el Perú*. Lima.
- BONILLA AMADO, JOSÉ
1971 *La revolución de Túpac Amaru*. Lima.
- BRAM, JOSEPH
1941 *An Analysis of Inca Militarism*. Washington, D.C.
- BURKETT, ELINOR C.
1977 "In Dubious Sisterhood: Race and Class in Spanish Colonial South America." *Latin American Perspectives* 4:12:18–26.
- BURKHOLDER, MARK A.
1972 "From Creole to *Peninsular*: The Transformation of the Audiencia of Lima." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 52:3:395–415.
- BURKHOLDER, MARK A. AND D. S. CHANDLER
1972 "Creole Appointments and the Sale of Audiencia Positions in the Spanish Empire under the Early Bourbons, 1701–1750." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 4:2:187–206.
1977 *From Impotence to Authority: The Spanish Crown and the American Audiencias, 1687–1808*. Columbia and London.
- BURNETT, WESLEY, J.
1940 "The Revolt of Túpac Amaru." Master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- CAILLET-BOIS, RICARDO R.
1938 "Cochabamba en las vísperas de la gran sublevación de Túpac Amaru." *Anales del II Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2. Buenos Aires.
- CAMPBELL, LEON G.
1972a "A Colonial Establishment: Creole Domination of the Audiencia of Lima during the Late Eighteenth Century." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 52:1:1–25.
1972b "Black Power in Colonial Peru: The 1779 Tax Rebellion of Lambayeque." *Phylon* 33:2:140–52.
1972c "The Foreigner in Peruvian Society during the Eighteenth Century." *Revista de Historia de América* 73–74:153–63. México.
1973a "Racism without Race: Ethnic Group Relations in Late Colonial Peru." In Harold E. Pagliaro, ed., *Racism in the Eighteenth Century*. Cleveland and London.
1973b "The Historiography of the Peruvian Guerrilla Movement, 1960–1965." *LARR* 8:1 (Spring):45–70.
1975 "The Changing Racial and Administrative Structure of the Army of Peru under the Later Bourbons." *The Americas* 32:1:117–33.
1976a "The Army of Peru and the Túpac Amaru Revolt, 1780–1783." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 56:1:31–57.
1976b "After the Fall: The Reformation of the Army of Peru, 1784–1816." *Ibero-Amerikanisches Archiv*. Berlin.
1978 *The Military and Society in Colonial Peru, 1750–1810*. Philadelphia. The American Philosophical Society.
- CARMAGNANI, MARCELLO
1961 "La oposición a los tributos en la segunda mitad del siglo xviii." *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía* 129:158–95. Santiago.
- CARRERA NARANJO, ABEL
1971 "Túpac Amaru y la primera insurrección americana." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:68–93. Lima.

CARRILLO, HORACIO

- 1971 "Túpac Amaru en Jujuy." *Revista del Centro de Estudios Histórico-Militares del Perú* 10:155–59. Lima.

CASTAÑEDA, CARLOS E.

- 1929 "The Corregidor in Spanish Colonial Administration." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 9:446–70.

CASTRO ARENAS, MARIO

- 1973 *La rebelión de Juan Santos*. Lima.
1975 "La rebelión de Juan Santos Atahualpa." *Cuadernos Americanos* 199:125–45. México.

CÉSPEDES DEL CASTILLO, GUILLERMO

- 1946 "La visita como un institución indiana." *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 3:984–1025. Seville.
1947 *Lima y Buenos Aires. Repercusiones económicas y políticas de la creación del virreinato del Plata*. Seville.
1953 "Reorganización de la hacienda virreinal peruana en el siglo xviii." *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* 23:329–69. Madrid.

CHAVES, JULIO CÉSAR

- 1971 "Los ideales de Túpac Amaru." *Anales del V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 1:466–75. Lima.
1973 *Túpac Amaru*. Buenos Aires.

CHAVES TORRES, JUAN MANUEL

- 1948 "El caudillo José Gabriel Condorcanqui Túpac Amaru Inca." *Revista de la Universidad de Arequipa* 26:39–40:202–21. Arequipa.

CHOY, EMILIO

- 1954 "Sobre la revolución de Túpac Amaru." *Revista del Museo Nacional* 33:260–82. Lima.
1967a "Notas sobre la transcendencia de la revolución de Túpac Amaru." *Anales del IV Congreso Nacional de la Historia del Perú* 4:336–37. Lima.
1967b "Sobre las contradicciones en la revolución de 1780." *Anales del IV Congreso Nacional de la Historia del Perú* 4:338–40. Lima.

COOK, NOBLE DAVID

- 1965 "La población indígena en el Perú colonial." *Anuario del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas* 8:73–110. Rosario.

CORNBLIT, OSCAR

- 1970 "Levantamientos de masas en Perú y Bolivia durante el siglo dieciocho." *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología* 6:1:100–43. Buenos Aires.

CORNEJO BOURONCLE, JORGE

- 1949a *Sangre Andina. Diez mujeres cuzqueñas*. Cuzco.
1949b *Túpac Amaru. La revolución precursora de la emancipación continental*. Cuzco.
1956 *Pumacahua. La Revolución del Cuzco de 1814*. Cuzco.

CORTÉS SALINAS, MARÍA DEL CARMEN

- 1971 "Benito de la Mata Linares: Juez y testigo en el Rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Anales del V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América*, 1:431–65. Lima.

COSSÓ DEL POMAR, FELIPE

- 1965 "Túpac Amaru." *Cuadernos Americanos* 24:3:123–34. México.

DEL SOLAR, EMILIO

- 1926 *Insurrección de Túpac Amaru, sus antecedentes y efectos*. Lima.

DURAND FLOREZ, LUIS

- 1973 *Independencia e integración en el plan político de Túpac Amaru*. Lima.

DUVIOLS, PIERRE

- 1971 *La lutte contre les religions autochtones dans le Pérou colonial: "L'extirpation de l'idolâtrie" entre 1532 et 1660*. Lima.

EGUIGUREN, LUIS ANTONIO

- 1912 *La rebelión de Huanuco, 1812*. Lima.
1914 *La revolución de 1914*. Lima.
1960 *La causa de la emancipación del Péru*. Lima.

- ESPINOSA SORIANO, WALDEMAR
 1960 "El alcalde mayor indígena en el virreinato del Perú." *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 17:183–300. Seville.
- FABREGAT, CLAUDIO ESTEVA
 1973– "Población y mestizaje en las ciudades de Iberoamerica: Siglo XVIII." *Revista de Indias* 131–38:551–604. Madrid.
- FAGEN, RICHARD
 1965 "Charismatic Authority and the Leadership of Fidel Castro." *Western Political Quarterly* 18:2:275–84.
- FEBRES VILLAROEL, OSCAR
 1964 "La crisis agrícola del Perú en el último tercio del siglo xviii." *Revista Historica* 27:102–99. Lima.
- FERNANDEZ DEL CASTILLO, ANTONIO
 1971 "Túpac Amaru y la proyección de su pensamiento de Cádiz 1812 y Filadelfia 1944." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:7–23. Lima.
- FISHER, J. R.
 1968 "The Rebellion of Túpac Amaru." *History Today* 18:562–69. London.
 1970 *Government and Society in Colonial Peru. The Intendant System, 1784–1814*. London.
 1971 "La rebelión de Túpac Amaru y el programa de la Reforma Imperial de Carlos III." *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 28:405–21. Seville.
 1975 "Silver Production in the Viceroyalty of Peru, 1776–1824." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 55:1:25–43.
- FISHER, LILLIAN ESTELLE
 1966 *The Last Inca Revolt, 1780–1783*. Norman.
- FRIEDRICH, CARL J.
 1961 "Political Leadership and the Problem of the Charismatic Power." *Journal of Politics* 23:3–24.
- FUENZALIDA, FERNANDO ET AL.
 1970 *El indio y el poder en el Perú*. Lima.
- FURLONG, GUILLERMO
 1946 *Los Jesuitas y la cultura rioplatense*. Buenos Aires.
- GANDIA, ENRIQUE DE
 1957– "Orígenes de las rivalidades entre los virreinos del Perú y del Río de la Plata." *Revista del Centro de Estudios Histórico Militares del Perú* 11:13:167–220. Lima.
- GARCÍA FERNANDEZ, ALBERTO
 1952 *La revolución de Túpac Amaru en Condesuyos y Cailloma de Arequipa*. Mimeoprint del Colegio Nacional "San Pedro" de Chimbote. Chimbote.
- GARCÍA NARANJO, JOAQUÍN
 1912 *Sublevación de Tupa-Amaro en el Perú*. Seville.
- GARCÍA ROSELL, CÉSAR
 1957 "El separatismo de Túpac Amaru: un análisis de la insurrección de 1780." *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco* 8:8:92–114; 9:11:47–59. Cuzco.
- GIBSON, CHARLES
 1948 *The Inca Concept of Sovereignty and the Spanish Administration in Peru*. Austin.
- GRONDIN N., MARCELO
 1975 *Tupaj Katari y la rebelión campesina de 1781–1783*. Oruro.
- GUZMÁN AUGUSTO
 1944 *Tupaj Katari*. México.
- HARTH-TERRE, EMILIO
 1973 *Negros e indios: un testamento social ignorado del Perú colonial*. Lima.
- HELMER, MARIE
 1950 "Documents pour l'histoire économique de Amerique de Sud. Commerce et industrie au Pérou à la fin du XVIIe siècle." *Revista de Indias* 2:519–26. Madrid.
 1956 "Un tipo social, el minero de Potosí." *Revista de Indias* 16:85–92. Madrid.
 1964 "Negersklaverei und Negerhandel in Hochperu, 1540–1640." *Jahrbuch fur Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* 1:157–86. Cologne.

Latin American Research Review

- HERNANDEZ, ROMÁN
1969 *Precursor y rebelde Túpac Amaru*. Lima.
- HUERTA, LORENZO
1971 "Repercusión del movimiento de Túpac Amaru II en Ayacucho." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:106–21. Lima.
- HUTCHINS, PATRICIA C.
1965 "The Catari Revolt: Incaic Rebellion in Upper Peru, 1777–1782." Master's thesis, Ohio State University.
- KAPSOLI E., WILFREDO
1975 *Sublevaciones de esclavos en el Perú s. XVIII*. Lima.
- KLEIN, HERBERT S.
1975 "Hacienda and Free Community in Eighteenth-Century Alto Peru: A Demographic Study of the Aymara Population of the Districts of Chulumani and Pacajes in 1786." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 7:2:193–220.
- KONETZKE, RICHARD
1965 "Noticias documentales acerca de la importancia política y social de los mestizos peruanos a fines del siglo xviii." *Revista Histórica* 28:221–27. Lima.
1969 "Ein indianer parlament im kilonialen Hochperu?" *Historia* 8: 265–76. Chile.
- KUBLER, GEORGE
1946– "The Quechua in the Colonial World." In Julian Steward, ed., *Handbook of South American Indians* 2:331–409. Washington, D.C.
1947 "The Neo-Inca State, 1537–1572." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 27:189–203.
1952 *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795–1940*. Washington, D.C.
- LARSON, BROOKE
1978 "Rural Colonial Society and Economic Change: The Cochabamba Region of Upper Peru, 1700–1830." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- LEWIN, BOLESLAO
1943 *Túpac Amaru el rebelde. Su época, sus luchas y su influencia en el continente*. Buenos Aires.
1952 *Movimientos de emancipación en hispanoamérica y la independencia de hispanoamérica*. Buenos Aires.
1957a *La rebelión de Túpac Amaru y los orígenes de la independencia de hispanoamérica*. Buenos Aires.
1957b "El acto final en la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Revista de Educación* 2:12:489–513. Argentina.
1957c "El inca rebelde José Gabriel Túpac Amaru (1780)." *Universidad* 36:51–66. Argentina.
1957d "Las causas de la sublevación de Túpac Amaru a través de las declaraciones oficiales." *Boletín Histórico* 71–72:114–18. Montevideo.
1957e "Las tendencias separatistas del movimiento de Túpac Amaru." *Anuario del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas* 2:11:175–92. Argentina.
1960 "Túpac Amaru, símbolo de rebeldía americana." *Revista de la Universidad del Plata* 10:93–100. La Plata.
- LOCKHART, JAMES
1972 "The Social History of Colonial Spanish America: Evolution and Potential." *LARR* 7:1:6–46.
- LOHMANN VILLENA, GUILLERMO
1957 *El corregidor de indios en el Perú bajo los Austrias*. Madrid.
- LÓPEZ MARTÍNEZ, HÉCTOR
1972 *Rebeliones de mestizos*. Lima.
- LORENTE, SEBASTIÁN
1871 *Historia del Perú bajo los Borbones*. Lima.
- LUJÁN RIPOLL, ROGER
1956 "La sublevación de José Gabriel Condorcanqui (Túpac Amaru)." *Cultura* 1:3:53–56. Lima.

- MACERA DALL'ORSO, PABLO
 1955 *Tres etapas en el desarrollo de la conciencia nacional*. Lima.
 1964 "Nuestra historia, el indio y sus intérpretes peruanos del siglo xviii." *Cultura y Pueblo*, año 1, no. 4–5. Lima.
 1971 "Feudalismo colonial americano: el caso de las haciendas peruanas." *Acta Historia* 35. Szeged, Hungary.
Población indígena y tenencia de la tierra en el Perú (siglos XVII–XIX). Lima. Forthcoming.
- MALAGA MEDINA, ALEJANDRO
 1971 "Arequipa y la rebelión de 1780." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:129–54. Lima.
- MARKHAM, SIR CLEMENTS R.
 1862 *Travels in Peru and India*. London.
- MARTÍN, LUIS
 1973 "Indian Education in Colonial Peru." *Indian Historian* 6:3:44–47.
- MEANS, PHILLIP A.
 1919 "The Rebellion of Túpac Amaru II, 1780–1781." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 2:1:1–25.
 1932 *The Fall of the Inca Empire and the Spanish Rule in Peru, 1530–1780*. New York.
 1942 "Ciertos aspectos de la rebelión de Túpac Amaru II, 1780–1781." *Peruanidad* (Lima) 2, no. 7.
- MELLAFÉ, ROLANDO
 1970 "The Importance of Migration in the Viceroyalty of Peru." In Paul Deprez, ed., *Population and Economics*. Winnipeg.
- MENDIBURU, MANUEL DE
 1847–1890 *Diccionario histórico-biográfico del Perú*. 8 vols. Lima.
- MILLONES, LUIS
 1967 *Proyecto de estudio: Movimientos campesinos del siglo xviii hasta nuestros días*. Lima.
 1973 *Minorías étnicas en el Perú*. Lima.
- MOORE, JOHN P.
 1966 *The Cabildo in Peru under the Bourbons*. Durham.
- MOREYRA Y PAZ SOLDÁN, MANUEL
 1956 *El Tribunal del Consulado de Lima. Cuaderno de Juntas (1706–1720)*. Lima.
- MÖRNER, MAGNUS
 1966 "The History of Race Relations in Latin America: Some Comments on the State of Research." *LARR* 1:3:23–44.
 1969 "La reorganización imperial en hispanoamérica, 1760–1810." *Iberoromansk* 4:1:1–33. Stockholm.
 1970a "A Comparative Study of Tenant Labor in Parts of Europe, Africa, and Latin America, 1700–1900: A Preliminary Report of a Research Project in Social History." *LARR* 5:2:3–15.
 1970b *El colonato en la América Meridional Andina desde el siglo XVIII. Informe preliminar*. Stockholm.
 1970c *La corona española y los foráneos en los pueblos de indios de América*. Stockholm.
 1975a "En torno a las haciendas de la región del Cuzco desde el siglo XVIII." In Enrique Florescano, ed., *Haciendas, latifundios y plantaciones en América latina*, pp. 15–48. México.
 1975b "Some Characteristics of Agrarian Structure in the Cuzco Region towards the End of the Colonial Period." *Boletín de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 18:15–29. Amsterdam.
 1976 "La rebelión de Túpac Amaru en el Cuzco desde una nueva perspectiva." Paper delivered at a symposium on colonial Indian revolt at the Forty-Second International Congress of Americanists, Paris, France.

Latin American Research Review

- MORSE, RICHARD A.
1974 "Trends and Patterns of Latin American Urbanization, 1750–1920." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16:4:416–47. The Hague.
- MOSES, BERNARD
1908 *South America on the Eve of Independence*. New York.
1919 *Spain's Declining Power in South America, 1730–1806*. Berkeley.
- MURRA, JOHN V.
1958 "On Inca Political Structure." In Verne Ruy, ed., *Systems of Political Control and Bureaucracy in Human Societies*. Seattle.
1961 "Social Structure and Economic Themes in Andean Ethnohistory." *Anthropological Quarterly* 34 (April): 47–59. Washington.
- NUÑEZ DEL PRADO BEJAR, DAISEY IRENE
1975 "El rol de la mujer campesina quechua." *América Indígena* 35:2:391–401. México.
- OSSIO, JUAN M.
1973 *Ideología mesiánica del mundo andino*. Lima.
- PALACIO ATARD, VICENTE
1946 *Areche y Guirior. Observaciones sobre el fracaso de una visita del Perú*. Seville.
- PALMA, RICARDO
1893–1896 *Tradiciones Peruanas*. 4 vols. Barcelona.
- PAZ-SOLDÁN, EUSEBIO QUIROZ
1971 "Apuntes sociales de Arequipa en el siglo xviii." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 3:249–70. Lima.
- PHELAN, JOHN LEDDY
1960 "Neo-Aztecism in the Eighteenth Century and the Genesis of Mexican Nationalism." In Stanley Diamond, ed., *Culture in History. Essays in Honor of Paul Radin*. New York.
1978 *The People and the King: The Comunero Revolution in Colombia, 1781*. Madison.
- PIEL, JEAN
1967–1968 "Notas históricas sobre la evolución y la permanencia de las estructuras de dominación interna y externa en la sociedad peruana." *Revista del Museo Nacional* 35:188–210. Lima.
1970 "The Place of the Peasantry in the National Life of Peru in the Nineteenth Century." *Past and Present* 46:108–33. London.
1975 *Capitalisme agraire au Pérou. Originalité de la société agraire péruvienne au XIXe siècle*. Paris.
- PIKE, FREDRICK B.
1967 *The Modern History of Peru*. London.
- PINI RODOLFI, FRANCISCO
1970 "La población del Perú a lo largo de un siglo: 1785–1884." In Washington Patiño et al., *Informe demográfico, Perú: 1970*, pp. 19–123. Lima.
- PINO, JUAN JOSÉ DEL
1957 "Movimientos indígenas del siglo xviii. Significado de la revolución de Túpac Amaru frente al estudio de la causa de la independencia." *Ayacucho* 7:27:26–30. Ayacucho.
1960 "Significado de la revolución de Túpac Amaru frente al estudio de la causa de independencia." In L. E. Eguiguren, ed., *La Causa de la Emancipación del Perú*, pp. 23–34. Lima.
- PRADO, JAVIER
1941 *Estado social del Perú durante la dominación española*. Lima.
- RAFFELD, HERBERT
1951 "The Viceroyalty of Peru: Bulwark of Royalism, 1808–1821." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- RAMA, CARLOS M.
1967 *Die Arbeiterbewegung in Lateinamerika*. Berlin.

RAMOS, DEMETRIO

1967 *Trigo chileno, navieros del Callao y hacendados limeños*. Madrid.

REGLADO C., LILIANO AND MARÍA SALINAS B.

1971 "Apuntes sobre la actitud del consulado limeño en la etapa emancipadora." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 3:271–91. Lima.

REINA LOLI, MANUEL

1965 "Rebeliones indígenas en Ancash." *Anales del III Congreso Internacional de Historia del Perú*. Lima.

REVISTA DEL CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS HISTÓRICO-MILITARES DEL PERÚ

1957– "Inauguración de el panteón de los próceres de los bustos de Túpac Amaru y
1958 Pumacahua." *Revista del Centro de Estudios Histórico-Militares del Perú* 11:13:93–98.
Lima.

RODRÍGUEZ VICENTE, MARÍA ENCARNACIÓN

1971 "La real hacienda en el Perú a comienzos del siglo XIX." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 3:292–301. Lima.

1973– "Haciendas y hacendados de Lima hacia 1784." *Revista de Indias* 131–38:637–52.

1974 Madrid.

ROEL PINEDA, VIRGILIO

1970 *Historia social y económica de la colonia*. Lima.

1971 *Los libertadores*. Lima.

ROMERO, CARLOS A.

1935 "Rebeliones indígenas en Lima durante la colonia." *Revista Histórica* 9:318–37.
Lima.

ROWE, JOHN H.

1951 "Colonial Portraits of Inca Nobles," In Sol Tax, ed., *The Civilizations of Ancient America*. Chicago.

1954 "El movimiento nacional inca del siglo XVIII." *Revista Universitaria* 107:17–47.
Cuzco.

1957 "The Incas under Spanish Colonial Administration." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 37:2:155–99.

1961 "The Chronology of Inca Wooden Cups." In Samuel K. Lothrop et al., *Essays in Pre-Columbian Art and Archaeology*, pp. 317–41, 473–75, 498–500. Cambridge, Mass.

1971 "La fecha de nacimiento de José Gabriel Thupa Amaro." *Historia y Cultura* 5:187–91. Lima.

SÁNCHEZ ALBORNOZ, NICOLÁS

1965 "La saca de mulas de Salta al Perú, 1778–1808." *Anuario del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas* 8:261–312. Rosario, Argentina.

1973 *El indio en el Alto Perú a fines del siglo xvii*. Lima.

1974 *The Population of Latin America: A History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

SANTIESTEBAN OCHOA, JULIÁN

1942a "Túpac Amaru II, afirmación de peruanidad." *Revista Universitaria* 82–83. Cuzco.

1942b "Aclarando sobre la revolución de 1780." *Revista Universitaria* 82–83. Cuzco.

SARFATTI, MAGALI AND ARLENE EISEN

1966 *Spanish Bureaucratic-Patrimonialism in America*. Berkeley.

SARIOLA, SAKARI

1972 *Power and Resistance: The Colonial Heritage of Latin America*. Ithaca and London.

SILVA SANTIESTEBAN, FERNANDO

1964 *Los obrajes en el virreinato del Perú*. Lima.

SOTELO, HILDEBRANDO

1942 *Las insurrecciones y levantamientos de Huarochiri y sus factores determinantes*. Lima.

SPALDING, KAREN

1967 "Indian Rural Society in Colonial Peru: The Example of Huarochiri." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

1970 "Tratos mercantiles del corregidor de indios y la formación de la hacienda serrana en el Perú." *América Indígena* 30:3:595–608. México.

- 1972 "The Colonial Indian: Past and Future Research Perspectives." *LARR* 7:1:47–76.
- 1973 "Kurakas and Commerce: A Chapter in the Evolution of Andean Society." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 53:4:581–99.
- 1974 *De indio e campesino. Cambios en la estructura social del Perú colonial*. Lima.
- 1975a "Hacienda-Village Relations in Andean Society to 1830." *Latin American Perspectives* 2:1 (Spring):107–21.
- 1975b "Class Structure in the Southern Peruvian Highlands, 1750–1920." *Radical History Review* 3 (Fall–Winter):5–27.
- TAMAYO HERRERA, JOSÉ
- 1971 "Una consecuencia económico-social de la rebelión del Cuzco de 1814." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 3:382–98. Lima.
- TEPASKE, JOHN
- 1970 "La crisis del siglo XVIII en el virreinato del Perú." In Bernardo García Martínez, ed., *Historia y sociedad en el mundo de habla española*, pp. 263–79. México.
- 1972 "Quantification in Latin American Colonial History." In Val L. Lorwin and Jacob M. Price, eds., *The Dimensions of the Past*. New Haven and London.
- 1974 "The Collapse of the Spanish Empire." *Lex et Scientia* 10:1–2:34–46. New York.
- 1975 "Recent Trends in Quantitative History: Colonial Latin America," *LARR* 10:1:51–62.
- TISNÉS, FR. ROBERTO M.
- 1971 "Túpac Amaru y la Nueva Granada." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:499–524. Lima.
- TORRES ALMEYDA, LUIS
- 1959 "Mirando hacia la libertad." *Universidad de Antioquia* 139:455–76. Colombia.
- TUCKER, ROBERT C.
- 1968 "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership." *Daedalus* 97:3:731–56.
- TUDELA Y BUESO, JUAN PÉREZ DE
- 1971 "Acerca del significado de Túpac Amaru en la historia política de la monarquía indiana." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:418–98. Lima.
- URQUIAGA, JOSÉ SEBASTIAN
- 1916 *Sublevaciones de indígenas en el departamento de Puno*. Arequipa.
- VALCARCEL, CARLOS DANIEL
- 1946c *Rebeliones indígenas*. Lima.
- 1947 *La rebelión de Túpac Amaru*. México.
- 1954a "Fidelismo y separatismo en el Perú." *Revista de Historia de América*, pp. 37–38. México.
- 1954b "Sentido social de la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Letras* 20:50–53:161–75. Lima.
- 1955 "La rebelión del cacique Túpac Amaru y su anhelo de justicia social." *Anales del Primer Congreso Nacional de Historia del Perú*. Lima.
- 1956a "Dos objetivos de Túpac Amaru." *Estudios Americanos* 9:52:43–46. Seville.
- 1956b "Túpac Amaru, precursor de la emancipación social." *Revista de Historia de América* 42:423–32. México.
- 1957b "Túpac Amaru, fidelista y precursor." *Revista de Indias* 17:68:241–53. Madrid.
- 1960c "Plantamientos básicos de Túpac Amaru." In L. E. Eguiguren, ed., *La causa de la emancipación del Perú*, pp. 41–42. Lima.
- 1960d "Peru Borbónico y emancipación." *Revista de Historia de América* 50:315–48. México.
- 1970a *Túpac Amaru, el revolucionario*. Lima.
- 1970b *El retrato de Túpac Amaru*. Lima.
- 1971 "José Angulo, líder de la rebelión cusqueña de 1814." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:169–71. Lima.
- VALCARCEL, LUIS
- 1945 *Ruta cultural del Perú*. Lima.
- VALEGA, JOSÉ M.
- 1939 *El virreinato del Perú*. Lima.
- 1940–
1944 *Gesta emancipadora del Perú*. 12 vols. Lima.

- VALENCIA VEGA, ALIPIO
 1950 *Julián Tupaj Katari, caudillo de la liberación india*. Buenos Aires.
 1961 *El indio en la independencia*. La Paz.
- VALLEJO FONSECA, JOSÉ A.
 1957 "La lucha por la independencia del Perú. La rebelión de 1742. Juan Santos Atahualpa." *Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco* 8:8:232–92. Cuzco.
- VARESE, STEFANO
 1967 "La rebelión de Juan Santos Atahualpa: un movimiento mesiánico del siglo xviii en la selva peruana." *Cuadernos de Antropología* 5:10:1–9. Lima.
 1968 *La sal de los cerros*. Lima.
- VARGAS UGARTE, RUBÉN
 1956 *Historia del Perú*. 4 vols. 2d ed. Lima.
 1966 *Por el rey y contra el rey*. Lima.
- VEGA, JUAN JOSÉ
 1967 "Túpac Amaru y el derecho virreinal." *Revista de Derecho y Ciencias Políticas* 3:563–72. Lima.
 1969 *José Gabriel Túpac Amaru*. Lima.
 1971a "Túpac Amaru, Tupac Catari, Tomas Catari." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* 2:155–68. Lima.
 1971b *Micaela Bastidas y las heroínas tupamaristas*. Lima.
- VELAZCO ARAGÓN, LUIS
 1958 "Túpac Amaru, titán de los Andes." *Revista Instituto Americano de Arte* 8:8:21–37. Cuzco.
- VILLANUEVA URTEAGA, HORACIO
 1948 "Los Padres betelmitas del Cuzco y la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *Revista del Instituto y Museo Arqueológico*. Cuzco.
 1958 "La idea de los Incas como factor favorable a la independencia." *Revista Universitaria* 47:115:137–58. Cuzco.
 1964 *El incario en la emancipación del Perú*. México.
 1971 "Antonio Valdez y la rebelión de Túpac Amaru." *V Congreso Internacional de Historia de América*. Lima.
- VOLLMER, GÜNTER
 1967 *Bevölkerungspolitik und Bevölkerungsstruktur im Vizekönigreich Peru zur Ende der Kolonialzeit, 1741–1821*. Hamburg, Berlin, Zurich, Gehlen.
- WACHTEL, NATHAN
 1966 "Structuralisme et histoire: à propos de l'organisation sociale de Cuzco." *Annales, E.S.C.* 21:71–94. Paris.
 1967 "La vision des vaincus: la conquete espagnole dans le folklore indigene." *Annales, E.S.C.* 22:554–85. Paris.
 1971 *La vision des vaincus. Les indiens du Pérou devant la conquête espagnole, 1530–1570*. Paris.
 1974 "Le réciprocite et l'état inca: de Karl Polanyi a John V. Murra." *Annales, E.S.C.* 29:1346–57. Paris.
- WEIDNER, DONALD L.
 1969 "Forced Labor in Colonial Peru." *The Americas* 16:4:357–83. Washington.
- WEISSE, CARLOS
 1914 *Historia del Perú*. Lima.
- YANES, ANNE DART
 1973 "Túpac Amaru II (1742–1781)." In Harold Eugene Davis, ed., *Revolutionaries, Traditionalists and Dictators in Latin America*, pp. 15–31. New York.
- ZUBRITSKI, YURI A.
 1977 "Motivos políticos en la poesía quechua." *LARR* 12:2:161–70.