The Tragedy of Success

In Huamanga, if one saw a gallant figure dressed in rose velvet breeches with fine gold trim, bright doublet beneath a dark velveteen cape from Se-govia, broad felt hat, and a pair of good shoes, one probably expected to see the face of a wealthy colonial, or perhaps even a mestizo. Sometimes, however, the face belonged to an Indian. The growing poverty of Andean peoples by the early seventeenth century could lead us to overlook the rise of natives who escaped severe burdens imposed upon most Indians, in some cases climbing the social ladder, and accumulated considerable wealth.

Yet our story has already suggested the historical importance of privileged strata within the “republic of Indians.” We have seen the embryonic potential for class divisions among Huamanga’s societies before Spanish conquest, and the institutions which stifled their further development. After conquest, the strategic position of Hispanicizing curacas as mediators between natives and colonials intensified incipient contradictions in native society; the post-Incaic alliances caught native elites between traditional roles as protectors of ayllu interests, and new opportunities and demands as “friends” of the conquistadores. During the crisis of the 1560s, the taqwongos pressured collaborators of the colonial regime to purify themselves and renew exclusively Andean loyalties, but the tenuous and guarded relationship of Indian elites to Taki Onqoy mirrored their ambivalent, contradictory position. A decade later, Toledo’s reforms organized a network of state power to coerce a surplus out of a self-sufficient ayllu peasantry; the system worked in part because its power groups incorporated Indian as well as Hispanic lords.

The Indians eventually undermined Toledan mitas and tributes, but not the emergence of multiracial power groups. Indeed, judicial politics encour-

aged mutually beneficial arrangements among native elites and Hispanic patrons who sometimes profited by subverting state-sponsored extractions. The economic boom of the late sixteenth century integrated local societies into a highly commercialized economy; local commodity-circulation patterns induced internal differentiation even further, concentrating Indian resources in fewer hands, and privatizing a proportion of ayllu lands. From the first years of conquest, but with increasing force in the seventeenth century, ayllu society lost migrants to cities, mines, commercial centers, Spanish patrons, and foreign Indian communities. Some of the migrants learned skills or developed connections which saved them from the fate of poor Indians, and enabled them to join the ranks of those who profited from the commercial economy.

The personal strategies and achievements of successful Indians, who assimilated in important ways to Hispanic-mestizo society, bear a close relationship to the broader history of European exploitation and Indian resistance. Their achievements stimulated a process of class differentiation within native society, inserted European-style relationships, motivations, and culture more directly into peasant life, and furthered the shrinkage of traditional Andean rights and resources. The tragedy of Indian success lay in the way it recruited dynamic, powerful, or fortunate individuals to adopt Hispanic styles and relationships, thereby buttressing colonial domination. The achievements of native individuals, in the midst of a society organized to exploit indigenous peoples, educated Indians to view the Hispanic as superior, the Andean as inferior.

PATHS TO SUCCESS

Despite conditions which severely impoverished most natives by the early seventeenth century, a minority managed to accumulate sufficient funds to buy or rent valuable rural and urban property. A sample of fifty-two transactions shows that many Indians who bought or rented lands and homesteads spent sums far beyond the economic horizons of most natives. Fully half (50.0 percent) the purchases cost 40–90 pesos (of 8 reales); another fourth (28.3 percent) required 100 pesos or more. These represented large sums for an Indian. The state’s annual tribute, a heavy burden for many, amounted to less than ten pesos; an unskilled asiento Indian earned perhaps twenty pesos for an entire year’s service; an expenditure of thirty pesos to rent a mitaoy replacement was unrealistic for a poor peasant.

Even by Hispanic standards, some Indian purchases represented significant accumulations. One woman bought part of a fine city lot owned by a distinguished encomendero family. The 300 pesos she spent equalled eight or nine months of the profit expected by a master who rented out a skilled slave artisan. Juana Payco and Don Pedro Pomaconxa each bought valu-
able lands from foreign ayllus for 600 pesos. That amount of money sufficed, in most years, to buy a prime African slave. Some transactions, especially purchase or rental of city residences by Indians whose economic base remained in the countryside, fulfilled prestige desires. To establish a respectable residence in Huamanga, one kuraka shunned a site in the city’s Indian parishes; instead, he rented homes in the finer, more expensive Spanish section.

Even as monetary obligations and debt became increasingly oppressive forces in the lives of poor Indians, an emerging sector of natives accumulated enough liquid wealth to become creditors. We have seen that the wills of prosperous Indians recorded lists of uncollected petty debts. Native artisans and other “creditable” figures served as bondsmen of Indians in debt or in trouble. Some loans were more than petty in size. Lorenzo Pilo, born to a wealthy Indian family in the city of Huamanga, and owner of valuable lands in rural Angaraes, loaned 300 pesos to an impoverished kuraka. Pilo eventually had the chief jailed for lack of payment. Doña Juana Yanque Molluma financed the purchase of 300 cows and bulls by her daughter for 1,650 pesos. Significantly, even Spaniards turned to wealthy Indians for credit on occasion. One Spaniard secured a one-year loan of 140 pesos from Doña Juana Mendez; another paid 50 pesos of interest a year on a long-term loan of 700 pesos from Catalina Reinoso, an Indian gentlewoman who owned a vineyard in the Nazca Valley descending from Lucanas to the Pacific coast.

The historical question which we must ask is how an emerging sector of wealthy Indians earned such funds, and protected themselves from expropriations which confined most natives to a meager existence. The economic and political means by which a minority of Indians achieved success, in a society which had despoiled most ayllus and peasants of the capacity to produce and market a surplus, warrant close examination.

In a thriving commercial economy heavily dependent on artisanal or craft technologies, those who sold skilled services might earn substantial incomes. Experienced mine workers commanded handsome wages in the seventeenth century. Inflated prices controlled by outside merchants, respite from a harsh existence in drinking and gambling, and fraudulent abuses by mine owners often consumed wages quickly. But some Indians probably managed to accumulate savings, by setting aside significant amounts of wages or stealing valuable ores. More attractive than mining were artisanry and transport, relatively independent forms of work for which there was high demand. Huamanga’s economy relied heavily on skilled trades and crafts for construction and manufactures, and Indian artisans assumed a prominent role in all kinds of “Hispanic” occupations, as silversmiths, painters and gilders, masons, stoncutters, carpenters, joiners, tanners, tailors, shoemakers, and the like. Martín de Oviedo, a Spaniard with a strong reputation as a “master sculptor” and architect, was hired in 1609 to refurbish the interior of the Dominican church for 4,600 pesos; Oviedo, in turn, subcontracted for Indian carpenters, painters, and gilders to work on the project. An independent Indian craftsman could earn a very respectable income. In two months, a stonemason could fashion a water wheel worth sixty pesos. Juan Uscamato, a carpenter, earned 150 pesos by agreeing to build a flour mill in six months. His expenses were low, and he probably did not have to work full time on the mill, since the contractor agreed to supply needed materials, including carved stone and iron tools, and six Indian laborers to work under Uscamato.

The asiento labor contracts of Huamanga (described in Chapter 6) show a dramatic income gap between skilled Indians and unspecialized laboring peas. Artisans hired in asientos earned double or triple the wages promised for general service, some 40–60 pesos a year besides subsistence. Arrieros (muleteers, drivers of animal trains) earned at least twice as much again, some 80–130 pesos a year. The nonmonetary components of the compensation often included special rights which widened the gap further. One tanner received ten semiminished hides which, in effect, subsidized his independent work. Arrieros received a few extra yards of cloth to stock their wares. More important, the drivers’ work helped them consolidate independent trading connections, and lower their own business costs by transporting commodities on employers’ animals, as in the previously mentioned case of the employer who formally agreed that his hired arriero could make “all the trips he wants with [the employer’s] animal train.”

Concessions such as these mattered because those who engaged in substantial trade or commercial production could accumulate great wealth. Indian merchants, like Spaniards, speculated in commodities. Artisans, unlike arrieros, could not pursue commerce on a full-time basis, but ambitious craftsmen engaged in varied mercantile transactions on the side. Indians, like Spaniards, carved out private landholdings for commercial production of coca, wine, maize, wheat, vegetables, wool, meat, hides, cheese, and the like. Indeed, Indian entrepreneurs tended to focus their accumulations of private property in the very same zones which attracted their Spanish counterparts: the well-located and fertile valleys of the Angaraes-Huanta district, the city of Huamanga and its surrounding valleys, the coca montaña of eastern Huanta, and, to a lesser extent, fertile pastures and farmlands along the road which cut across Vilcashuamán to Cuzco and Potosí (see Map 3 above, Chapter 4).

Marketable skills and services, commercial production, and trade itself earned Indians considerable revenues, but they do not explain how a successful minority protected its wealth from expropriation. Ayllus too had earned very impressive incomes in the sixteenth century, but colonial con-
control made such accumulation increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for most ayllus in the seventeenth century. The economic function of the colonial power structure was, after all, to usurp Indian resources and to siphon the surplus of a native society reduced to bare subsistence. Kuracas enjoyed greater access to revenues than common households, but redistributive obligations presumably limited the capacity of chiefs to accumulate personal resources while kinfolk slid deeper into poverty. Indeed, the chiefs' personal liability for community obligations, especially tribute and mita, sometimes forced them to sell valuable lands or animals, and subjected their wealth to confiscation by corregidores. As we have seen, the periodic composiciones de tierras permitted colonial judges to award title to “surplus” Indian lands requested by Spanish petitioners. In practice, the land inspections made ayllu land tenure a precarious proposition. To avoid dependence on a European lord, a forastero might seek a livelihood in a new Indian community setting. But earning the acceptance of foreign ayllus might entail new kinship bonds, or payments of rent for land-use rights, which limited accumulation.

Under these circumstances, earning a respectable income did not, by itself, insure one against impoverishment. Indians could achieve lasting economic success only if their socioeconomic “strategy” shielded them, in part at least, from colonial expropriations and from redistributive obligations to poorer Indians. A key shielding device involved “privatizing” property rights. Individual title to land, recognized by Spanish law, protected the owner from legal confiscations which befall ayllu property. Private ownership of property also provided a weapon against overlapping or collective claims by ayllus and ethnic groups, especially if the owner accumulated lands in “foreign” zones, i.e., outside the domain traditionally claimed by the Indian’s ayllu or ethnic relatives. But even within a given ayllu or ethnic domain, a process of privatization transferred a proportion of property rights to powerful or wealthy local Indians, and to wealthy outsiders of all races. During the first composición de tierras, held in 1594, some of Huamanga’s kuracas secured private title to extensive land-use rights traditionally allotted them by ayllus. A kuraka who wished to protect his prestige, or to work the lands by calling upon traditional ayllu relationships, probably could not alienate such lands from collective claims in an absolute sense. But we know that kuracas sold or rented some of these lands to outsiders, and that in later generations, children who “inherited” lands from deceased chiefs defended their property rights against Indian relatives. Even if a chief (or his heirs) did not privatize ayllu property for his own use, he held authority to sell community lands in order to pay tributes or to hire mitayo replacements. Such sales alienated property from ethnic and ayllu domains in a more permanent sense. Fertile lands once held by ayllus circulated as

commodities on a surprising scale in the seventeenth century, especially in dynamic commercial zones of northern Huamanga (from the Río Pampas north, with special intensity along the Angaraes-Huanta-city of Huamanga axis). And as we have seen, the buyers of valuable property included Indians as well as Spaniards and mixed-bloods.

Another form of protection lay in escaping tribute and mita obligations. A household continually drained by contributions to pay ayllu tributes or hire mitayo replacements could hardly expect to accumulate money sufficient to buy lucrative property, even if it earned a significant monetary income. The colonial regime, however, exempted certain natives from mita and tribute, and Spanish law failed to incorporate the large forastero population systematically until the eighteenth century.

The evidence suggests that the privilege of exemption brought considerable benefits. Tributary status did not apply to independent women heads of household, and women accounted for over a third (35.8 percent) of Indian purchases or rentals of property. Forasteros and artisans also played a conspicuous role in private accumulations of property. The forasteros’ ill-defined legal status freed them from mita and tribute as long as they escaped tax collectors sent from their original communities; artisans, both village and urban, held legal exemption from the mita. Finally, major kuracas, municipal functionaries (mostly officers of the Indian cabildo), and lay assistants of Catholic priests all enjoyed exemptions from mita and, some of them, from tribute. A few earned modest salaries as well. Within ayllu society, therefore, appointments to municipal and church posts distributed privileges which allowed some people to accumulate resources while others eked out a bare existence or fell into debt.

A third form of shielding, and one which increased opportunities for economic gain dramatically, exploited privileged ties to the colonial power structure. Within ayllu society especially, access to power often proved a decisive determinant of revenues and obligations. Powerful ayllus and favored relatives of kuracas paid lighter tributes than others, and the kuracas themselves levied extra tributes. The Toledan regime had reorganized the countryside by establishing a series of multiracial power groups, with a Spanish corregidor at the center, but including a contingent of Indian functionaries and assistants. The revamped Indian power structure drew its members from important kuraka families, socially mobile commoners eager to benefit by association with Hispanic power, and (in the seventeenth century, at least) a few forasteros integrated into local ayllu societies. Judicial politics further cemented alliances between Indian elites and Hispanic patrons. The assistance of Hispanic patrons brought with it a quid pro quo: loyalty to the interests of “friends,” cooperation in local schemes of extraction. In effect, local alliances assimilated an elite fraction of ayllu society to the Hispanic
power structure, and thus to the conversion of political advantage into private wealth. The liability of kurakas for community tribute and mita, for example, theoretically subjected chiefs to confiscations of wealth which might have impoverished them in the seventeenth century. Some confiscations did indeed occur, but often kurakas enlisted the aid of corregidores and priests to "prove" that mita and tribute quotas had been set too high. Instead of losing resources to pay for tributes in arrerias, a kuraka could earn thousands of pesos by joining Hispanic friends in mutually profitable schemes, such as putting-out systems to sell cloth or rope woven by ayllus.28 The burden of such schemes, and the reduced quotas of legal mitas and tributes, fell most heavily on the least powerful and poorest segments of native society.

The differentiation of native society into rich and poor reflected the ability of a minority to free itself from constraints which bound most Indians. We ought not underestimate the difficulty of such achievements, especially for natives who did not inherit advantages by birth into powerful or wealthy Indian families. For the great majority the road to success was closed. Daring decisions did not guarantee prosperity. Emigration from the society of one's relatives, perhaps the boldest step an Indian might take, led some individuals to success, but prosperous emigrants were a minority. Most forasteros lived a more modest existence as yanaconas, day laborers, petty producers, community peasants integrated by marriage into foreign ayllus, vagrants, and the like. Artisanry exerted a special appeal precisely because it offered the surest path to economic improvement and independence. Prospective apprentices flocked to cities to find artisans willing to teach them a trade in exchange for their labors. As a result, in a regional economy where labor was usually in short supply, and wages tended to rise, apprentice labor constituted a glaring exception. In two of three apprenticeship asientos, the hired Indian's compensation did not include a monetary wage at all; a chance to change the course of one's life was compensation enough.29

Those who earned relatively high incomes, of course, did not automatically accumulate "private" resources shielded from overlapping or redistributive claims by poorer relatives. Women heads of household, for example, enjoyed legal exemptions from mitas and tributes, and participated heavily in commercial production and trade. But ties of kinship and obligation meant—in some cases, at least—that apparently "private" resources in fact helped to shore up the faltering economic base of poorer kinfolk, including male tributaries.30 In these cases, "success" was less individualized, more subject to a web of overlapping rights which redistributed accumulations.

By the seventeenth century, however, an emerging strata of ambitious Indians superseded such obstacles, and accumulated impressive personal wealth. As we shall see, the success of these natives changed the very texture of Indian life.

THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIAN HISPANISM

Above all else, Indian success rested upon one's capacity to imitate Hispanic strategies of accumulation, or to develop close ties with Hispanic-mestizo society. The successful Indians of the seventeenth century were independent producers and merchants, many of them women or forasteros or both, who owned private property and invested in commerce; artisans and others whose special skills, whether Andean or Hispanic, earned them incomes sufficient to purchase property or engage in commerce; political and religious functionaries of the colonial villages who enjoyed mita-tribute exemptions, and who profited from their position in the colonial power structure. The material wellbeing of these Indians no longer depended, as it had for their ancestors, on their ability to mobilize traditional forms of property, reciprocal obligation, and loyalty within an ancient family of ayllu and ethnic relatives. Their economic welfare came to depend primarily upon their capacity to privatize interests in a commercial setting: to accumulate private property, exploit commercial opportunities, and convert political influence, service, or privilege into liquid wealth. For these Indians, rural commodity circulation and a certain monetization of obligations represented an opportunity, not a burden or a symptom of declining self-sufficiency. The penetration of commercial capital into the countryside created opportunities to buy lands, to extend commercial networks, to consolidate influence as creditors to those trapped in a quagmire of tributes, corvees, subsistence problems, and debts.

A certain Hispanization of property and relationships, linked to the emergence of successful natives, thus began to remold the internal structure of Indian society. The process of Hispanization, like the internal differentiation it mirrored, was only partial or incomplete. Ayllu reciprocities and property rights still constituted an important resource for many Indians.31 But those who continued to depend exclusively upon "traditional" rights were condemned to poverty, and by the early seventeenth century, relations between rich and poor Indians began to take on a more "Hispanic" tonality and texture. Wealthy Indians no longer depended upon the collective claims of ayllus and ethnic groups for access to property; they acquired private title to the best Indian lands, both in ayllu homelands and among foreign Indians. Commercial transactions and debt forged new bonds and dependencies superseding those of kinship and reciprocal obligation. Wealthy and powerful natives looked beyond traditional Andean reciprocities for access to labor, and resorted to Hispanic methods of labor exploitation. Indian miners, coca planters, and hacendados attached dependent laborers to their properties, and hired temporary workers for wages.32 On occasion, a prominent Indian even secured an official mita allotment! In 1598, Viceroy Luis de Velasco granted the Indian Doña Isabel Asto, a rich miner and widow of
a Spaniard, sixty mitayos to work her mines in Huancavelica. In one of
ten (10.3 percent) asiento labor contracts in Huamanga, the hired Indian
worked for an Indian master. The employers, some of them artisans hiring
apprentices, were clearly men and women of considerable means. One In-
dian merchant could afford to pay a hired arriero 100 pesos a year in wages.
Another employer, Catalina Cocachimo, recruited a yanacona by lending
an Indian 150 pesos. Adapting both the form and content used by Hispanic
colonials, she contracted the peon to work for her at 20 pesos a year to repay
the debt; after one year, he would receive a plot of land to grow his own
food.

An especially significant result of these changes is the way they affected
bonds between related ayllu Indians. In the case of "unrelated" Indians,
such as a forastero establishing a presence among ethnically distinct ayllu
Indians, or a city Indian hiring a poor ayllu peasant, we might expect pri-
vate property holdings, commercial and debt relations, and nontraditional
claims to labor to play an important role. But the new forces also condi-
tioned relations among originarios, local ayllu Indians descended from
common ancestor-gods (as distinguished from immigrant forasteros descended
from foreign ayllus and ancestors). Even among originarios, a wealthy mi-
nority and pauperized majority might head in opposite directions. In June
1639, for example, the Indians and chiefs of Guaychao had to sell valuable
community lands to an outsider to raise funds. Yet in the very same month,
Pedro Alopila, a local ayllu Indian, bought for himself some twelve hectares
of irrigable maize lands from a Spanish landowner. Internal differen-
tiation opened the door to new relationships far removed from traditional bonds
among originarios. Consider, for example, the career of Juana Marcacuray,
a woman who retained her ayllu presence and identity until her death.
Within the region of her ayllu homeland, she accumulated seven private
properties (including two coca fields), indebted various members of the
community, and collected rent from Indian tenants on her property.

The case of Don Juan Uybua and Sebastian Cabana, ayllu Indians of the
same village, is also revealing. Uybua, a local kuraka, paid a debt of 90
pesos owed by Cabana, who was accused of losing four cows and three
horses. But Uybua's act hardly represented the traditional generosity ex-
pected of a chief bound by long-term reciprocities with kinfolk. The two In-
dians apparently belonged to different (though related) ayllus, and Uybua
used the debt to make a typically "Hispanic" arrangement. To "repay" the
loan, Cabana had to agree to a labor asiento binding him to Uybua for al-
most seven years! Uybua would place the indebted peon's kurakas by pay-
ing him the annual tribute owed by Cabana.

The emerging Indian elite of the seventeenth century thus embraced
strategies and relationships drawn from the dominant, exploiting sector of
society. Increasingly, Hispanic models of advancement offered the only way
out of confines which shackled most Indians. Those whose personal success
required a Hispamerization, however partial, of their economic lives included
originarios as well as forasteros, socially mobile commoners as well as kurak-
as, permanent city dwellers as well as Indians who maintained homes and
bases in both city and countryside. Not surprisingly, the material culture and
technology of Indian production bore witness to the process of Hispan-
zation. Artisans used Spanish tools and materials in their shops; ranchers
raised herds of cows and sheep; farmers harnessed plows to oxen to till
wheat fields. To a certain extent, the spread of Hispanic material culture was
more generalized than that suggested here, particularly as growing numbers
of Indians produced "Spanish" commodities such as eggs or beef, or served as
peons to Spanish overlords. But the material "Hispamerization" of Indian
production was more closely associated with wealthy Indians, including
chiefs.

The spread of Hispanic "culture," moreover, was not confined to re-
ources used in material production. Wealthy Indians bought and used the
accoutrements of cultured Spanish folk. They wore fine clothes (made in
Europe), travelled on horse and saddle, bought furniture, jewelry, and trin-
kets for their homes, enjoyed wine with meals, and owned Spanish firearms
and swords. The successful (or pretentious) appropriated the Spanish titu-
lature of Don or Doña, and acquired urban predilections. Even if their live-
lihood kept them in the countryside much of the time, wealthy Indians es-
ablished second homes in which to live and do business in Huamanga or
other cities. A few cultured natives even read and wrote Spanish. In 1621,
the Jesuits opened the Royal School of San Francisco de Borja, a boarding
school in Cuzco which taught Spanish language, religion, and culture to
sons of major kurakas from Huamanga, Cuzco, and Arequipa. The new
school represented a small part of a much broader educational process, for-
mal and informal, long under way, which created a growing sector of lati-
no Indians. The ladinos were people of Indian parentage whose culture, de-
meanor, and lifeways took on a more mestizo or even Spanish character.
They knew the ways of Spanish-mestizo society, dressed in nontraditional
garb, understood and spoke Spanish, and in some cases even cut their hair.
In cities and mining centers especially, ladino traits spread through the In-
dian population far beyond the successful, prospering elites. But the most
"Hispanic," least "mestizo" or "Indian," of the ladinos were those whose so-
ecconomic stature allowed them to buy fine clothes, mix in Spanish cir-
cles, get an education, and the like.

Apparently, the successful valued their Hispamerization highly. Juana Hernán-
dez, owner of at least eighty-five hectares of wheat and corn fields near Jul-
camarca (Angaraes), proudly called herself "a ladina Indian, and very intel-
ligent in Spanish language." Indians spent considerable sums—200 pesos for a suit of clothes, 50 pesos for a gun—to collect Spanish items. Don Fernando Ataurimachi of Huamanguilla (Huanta), descendant of the Inca Huayna Capac, related by kinship to Spaniards, and owner of urban property and irrigated corn lands, collected Spanish guns, lances, halberds, and swords. The proud Ataurimachi made a point of showing off his collection at great public festivals.36

Some of the Hispanizing Indians took Christian religion quite seriously. The defeat of Taki Ongoy, of course, made plain that all Indians needed to avoid the wrath of powerful Christian gods. To placate the gods and their priests, peasants submitted to a thin overlay of Christian ritual.37 Catholicism might have enjoyed somewhat greater acceptance among city Indians cut off from rural kin networks and ancestor-gods.38 But the evidence suggests a striking enthusiasm on the part of wealthy Indians in both city and countryside. Ataurimachi of Huamanguilla married his Indian wife in a Christian ceremony supervised by a Catholic priest. Successful Indians led the native cofradías (Catholic lay associations), sought Christian burial in places of honor—"inside the church next to the pulpit"—and had masses said for their souls. Some donated lands, animals, and money to the church, or set up ecclesiastical benefices to look after their souls. Some Indians, of course, had good reason to profess Christianity; they had climbed in social and economic station by serving Catholic priests as sextons (sacerdotes), choir leaders (cantores), and the like.39

But others, too, developed close bonds with Christian gods and their representatives on earth. Catalina Pata, a city Indian of Huamanga, bought a huge crucifix which stood a yard and a half tall in her home. Her son, a wealthy artisan, donated lands to the Augustinians "on the condition that the day I die they accompany me . . . and give me a burial inside their church and sing a mass [for my soul]." The will of Don Diego Quino Guaracu, a minor chief of Andahuaylas, named Friar Lucas de Sigura executor of the Indian's estate. Quino gave the priest, apparently a close friend, control of a handsome ecclesiastical benefice of lands sufficient to support nine or ten peasant families. In addition, Quino ordered that his daughter be raised in Huamanga's convent of Santa Clara, "where she might grow up civilized and Christian.40 For these Indians, Christianization—which by no means excluded continuance of traditional paganisms—constituted far more than a superficial overlay. Like the secular symbols of Hispanism, Christian religion expressed relationships and aspirations which deeply touched their lives.

In a society where "cultural" and "economic" dimensions of life penetrated one another deeply, Indian Hispanism had profound symbolic importance. Andean culture esteemed cloth highly as a ritual article, and as an
More often, lesser or aspiring elites sought to gain or extend footholds in the countryside of Huanta, Angaraes, and Vilcashuaman by marrying Indian women. Juan Ramírez Romero had a notoriously exploitative reputation when he served as lieutenant of a rural corregidor from 1601 to 1606. This ambitious hacendado and "citizen" of Vilcashuaman, owner of extensive ranches, farms, and sugar fields, probably made his first inroads by marrying Doña María Cusitoclo. Ramírez observed that "my father-in-law," a local kuraka, had given him much of the property as a dowry. Not far away, an Indian-white couple, Doña Beatriz Guarcay Yquillay and Don Cristóbal de Gamboa owned sixty hectares of land donated by her brother, chief kuraka of Viscchongo, "to cancel his sister's rights... in the property of their father Don Juan Pomaquiso." The families created by such marriages could amass enviable wealth. Isabel Payco of Quinua (Huanta), a dynamic zone with a substantial stratum of wealthy Indians, married Juan Enriquez, a commercial farmer-hacendado. Payco bought perhaps 100 hectares of wheat and maize lands to the marriage, and a home in the village. Payco and Enriquez made out well, their mestiza daughter inherited hundreds of hectares of land, and several urban properties in Lima.

For some Indian women, marriage or informal conjugal relations with outsiders had its attractions. The daughters of Indian chiefs may have had little choice in the matter, but wealthy or ambitious women shared the Hispanic orientation of their male counterparts. María López, an Indian, acquired several urban properties in Huamanga during her marriage to a respectable Spanish resident. When her husband died, she established an informal relationship, and had a child, with Gaspar de Arriola, a wealthy "citizen" of Huamanga "to whom I am much obligated for good works." Arriola contributed valuable lands to the support of López and their illegitimate son. More humble Indian women, too, had reason to pursue relations with outsiders. Earlier (Chapter 6), we saw that young males seemed to experience a kind of life crisis on the threshold of marriage and tributary responsibilities; some fled and swelled the forastero population. Young women facing the grim burdens of aylu life must have experienced crises and tensions of their own, especially if they had a chance to "escape" by marrying outsiders—forastero Indians, free blacks, mixed-bloods, or Spaniards. Among the originary population, women usually outnumbered men anyway. Some women made the jump and did well. Juana Curiqumán, for example, married a free mulatto, Alonso de Paz; not far from her homeland in Soras, they bought a modest hacienda worth 600–700 pesos. Describing the situation, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala of Lucanas complained that Indian women "no longer love Indians but rather Spaniards, and they become big whores." His remark expressed male resentment; it underestimated the importance of force and sexual assault in many Indian-white relationships, and ignored the women whose lives and resources remained
bonded to Indian kinfolk (of both sexes). Nevertheless, Poma’s exaggeration corresponded to a very real social pattern, to a Hispanic allure which attracted both female and male.

At its highest levels, Indian success signified a fuller emergence of class relationships within seventeenth-century native society. Hispanism was a path to success for a small minority, but it also tended to transform the prosperous into foreigners — people whose economic relations, social bonds, and cultural symbols differentiated them from poorer, more “Indian” counterparts, and imparted a Hispanic-mestizo dimension to their identities. In any given rural terrain, the emerging provincial elite included a strong component of “outsiders” anyway — forastero Indians, Spanish colonials and officials, mestizos (some of them heirs of Indian-white marriages among local elites), occasionally a black or mulatto. But even a local ayllu Indian acquired a more alien character if success violated community norms or assimilated the native to outside exploiters. Poma de Ayala observed an erosion of major kurakas’ legitimacy among kinfolk; social climbers who had usurped chieftainships from rightful heirs, and chiefs whose social and economic activities allied them with hated colonials “are no longer obeyed nor respected.” Consider also the will of Juana Marcumay, a wealthy ayllu Indian with no children. Marcumay left her considerable estate to her friend Doña Mariana de Balaguera, wife of the municipal standard bearer of Huamanga, “in view of [my] having received very many good works, worthy of greater reward, from her household.” Traditionally, property rights would have reverted to ayllu relatives if the deceased left no spouse or children.

Success tended to draw the most dynamic and powerful members of native society — originarios as well as forasteros, villagers as well as city folk — into the world of aristocrat-entrepreneurs, and thereby widened the social basis of colonial exploitation. The question we may ask is whether this tendency met with any kind of resistance. As we shall see, considerable tension and conflict marred the achievements of successful Indians.

STRIFE, TENSION, AND PURIFICATION

In a society where ethnic loyalties continued to set communities against one another, forasteros who intruded on ayllu domains contended with hostilities which sometimes flared into open conflict. Catalina Puscotilla, an “Indian hacendada,” held 150 hectares of prime land near the village of Espiru Santo, midway between the urban markets of Huancavelica and Huamanga. The zone’s waters, ecology, and location made it especially important for commercial agriculture, and Puscotilla’s Indian husband had agreed in 1625 to pay the Crown 298 pesos (of 8 reales) for legal title to the land. The local Quiguieres Indians bitterly disputed the award of valuable property to outsiders, however, and a classic hacienda-community conflict...
festered for decades. In the 1640s Puscotilla, now a widow, was still hindering the Quiquaires, as well as a mestizo rival who had entered the fray. Lorenzo Pisco, a wealthy city Indian and “master shoemaker,” encountered similar problems in the countryside. To end litigation with the Angaraca Indians of Pata, Pisco resorted to an expedient well known to Spanish entrepreneurs. He simply paid the Indians, who could ill afford protracted legal struggles anyway, seventy pesos to withdraw their suit.\(^2\)

Outsiders could gain more acceptance by integrating themselves into community life and responsibilities, but such integration gave local Indians a means to exert pressure for redistribution of wealth. In 1642 Clemente de Chaves, a ladino from Huamanga, spent thirty pesos to buy a modest amount of land from a wealthy ayllu Indian of Huanta. The fact that Chaves married and settled in the area, and “helps [the community] serve the mitas of Huancavelica” undoubtedly stabilized his presence. A wealthier forastero, Don Diego de Rojas, married Teresa Cargua of Lucanas Andamarcas. Rojas apparently won the esteem of his new kinfolk, for he served as chief of their small ayllu. Acceptance of Rojas’s leadership probably derived from his willingness to submit to local reciprocities which demanded “generosity” on the part of chiefs. An Indian as wealthy and powerful as a Lorenzo Pisco, who had a curaca jailed for failure to pay a debt, might shun obligations which limited one’s capacity to accumulate or privatize wealth. But if he did, the intruder risked the same conflicts and litigations which afflicted Spanish entrepreneurs.

Conflict between ayllu Indians and wealthy forasteros is readily understandable, but the changing texture of relationships among originarios generated analogous tensions. Poma de Ayala’s observation that kurakas lost “respect” as they were integrated into the colonial political and economic structure suggests the development of more precarious, forced relations between chiefs and “their” people. At times, loss of confidence in the reciprocal exchanges which bound chiefs and ayllu peasants erupted in outright refusals to obey an “illegitimate” request. In Vicashuaman, for example, some Papres and Chiques kurakas and Spanish priests decided that ayllus ought to plant nearly 300 hectares of wheat to earn funds for local churches and cofradías. When the peasants discovered that they would not be paid for their work, resistance grew so fierce that the project had to be abandoned.\(^4\) A chief who lost legitimacy among kinfolk faced serious problems beyond those of simple disobedience. Emigration of ayllu Indians might increase; complaints to Spanish officials might undermine ethnic or ayllu authority; rivals to a chief’s authority might secure a following and embroil local society in a civil war.\(^5\)

A new tension thus entered the relationship of major chiefs and ayllu peasants. To shore up the legitimacy which made ayllu households respon-

---
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Andean society. Poor Indians understood very well the temptation to escape or soften burdens by allying with the world of the colonials, in a search for personal gain which weakened community solidarity and confirmed the superiority of the Hispanic over the Andean.61

At moments of crisis, these tensions exploded in nativist outbursts which sought to purge Andean society of Hispanic-Christian influence. The data available on these internal convulsions is extremely scarce, but the Jesuits recorded one such instance in 1613 when an epidemic swept western Huamanga (the Castrovirreyna-Huancavelica zone settled by the Huachos and Yauyos peoples).62 In this case, at least, Indian nativism generated fierce hostilities and violence. Indians not only killed two Catholic priests, but also (as we shall see later) one of their own chiefs! Quickly, Catholic extirpadores of the idolatry dragged 150 pagan priests to the city of Castrovirreyna for the standard public spectacle and proceedings: whippings and haircuts for the worst offenders, a bonfire to destroy Andean articles of worship (including the huacas themselves), "confession" and eventual rehabilitation of the idolaters. But some of the offenders refused to submit, and staged a spectacular show of defiance. Within five days, thirty of "the most obstinate" leaders, "exasperated and desperate," had killed themselves "with poison that they took by their own hand."

As in the 1560s, when millenarian upheaval inflamed Huamanga, the huacas served as a medium of popular protest and calls for change. In the Taki Onqoy movement, the Andean gods had literally "seized" the bodies of Indians, transforming previously unimportant natives into authoritative voices of angry gods. This time, the huacas voiced popular impulses by appearing to a variety of people in visions and dreams. "Three times they appeared in public to many people, and preached and taught them what to do..." The huacas rebuked the Indians for supposed disloyalty and neglect of the native deities, who had taken vengeance by sending disease and hard times to the land. And they issued a series of anti-Christian "commandments." The Indians "should not recognize any other god except their huacas," and should know "that everything that the Christians teach is false." The natives should perform the traditional rites and services owed to ancestor-gods, and should avoid any collaboration with Spaniards, who were "enemies of the huacas." The Indians "ought not to serve the Spaniards, nor deal with them, nor communicate, nor ask [their] advice... unless forced to."

The qualification "unless forced to" concealed a harsh fact of life. In the context of the early seventeenth century, the colonial power structure was too secure to be smashed or challenged overtly. But the Indians should not collate willingly. Instead, they should close ranks around a purifying hatred of colonials and Christian influence. "The day that a cleric or priest leaves town...", ordered the huacas, "[the Indians] should catch an all-black dog and drag him along all the streets and spots where the priest had walked." Afterwards, the natives should kill the animal at the river, "and where [the river parts into] two branches they should throw in [the body], in order that... they purify the places walked by the priest." In Andean culture, the juncture of two streams had special ritual significance as a symbol of perfection, or the achievement of "balanced" social relationships (Chapter I).

What distinguished the religious turmoil of 1613 was not its "idolatrous" nature, but rather its intense nativism—an attempt to wipe village society clean of Hispanic-Christian influence. Idolatry itself was neither exceptional, nor especially anti-Hispanic. Huamanga's Indians had long adhered to traditional religious practices, sometimes concealed beneath an overlay of Christian symbols and holidays. From an Andean point of view, "pagan" traditions balanced relationships with ancestor-gods who vitally affected the material welfare of the gods' children. Most Indians, therefore, could scarcely abandon their service to Andean gods. At crucial moments in the ritual calendar or life cycle, alcohol and coca lowered inhibitions, and "the most Christian [Indian], even if he [could] read and write, [chant] a rosary, and dressed like a Spaniard," reverted to Andean paganism.63 Indeed, successful or Hispanized native elites, including lay assistants of Catholic priests, often led traditional religious practices. This form of idolatry, though it sometimes expressed a muted hostility to Christian gods, tended to encourage coexistence and eventual interpenetration of Andean and Hispanic gods, symbols, and practices. In this sense, it promoted a syncretic religious culture through which Hispanizing Indian elites could maintain traditional sources of prestige and influence among kinfolk, while pursuing strategies and relationships drawing them ever more tightly into the world of Hispanic exploiters.64

The nativist idolatry which erupted in 1613, on the other hand, promoted fiercely aggressive anti-Hispanic sentiments, and spoke directly to the internal crisis symbolized by Indian Hispanism. For syncretism or coexistence, it substituted internal purification.65 For tradition led by a native elite, it substituted visions and dreams beyond the control of local authority. Before affirming the prestige of Hispanized Indians, it first put their loyalties on trial. At bottom, nativist currents and outbursts represented a protest against internal trends which sapped the strength and unity of Andean society. The message of anti-Hispanism, we ought to remember, was directed at Indians, not Spaniards. The huacas' commandments called upon all natives to reject the temptation to forsake the Andean for the Hispanic, in a quest for personal success which weakened community solidarity and confidence in the adequacy of Andean tradition. The most pointed targets of such
"commands," however, were those who had already made such a choice. To regain the favor of the huacas—and of poor peasants—successful natives would have to drop Hispanic aspirations which converted them into willing partners of colonial enemies. By reaffirming a purer loyalty to native Andean relationships, successful natives could demonstrate solidarity with the more "Indian" peasantry. Those who rejected the call of the huacas risked extreme alienation from local Indian society, and even violence. Nativists turned against ethnic elites who shied away from religious purification, and in one case poisoned "a kuraka of theirs, a good Christian, for not coming to their rites nor wanting to worship their idols."66

But murder remained the exception rather than the rule. We do not know to what extent wealthy forasteros participated in nativist idolatries. But among the originarios, at least, a good many elites responded to the pressure of local sentiment, and participated in the condemnation of their Hispanic-Christian ways.67 The threat of social alienation could become a tool of resistance which conditioned social and economic behavior. Indeed, to the extent that ayllu peasants could mobilize such a tool to redistribute the resources of successful Indians, they placed limits on the process of privatization and internal differentiation reshaping rural life. But why, we may ask, should a notable fraction of the successful Indians adopting "Hispanic" strategies and relationships prove so vulnerable to the threat of alienation from Andean gods and peoples?

**BETWEEN TWO WORLDS**

One answer, at first sight adequate, lies in the realm of physical safety and material interest. We have already seen that Indians feared antagonizing Andean gods who ruled over one's health, economic wellbeing, and the like. Equally as important, many successful Indians retained important economic ties in the ayllu countryside. Presumably, they could pursue those interests and protect their persons more effectively if they built loyalties and cooperative relationships, or at least avoided gratuitous antagonisms. Social isolation, beyond a certain point, invited violence, disruptive conflicts, and perhaps expulsion from valuable property. Even forasteros assumed relationships and obligations which stabilized their presence. Successful originarios depended upon "traditional" rights and obligations for some part of their access to resources and labor. A kuraka who enjoyed prestige among "his" people could set up a lucrative putting-out system with little trouble. A chief who had lost the "respect" or confidence of ayllu households, on the other hand, contended with uncooperative, resistant people. By this logic, those Indians who depended upon a certain esteem among ayllu peasants to maintain or enhance their material wellbeing could not afford to ignore pressures to participate in the nativist idolatries of an aroused peasantry.
Yet this answer is true only up to a certain point. After all, the direction of change limited the material vulnerability of wealthy Indians to declining esteein. An Indian elite which controlled considerable wealth and had integrated itself into provincial power groups enjoyed the same weapons of coercion and economic domination held by colonial aristocrat-entrepreneurs. They had powerful friends and relatives, and sufficient wealth to contract laborers, recruit dependent clients and retainers, accumulate property independent of ayllu control, invest in commerce, indebt (and jail) poor Indians, and the like. Indeed, deteriorating self-sufficiency and commercial penetration of their communities left peasants dependent on wealthy superiors of all races for money, subsistence, credit and protection. As wealthy Indians developed “Hispanic” patterns of accumulation, they emancipated their _económico_ lives from the esteem of kinfolk. The wealthiest Indians could indeed afford to withdraw themselves from the traditional burden of prestige and reciprocal obligation, and some in fact did.68

But others did not. The structural position of successful Indians, as a group, was laden with a deep contradiction which inhibited their social acceptance among Spaniards and Indians alike, and generated ambivalent loyalties and identities. As an emerging class, the successful Indians held interests and aspirations joining them to the colonial Hispanic world whose social, economic, and cultural patterns they emulated. But the stain of their racial origins linked them to the Indian peasantry, and generated social barriers which normally prevented their complete merger into Hispanic society and culture. Ruling classes tend to consider those whose labor they exploit as “lazy” or inherently inferior. In a colonial situation, where class relationships have their genesis in the conquest of one people by another, this characterization applies to entire castes defined by their racial and cultural origins, in this case the “republic of Indians.”69 The achievements of an Indian minority, judged by the Spaniards’ own standards, flowed in the face of the natives’ supposedly inherent degradation. Dynamic Indians competed with Spaniards for land, labor, and profits; they recast themselves in the trappings of Hispanic culture, and found Spanish suitors, allies, and friends. In some cases, they even mastered reading and writing skills known by only a minority of Spaniards. These wealthy and acculturated Indians flagrantly violated the world view and psychology of colonialism.

The Spanish response to ladinos, elites, and social climbers was, therefore, highly contradictory. On the one hand, colonial entrepreneurs and officials pursued the contacts they needed to exploit or control the Indian countryside. Their natural allies and friends were powerful, wealthy, and ambitious Indians. But dynamic Indian figures also disturbed the racial hierarchy which legitimated colonial exploitation, and entitled all whites—even those who could not break into high elite circles—to a respectable social and economic position. Hence acculturated or wealthy natives also aroused the hostility and contempt heaped upon pretenders who deny their “true” origins. (It is true that money or wealth could help one surmount racial barriers, but the economic success of many Indians, even if impressive and disturbing to racial hierarchies, was nonetheless modest when measured by the standards of high elite circles of Spanish colonial society.)

In general, then, successful Indians could not simply abandon their racial origins and find social acceptance and identification in a Hispanic world. But strong ambivalences also colored relationships with the bulk of Indian society. On the one hand, poor Indians “needed” wealthier, more acculturated counterparts. Their wealth could shore up deteriorating household and ayllu economies, or save an Indian debtor from jail. Their cultural knowledge of Hispanic society could strengthen juridical and other defenses against European enemies, or establish contacts which might serve the community. In addition, poor Indians probably looked upon successful natives with a certain amount of pride; like Spaniards, they understood that Indian dynamism provided a symbolic counterpoint to stereotypes condemning natives to inferiority and subordination. In certain respects, then, a wealthy ladino whose loyalties and commitments joined him or her to Indian society could prove to be an exceptionally valuable and popular leader.70

But there, alas, was the rub—in the question of loyalties and commitments. A widening gulf of suspicion, tension, and conflict accompanied the differentiation of Indian society into rich and poor, and for very good reason. Success assimilated the most powerful and dynamic fraction of Indian society to an exploitative class of aristocrat-entrepreneurs; the more modest success stories often represented a drain from ayllu society of needed people, skills, and resources, and weakened its internal solidarity. The cultural Hispanism of ambitious Indians expressed their weakening commitment to an onerous Andean heritage, and their conspicuous aspiration to blend into the dominant sectors of colonial society. Thus even as poor Indians “needed” their more Hispanized counterparts, and might take some pride in their achievements, they lost confidence in the loyalties of a new, more alien Indian elite. One response, especially against forasteros, was open conflict. But another, probably more widespread, was more subtle. Social pressure forced wealthy Indians to demonstrate their loyalties to the people to whom they “belonged,” or else suffer an awkward, alienated relationship governed by colonial rules of coercion and economic domination.

The Indian elite, especially its poorer and more rural segments, was vulnerable to the pressure of social ostracism precisely because contradictions of class and race blocked their fuller acceptance into Spanish society. The structural position of ladinos suspended them between two social worlds, Hispanic and Andean, without fully welcoming them into either. Somewhat
ill at ease in Spanish circles, yet estranged or suspect in peasant society, at least some acculturated Indians endured considerable psychic strain and inner conflict. We know, for example, that Andean huacas haunted “Christian” Indians in dreams and visions, sometimes for years. Often the native gods first presented themselves to both men and women as attractive sexual partners luring the unfaithful to return to Andean loyalties. Indians whose “Hispanic” wealth, socioeconomic strategies, and aspirations tended to differentiate them from the peasantry nevertheless found that they could not make a final break from Indian society. At least some continued to search for esteem or social acceptance among Indians, and responded to pressures to demonstrate loyalty to Andean society.

And on occasion, a popular hero emerged from the ranks of the fortunate and powerful. Don Cristóbal de León, son of a middle-level kuraka in Lucanas Andamarca, was a cultured ladino: Spanish in dress and hair style, Christian in religion, and known for his learning and ability. Given his political and economic privileges, and his acquired culture, León was in a position to integrate himself into the provincial power group exploiting the local peasantry, or to leave for a respectable life in a Spanish city. But León departed from conventional patterns and incurred the wrath of local colonials. León continued to live in his ayllu homeland, opposed drafts of peasant laborers to transport wine from Pacific coastal valleys across Lucanas to Cuzco, and condemned putting-out arrangements run by kurakas and corregidores to sell cloth in lucrative markets. At one point, he even set out to Lima to denounce local abuses before the viceroy. The local corregidor imprisoned León, “punished” him, and threatened to end the matter by hanging him. The incident marked the first of several confrontations between León and local corregidores. In 1612, a corregidor and visiting priest finally killed the persistent troublemaker. Significantly, other chiefs and notables had avoided helping León out of his scrapes.

The tragedy of Indian success stemmed ultimately from the way it secured the participation of a defeated people in its own oppression. The colonial regime rewarded Indians whose advantages, skills, or luck enabled them to adopt Hispanic forms of accumulation, and punished those whose identification with the peasantry was too strong or aggressive. The political implications were profound. The lure of success and the threat of loss recruited Indian allies to the colonial power structure, discouraged overt challenges which invited repression, and fragmented the internal unity of Andean society. The economic implications, too, were far-reaching. Success stimulated class differentiation within the “republic of Indians,” dividing it into the rich and more acculturated on the one side, the poor and less acculturated on the other. The achievements of an Indian minority accelerated the erosion of traditional resources and relationships, while implanting His-