

INCA GARCILASO'S *COMENTARIOS REALES*, OR WHO TELLS THE STORY OF A CONQUERED CIVILIZATION?

DARÍO FERNÁNDEZ-MORERA
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
FKALOKAGATHOS@AOL.COM

Literature transcends ideology, national boundaries, and racial consciousness in the same way as the individual transcends this or that -ism. Using some scientific -ism to explain history, or interpreting it with a historical perspective based on pseudo-dialectics, has failed to clarify human behavior.

From Gao Xingjian's Noble Prize lecture, "The Case for Literature."

Civilizational studies, particularly those on the New World, have suffered from the ideologies of postcolonial criticism and "subaltern" studies. Their limitations can be foregrounded by applying these approaches to pre-colonial narratives while reversing margin and center: by reading these native narratives as situated at the center rather than at the margins—as narratives of conquerors rather than conquered, as homoglossic surfaces that attempt to cover up the underlying heteroglossy of their subject matter. The text of Inca Garcilaso's *Comentarios reales* is a particularly good subject for such a demythologizing attempt.

The *Comentarios reales* are the closest thing we have to a written record of Inca ideology and history since we have no written Inca texts prior to the Spanish conquest and since he claims that his work is based on the oral accounts passed to him by his Inca ancestors. In other words, he claims to have written down an *oral history* of his people. Certainly Garcilaso is the most famous expositor of an ideology and a history from a presumably Inca viewpoint. His intentions have been the subject of much speculation in the specialized literature. So has the extent to which he may have shaped his work to pass muster with the Spanish authorities, how much he echoes or not the Spanish accounts of Inca history, and how much his account is corroborated by the archeological evidence or by the investigations of modern historians.

None of these concerns are the subject of this article, especially since a perusal of the first part of the *Comentarios* shows that he is quite sympathetic to the Inca and that he can be trusted to go to extremes to

present the Inca in a favorable light without irritating the Spanish authorities, who allowed his work to be published and circulated in the early years, before second thoughts about Garcilaso's obviously favorable take on Inca history and ideology made the authorities have second thoughts on the matter.

Instead, the focus of this article is that in what is considered by our contemporary critics to be an attempt to justify himself for his position as a conquered man, the Inca Garcilaso unwillingly reveals the narrative means used by his ancestors to perpetuate the myth of the inevitability of their rule. Much in the Inca Garcilaso's *Comentarios reales* may well be a reaction or a surreptitious answer by this son of an Inca princess to Spanish rule, as the scholarly consensus proposes. Nevertheless, such a reading should not obscure the fact that much of the material in his narrative consists of a rather clear trace of the earlier master narrative constructed by the Incas to legitimize their own hegemony.

At this point one should probably place in quotation marks the words "conquered man" because whoever has seen the magnificent house of the Inca Garcilaso in Cuzco—now used by the local government for a Casa de la Cultura and the Museo de Arte Virreynal—will not feel very sorry for his way of life under Spanish rule, *pace* the sort of *ubi sunt* for the way of life of the Inca aristocracy that he attributes to Sayri Tupac, but that he himself may lament; and also because as important in his upbringing as his Inca maternal side was his paternal Spanish family side, a side usually neglected in studies of Garcilaso, but a side which generously supported him and his top rate education in Europe, where he eventually chose to live and be buried.

The *Comentarios* reproduce familiar arguments used by conquerors throughout history to trumpet the beneficent effects of conquest upon the conquered, the gratitude that the conquered must feel for their loss of liberty, and the regrettable but necessarily ruthless measures that sometimes must be taken against them for their own good. One may notice, too, how the Inca rulers' concept of civilization is universalized, thus repressing a self-conceptualization that undoubtedly already existed in highly sophisticated social organizations such as those of the Chachapoyas, or the Churajón, or the Chancas, before the uppity barbarians called the Incas began to postulate themselves as the center of the world in the name of the Sun:

Para lo cual es de saber que en aquella primera edad y antigua gentilidad [before the Inca arrived to enlighten the world] unos indios había

pocos mejores que bestias mansas y otros mucho peores que fieras bravas (Garcilaso 21; I, ix) [For which it is necessary to know that in that early age and ancient gentility there were Indians little better than tamed beasts and other Indians worse than ferocious beasts].¹

Shortly afterwards, Garcilaso's uncle tells him again of the brutal ways of the Indians before the benefic arrival of the Incas:

la gente en aquellos tiempos vivían como fieras y animales brutos, sin religion ni policía, sin pueblo ni casa, sin cultivar ni sembrar la tierra, sin vestir ni cubrir sus carnes, porque no sabían labrar algodón ni lana para hacer de vestir (Garcilaso 29; I, xv) [the people of those times lived like wild beasts and brute animals, without religion or laws, without town or house, without cultivating or seeding the earth, without clothes or covering of their naked flesh, because they did not know how to process cotton or wool to make garments].

Here Garcilaso has presented the standard colonialist maneuver of showing the backwardness of the conquered before the conquerors come to civilize them. The narrative then turns to the pre-Inca religion, telling us how barbaric the gods of the pre-Inca nations were, again in a familiar imperialist move:

[the pre-Inca nations had gods] conforme a las demás simplicidades y torpezas que usaron, así en la muchdumbre de ellos como en la vileza y bajeza de las cosas que adoraban....Conforme a la vileza y bajeza de sus dioses eran también la crueldad y barbaridad de los sacrificios de aquella antigua idolatría (Garcilaso 21; I, ix) [according to the other simple and brutal ways they had, as much in their sheer numbers as in the vileness and lowliness of the things they worshipped....As was the vileness and the lowliness of their gods so was the cruelty and barbarism of the sacrifices done in that ancient idolatry].

Of course the Inca god cannot allow this situation to continue, and so sends down two of his children to help the world. Providentially, and very conveniently for the Inca royalty and nobility, these children were the first Incas and from them all the Incas rulers happen to descend, making the Inca ruling class not only direct descendants of god but his anointed instruments in his beneficent designs.

"Nuestro Padre el Sol", que era lenguaje de los Incas y manera de veneración y acatamiento decirlas siempre que nombraban al Sol, porque se preciaban descender de él....Nuestro Padre el sol, viendo los hombres tales como te he dicho, se apiadó y hubo lástima de ellos y envió del cielo a la Tierra un hijo y una hija de los suyos (Garcilaso

29; I, xv) ["Our Father the Sun," for such was the language of the Incas and the veneration and obedience whenever they referred to the Sun, because they were proud to descend from Him....Our Father the Sun, seeing such men as I have told you, had pity on them, and sent from the heavens to the earth a son and a daughter of his].

The characteristically phallocentric and therefore patriarchal ways of sun-god worshippers show clearly in the method used by the first Incas, children of the sun-god, to find the site of their rule, namely sticking a bar into the mother earth:

y les dijo que fuesen por do quisiesen y, doquiera que parasen a comer o a dormir, procurasen hincar en el suelo una barrilla de oro de media vara en largo y dos dedos en grueso que les dio para señal y muestra (Garcilaso 30; I, xv) [and he told them to go wherever they wanted and wherever they stopped to eat or sleep that they tried to push into the ground a small bar of gold half a yard long and two fingers thick that he had given them as a sign and insignia].

The first Inca rulers organize their initially converted Indians hierarchically into classes, giving more power to those Indians the rulers consider more obedient and diligent in forcing other Indians to submit to the Inca and therefore more worthy of receiving power from the Inca, with instructions to keep ethnic and family purity intact, in a characteristically ethnocentric maneuver destined to strengthen Inca rule and prevent its dilution by racial miscegenation:

Las diferencias que el Inca mandó que hubiese en las insignias, demás de que eran señales para que no se confundiesen las naciones y apellidos....Que a los que había visto más dóciles a su doctrina y que habían trabajado más en la reducción de los demás indios, a éstos había semejado más a su persona en las insignias y hécholes mayores favores (Garcilaso, 40-41; I, xxiii) [The differences that the Inca ordered to exist among the insignias in addition were signals so that the nations and the lineages would not be mixed....That those who he had seen were more docile to his doctrine and had worked the hardest to reduce the other Indians to subjection, those he has likened the most to his own persona in the insignias and to them he has granted the biggest favors].

The goal of racial purity explains the Inca rulers' practice of marrying their sisters to produce the next (always male) Inca heir (although the Inca ruler could have many non-Inca concubines and therefore many half-Inca children who in rank would be above those not fathered

by the Inca but would not be in line to the Inca throne) as well as the laws that forbade marriages among people of different towns (Garcilaso 147-149; IV, viii-ix). Hierarchical principles even affected laws stipulating the way people would dress and cut their hair (Garcilaso 39; I, xxii).

Garcilaso shrewdly hides the Inca practice of institutionalized human sacrifice (of young women and children principally) that recent archeological discoveries on the tops of mountains have exposed. He asserts that Spanish historians who say otherwise are wrong (Garcilaso 62; II, viii). Instead, he credits the Incas with forbidding these sacrifices and the eating of human flesh that, once upon a time, Garcilaso records for us, did occur in the region. He chooses his words carefully because he admits elsewhere (Garcilaso 287; VII, vi) that the Inca practiced the bloodletting of children for certain specialized ceremonies but without reaching the point of killing them:

no sacrificaron carne ni sangre humana con muerte, antes lo abominaron y prohibieron como el comerla (Garcilaso 62; II, viii) [they never sacrificed either flesh or human blood to the point of killing; instead they hated and forbade such sacrifices as well as the eating of flesh].

When convenient, Garcilaso does not hesitate to use Spanish sources like Pedro Cieza de León, to reinforce the hegemonic claims of the Incas:

"Estos indios se mejoraron con el imperio de los Incas" (Garcilaso 65; II, x)

In the Incas' self-serving narrative, the Incas' civilizing work is so wonderful that the backward non-Inca Indians soon realize how much better they are under the Incas' rule, and go around excitedly telling other Indians how much better it is to submit:

Los mismos indios nuevamente así reducidos, viéndose ya otras y reconociendo los beneficios que habían recibido, con gran contento y regocijo entraban por las sierras, montes y breñales a buscar los indios y les daban nuevas de aquellos hijos del Sol y les decían que para bien de todos ellos se habían aparecido en su tierra, y les contaban los muchos beneficios que les habían hecho (Garcilaso 32; I, xvii) [The very same Indians just conquered, seeing themselves now different and recognizing the benefits that they had received, with great contentment and happiness went about the sierras, mountains and bush

lands searching for other Indians and would give them the good tidings of those children of the Sun, and would tell them that for the good of everyone they had appeared on their land, and told the Indians of the many beneficial things they had done].

This narrative would be greeted with a howl if the conquerors were the Spaniards instead of the Incas and, say, Bernal, were writing this sort of thing:

Los Canas quisieron informarse de espacio de todo lo que el Inca les enviaba a mandar, y qué leyes había de tomar y cuáles dioses habían de adorar. Y después de haberlo sabido, respondieron que eran contentos de adorar al Sol y obedecer al Inca y guardar sus leyes y costumbres, porque les parecían mejore que las suyas. Y así salieron a recibir al Rey y se entregaron por vasallos obedientes (Garcilaso, 77; II, xviii) [The Canas wanted to know very carefully what the Inca commanded them to do, and what laws to take and what gods to worship. And after knowing about it, they answered that they were happy to worship the Sun and obey the Inca and keep his laws and customs because they seemed better than their own. And so they came out to greet the King and delivered themselves to him as obedient vassals].

Of course, some Indians are too stupid or ungrateful to know what is good for them and resist, or revolt against the Incas. They must then be duly punished. One example among many is the Ayauri nation. These Indians were "tan duros y rebeldes que ni aprovecharon persuasiones ni promesas ni el ejemplo de los demás indios reducidos, sino que obstinadamente quisieron morir todos defendiendo su libertad, bien en contra de lo que hasta entonces había sucedido a los Incas" (Garcilaso, 77; II, xviii) [so obtuse and rebellious that neither persuasions nor promises nor the example of the other Indians who had submitted worked; instead, with obstinacy they wanted to die all of them defending their freedom, against everything that until then the Incas had experienced]. Finally the Incas beat them and the Ayauri then joined the good side. Some conquests lasted years not because the Indians were hard to beat, but because they were so stupid that civilizing them took longer than defeating them. So was the case with the Indians from Hurin Pacasa: "se gastaba más tiempo en doctrinarlos, según eran brutos, que en sujetarlos" (Garcilaso, 81; II, xx) [one would spend more time in teaching them, so stupid they were, than in conquering them].

The stubborn and ungrateful Collas, fortified on some heights, will have nothing to do with the Incas and tell them to go civilize somebody

else: in spite of repeated generous offers from the Inca to surrender to a better life, "[los Collas] estuvieron siempre pertinaces diciendo que ellos tenían buena manera de vivir, que no la querían mejorar y que tenían sus dioses, y que uno de ellos era aquel cerro que los tenía amparados y los había de favorecer; que los Incas se fuesen en paz y enseñasen a otros lo que quisiesen, que ellos no lo querían aprender" (Garcilaso, 101; III, ii, iii) [the Collas were always obstinate, saying that they had a very good way of life, that they did not want to improve it and that they had their own gods, and that one of them was that mountain from which they were resisting and that it would favor them; and that they Incas ought to go home in peace to teach to other Indians what they wanted, that they, the Collas, did not want to learn it]. The Incas, of course, take on the Incas' burden, and disinterestedly insist on civilizing them, which leads to a big battle and the defeat of the recalcitrant Indians. The Incas, magnanimously, pardon the rebels. But the ingrates rebel again, and now they must be subjugated a *fuego y a sangre* (Garcilaso, 102; III, iii). The Chinchas demonstrate a comparable and inexplicable "obstinacy" until the Inca ruthlessness overcomes them (Garcilaso, 243-47; VI, xvii-xix). This pattern repeats itself many times in the narrative of Garcilaso all the way to his recording of the arrival of the Spaniards.

Parts of the *Comentarios Reales* may give a *visión de los vencidos*, but it certainly gives, too, a *visión de los conquistadores*. The *Comentarios* certainly do not give the *visión* of the Ayauri, or the Pucaras, or the Chancas, or the Chimú, or the Chinchas, or the Chachapoyas, or the Huancas, or the Chancay, or the Cañetes, or the Churajón, who long before the writing of the *Comentarios* had been "pacified" by the Inca rulers to the point of abject submission in some cases and total disappearance in others.

From the point of view of postcolonial discourse, the Inca Garcilaso's writings, or, as one may put it, his *testimonio*, appear as the work of someone trying to use writing merely as a veiled weapon of resistance, or at least as a guarded expression of resentment.

However, this interpretation assumes that Peruvian history started with the Inca rulers and was then dramatically altered by the Spaniards; and this viewpoint coincides with a predetermined starting outlook of victimological attribution that is blinded to the larger and very sobering historical reality by a naive and possibly misplaced sympathy for the defeated Inca nation. In fact, Peruvian cultural history did not start with

the Incas any more than it did start with the Spaniards. It started with the pre-Incaic cultures of Peru.

One may wonder how this can be the case since anyone going to Peru today can see the Inca presence all around, but cannot see even pre-Inca traces. The answer is a simple one: the Incas destroyed those pre-Inca cultures and did so far more efficiently and thoroughly than the Spaniards ever tried or managed to do with Inca culture. Today in Peru we have evidence everywhere of the presence of the Incas, even after hundreds of years of Spanish domination. We do not have to make much of an effort to see it. But the Incas did such a good job of obliterating the national identity of the other and more numerous Amerindians of the region that only relatively recent and quite strenuous archeological efforts have been gradually revealing to us the marvelous nature of the pre-Incaic peoples that the Incas systematically conquered, destroyed, and later claimed to have civilized and improved; in fact, some of the more remarkable Inca achievements may originate in these pre-Incaic cultures. It is becoming more and more clear that the Incas were a very Roman-like people, a nation of conquerors and organizers who were to the pre-Inca Amerindians of Western South America what the Romans were to the Etruscans, and later, to a lesser extent, to the Greeks: rather than original creators of a sophisticated way of life, they were superior warriors and practical imposers of an iron order who deserved the Barbarian chief's comment on the ancient Romans recorded by Tacitus: "they create a solitude and call it peace."

Besides institutionalized collectivism, occasional outright extermination, taking away the noble sons of conquered kings to be brought up by the Inca, and detailed rules of behavior that included cutting one's hair in a certain way, wearing prescribed clothing and adornments, and prohibitions on leaving one's native village, another effective procedure used by the Inca rulers to control the Amerindian masses was the *mit'maj*, whereby defeated, but still rebellious enemies were forced to move from their territory to other regions of the empire, so they could be effectively uprooted from their ancestral land, where they were replaced by loyal settlers brought in from other areas (Garcilaso, 278ff; VII, i). We are all too familiar with this ethnic cleansing "pacifying" method from past, recent, and even ongoing world history.

That in Peru some Amerindian groups may still have harbored enough self-identity to side with the Spaniards in spite of generations of this and other methods which systematically wiped out their institutions

and disempowered them both as individuals able to support their families and as political collectives with a common agenda illustrates the remarkable spiritual resilience of human beings. This phenomenon also recurs throughout human history. In our recent past, witness the Chechen, who still survive today, though once upon a time they were relocated by the Marxist-Leninists to Siberia in a famous population redistribution maneuver sanctioned by Marxist theory in the last clause in point nine of Marx's *Communist Manifesto*: like some Amerindians, many Chechen sided with the enemy of their enemy, in their case the German National Socialist invaders of Marxist-Leninist Russia. A similar phenomenon occurred among the Ukrainians, devastated during the 1930's to the count of six million dead by a Marxist-Leninist-made famine: like oppressed Amerindian groups, they, too, sided (or, from their enemies' viewpoint, "collaborated") with the enemy (again the German National Socialists) of their enemy (the Marxist-Leninists) when they had the opportunity (see, for all this, Courtois). Anyone can come up with a favorite past or even present example of such phenomena.

Agustín de Zárate called the Incas a "gente belicosa" (Cossío, 36) [a warlike people]. More ominously, they called themselves Incas, which means "lords" (Garcilaso 42; I, xxiv). And they were indeed a formidable and strongly hierarchical ruling elite of probably no more than 10,000, who in their heyday controlled with an iron grip more than 10 million Amerindians.

Nonetheless, Felipe Cossío del Pomar's views in the 1960's are not untypical of the underlying sympathy that even today informs scholarly writings on the Incas and prevents a detached understanding of their rise and fall and of the White Europeans' decisive historical role in the brutal ethnic hegemonic struggles of the region. So, where the White Europeans, the Spaniards, get flunked, the Incas are given a pass and more: "Y como [the Inca nation] es una de las más cultas, es natural [my emphasis] que ejerza cierta hegemonía, puesto que de ella deriva más tarde el concepto de imperio" (Cossío del Pomar 43) [And since the Inca nation is one of the most learned, it is natural that it exerts a certain hegemony, since from it derives later the concept of empire].²

This sycophantic statement is redolent of the sort of thing that, for example, Italian historians used to say generations ago of Rome vis-à-vis conquered nations like the Etruscans. It is also the sort of thing that even a Bernal does not say about his own Spaniards. One may wonder

how such statements would be looked upon by an upper class member of the great Chachapoya culture, to whom the Incas may owe their monumental architecture, or a member of the Churajón people, who had developed, long before the Incas got to them, a sophisticated agricultural system that included terrace farming and complex irrigation canals later claimed by the Incas as their own invention.³

The destruction of the Chancas is particularly instructive. Despite the many extant references to the once large Chanca confederation, which included the mountains of Huanta in Ayacucho, the margins of the Apurímac river, and the entire basin of the Pampa river, almost nothing is known today about Chanca customs, religion, language, political organization or even the exact extent of their territory: since they were implacable enemies of the Incas, they were culturally and possibly physically erased from the face of the earth. No wonder that the name given to the scepter carried by an Inca ruler, the golden ax called *cuncacuchuna*, meant "cutter of heads" (see Mellado). This insignia has been proudly displayed by a recent Peruvian president, Alejandro Toledo, seemingly oblivious to the real nature of Inca rule and desirous of participating in the thorough mythologizing of the Inca past which is imbedded in the Peruvian national narrative and its political and educational institutions.

While reading Garcilaso, one wonders if there is not a measure of irony in his descriptions, as when he insists on the happiness that other Indians felt in the very act of subservience to the Inca and quotes in agreement the Spanish chronicler Father José de Acosta: "Pero la mayor riqueza de aquellos bárbaros Reyes [the Inca] era ser sus esclavos todos sus vasallos, de cuyo trabajo gozaban a su contento, y, lo que pone admiración, servíanse de ellos por tal orden y por tal gobierno que no se le hacía servidumbre, sino vida muy dichosa" (Garcilaso 177; V, vi) [The greatest wealth of those barbaric Inca Kings consisted in that their vassals were all their slaves, off whose work the Inca rulers lived a great life, and, what is astonishing is that they used them in such orderly manner and with such a governance that the subjects did not feel it as slavery but as a happy life].

It is an indication of the ruthless efficiency of this, like the Romans, relatively small but imperious ethnic group, that not only did it destroy the customs and religions of its enemies, and therefore the spiritual foundation of their cultures, but also their languages, to the extent that when the Spaniards arrived, the culture of the Incas and the language

preferably used by the Incas were already practiced and spoken throughout the empire (subject populations were forced to speak the language chosen by the Inca: Garcilaso 279-280; VII, i). The Inca largely succeeded in forcing their entire culture upon the population.

Again, a comparison with the lasting Latinization of many of the very different peoples of Western Europe under the Romans does not seem inaccurate. Today, Quechua dialects still by and large lord it over the other native languages of the region. One may contrast the success of Inca hegemony with the failure of the Spaniards in eliminating Quechua and replacing it thoroughly with Spanish: after centuries of Christian Spanish rule, a census taken in 1946 showed that 40% of the inhabitants of Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, originally made up of a multiplicity of peoples speaking a variety of Amerindian languages, by then identified themselves with the customs and the language of the Incas (Cossío del Pomar, 9), while the inauguration (in 2001) of a new President in Peru (Alejandro Toledo) featured Inca priests and Inca rites (see Mellado). Moreover, in another familiar hegemonic maneuver (for another historical irony, compare the Spaniards' demonization of the Amerindian gods), the Incas transformed the gods of the conquered nations into evil spirits, enemies of the Inca ruler-god *du jour*.

Nonetheless, in spite of the Incas' very effective policies of conquest, some Amerindians may have seen in the Spanish a chance to shake off or get back at Inca rule. This possibility filters occasionally through some of the otherwise pro-Inca narratives that have come down to us.

So we read in the writings of Titu Cusi Yupanqui of those despicably disloyal Indians who are siding with the Spaniards against Sayri Tupac, successor of Manco II (Chang-Rodríguez 46, 50). Garcilaso now and then lets us know how reluctant some of the Amerindians were in fact to accept Inca rule, and in a few cases he even admits the outright love of liberty of the eventually subjected nations (Garcilaso 268-73; VI, xxxii-xxxiv).

Although the awesome Inca ruling methods were far more successful in "flattening" or "dissolving" troublesome alien social groups than, say, Mexican methods, the indigenous cultural composition of the empire was likely less than monolithic in 1532, quite apart from the dynastic civil war that Pizarro and his Spaniards encountered. For example, the Huancas and the Chimú remained unconquered until 1460 and the Chachapoyas until 1470. The Araucans, of course, were never

conquered. How happily, then, did the Incas, in spite of all their tyrannical efficiency, succeed in establishing the feeling of a common "country" among the provinces and subjects of their vast and ethnically divided empire? We do not really know. Un-assimilated diversity as at least another factor in the Spanish victory remains an undeveloped area of investigation.

Notes

¹ All translations are my own. I cite by page number and then by book and chapter of *Garcilaso de la Vega, El Inca, Comentarios Reales*, ed. José de la Riva-Agüero (Mexico: Porrúa, 1998)

² See also p. 68. Such bias is normal in postcolonial discourse. In *Culture and Imperialism* Edward Said claims that Verdi's *Aida* allegorizes Western fears of Egyptian "expansionism" in Ethiopia. Said uses the weaker word "expansionism" where "imperialism" might have been used, and he ignores the real fact of Egyptian subjugation of Ethiopia. Said cannot dwell on Egypt doing to others what the West would one day do to Egypt because portraying a victim as a victimizer weakens victimization, which is necessary for the entire postcolonial enterprise.

Similarly, in the case of the Incas, for example, we are supposed to feel disgust at the rape of Inca princess Beatriz Clara for the brutal and Machiavellian act that it was (an attempt by the Maldonados to secure a marriage with this Inca heir to the wealth of Indian slaves and land that the Inca Sairy Tupac had been allowed to keep), but not feel disgust about the institutionalized ritual killings on mountain tops of young virgins and little boys over centuries of Inca rule, or the institutionalized sexual bondage in which women were kept for the exclusive pleasure of the Inca lords.

The intrigues and murders among the Incas themselves throughout their history had much to rival the Spaniards. For the rape of Beatriz Clara, see Chang-Rodríguez, 48; the Inca Titu Cusi later tried to marry her to his son to reinforce Cusi's illegitimate claim to royal legitimacy. She eventually married a Spaniard.

³ The Chachapoyas were conquered around 1470. A nation of great builders, along with the much earlier Tiwanaku culture it may

have provided the less culturally advanced Incas with the example and know-how for their impressive constructions. On the recent discoveries of Chachapoya artifacts on the mountains, see "200 Peru mummies were elite 'cloud people'," *Chicago Tribune*, December 19, 1997. On the Chachapoyas achievements, see Amat Olazabal, 1976. On the Churajón see Matos Mendieta, 351-524.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso, 1992.
- Amat Olazabal, Hernán. "Estudios arqueológicos en la cuenca del Mosna y en el alto Marañón." *Actas del 41 Congreso Internacional de Americanistas*. Mexico: El Colegio de Mexico, 1976. 3: 532-544.
- Behdad, Ali. *Belated Travelers. Orientalism in the Age of Colonial Expansion*. Durham: Duke UP, 1994.
- Chang-Rodríguez, Raquel. "Writing as resistance: Peruvian history and the *Relación* of Titu Cusi Yupanqui." *From Oral to Written Expression: Native Andean Chronicles of the Early Colonial Period*, ed. Rolena Adorno. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1982, 41-64.
- Cossío del Pomar, Felipe. *El mundo de los Incas*. Mexico: Fondo de cultura económica, 1969.
- Courtois, Stéphane, et al. *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology*. London: Verso, 1978.
- Fernández-Morera, Darío. *American Academia and the Survival of Marxist Ideas*. Westport: Praeger, 1996.
- Gorner, Peter. "Peru volcano unveils 500-year-old mummies." *Chicago Tribune*, October 25, 1995.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1991.
- Hulme, Peter, ed. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797*. New York: Methuen and Co. Ltd, 1986.

- _____. *Colonial discourse, postcolonial theory*. New York: Manchester UP, 1994.
- Garcilaso de la Vega, el Inca. *Comentarios Reales*. Ed. José de la Riva-Agüero. Mexico: Porrúa, 1998.
- Kadir, Djelal. *Columbus and the Ends of the Earth: Europe's Prophetic Rhetoric as Conquering Ideology*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.
- Matos Mendieta, Ramiro. "Las culturas regionales tempranas." *Historia del Perú antiguo*. Lima: Editorial Juan Mejía Baca, 1981, v. 1: 351-524.
- Mellado, Tania. "Peru's new leader taps Inca roots." *Chicago Tribune*, July 30, 2001.
- Mises, Ludwig von. *Human Action*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1949.
- _____. *Theory and History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1957.
- Nisbet, Robert. *Community and Power*. New York: Oxford UP, 1962.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1993.
- Shafarevich, Igor. *The Socialist Phenomenon*. Trans. William Tjalsma. Foreword by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. New York: Harper & Row, 1980, pp. 132-142.
- Toro, Alfonso and Fernando de, eds. *El debate de la postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica. Una postmodernidad periférica o cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento latinoamericano*. Frankfurt: Vervuert, 1999.
- Xingjian, Gao. "The Case for Literature." *PMLA* 116 (2001): 594-601.
- Zamora, Margarita. *Authority and Indigenous History in the Comentarios Reales*. New York: Cambridge U P, 1988.

(This Page Intensionally Blank)