

his men, tired of his almost pathological brutality, deserted. Aguirre was taken prisoner and beheaded by one of his own band who thus hoped for pardon for his part in the revolt.

Two thirds of the book are concerned with Gonzalo Pizarro and the civil wars; the other third is dedicated to Lope de Aguirre. Although the incidents are almost twenty years apart they have the connecting link of being the first Spanish attempts at independence in South America. This work reflects the author's ability as a novelist and biographer, but it should be remembered that the men and events themselves possess dramatic quality, and the reader should note that the most extravagant phrases are direct quotations from the documents and chronicles.

The quality of the binding, paper, and printing is unusually good. There is an excellent bibliography and a useful index of names. The book is well worth reading because it correctly and, rather more concisely than other accounts, gives the causes, events, and results of the civil wars of Peru (1544-1547) and the Ursúa expedition (1560-1561) along with a modern interpretation of their place in history.

GWENDOLIN BALLANTINE COBB.

Berkeley, California.

Areche y Guirior: Observaciones sobre el fracaso de una visita al Perú.
By VICENTE PALACIO ATARD. [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos de Sevilla, Publicaciones, XXX (N.º general), Serie 1.ª: Anuario, N.º 12.] (Sevilla: Imprenta y Litografía I.G.A.S.A., 1946. Pp. viii, 106. Paper.)

In an effort to repeat in South America the success that had been won by José de Gálvez's *visita* to New Spain, the Spanish court in March, 1776, appointed José Antonio Areche *visitador general* to Peru. Areche had served with Gálvez in Mexico. He opened his *visita* at Lima in August, 1777, and continued it until June, 1782, when he was supplanted by Jorge Escobedo.

In virtually all the many important matters confided to him by his instructions, and in others besides, Areche won initial successes; but in almost every case his success was transient. He carried out the required reforms in taxation and the administration of justice and in the reorganization of the Huancavelica mercury mine. When his innovations provoked strenuous opposition from the creole aristocracy, the local Spanish bureaucracy, and Viceroy Guirior himself, Areche won the first round and procured the summary removal of the viceroy. When the Indians, too, rebelled under Túpac Amaru, Areche took the field in person and suppressed the rebellion with exemplary ferocity.

Yet in the end, his *visita* was a complete failure. Most of his reforms were quickly undone and Areche's own career was blasted. Even his patron José de Gálvez finally turned against him. Areche himself was then summarily removed and recalled to Spain, where the Consejo de Indias in 1786 handed down a decision against him and in favor of Guirior. Repeated appeals on Areche's part never succeeded in getting this decision reversed. Posterity was no less hostile to him; only in the past generation have historians begun to give serious consideration to his side of the story of his spectacular failure in Peru.

Vicente Palacio Atard, a Spanish historian, now comes forward with the announced intention of breaking a lance in defense of Areche, who, in his opinion, has been the victim of rank injustice. He freely admits that Areche himself was partly to blame and points out how he blundered more than once through lack of judgment and moderation. But he lays most of the blame on the Spanish court, which assigned Areche an almost impossible task and then failed to support him properly, and on the Peruvian enemies of Areche, who were animated partly by a nascent nationalism and partly by the desire to protect their vested interests against the reforms he had been directed to carry out.

Palacio Atard is mistaken in thinking that his is the first substantial defense of the much maligned *visitador*, for in 1928 this REVIEW (Vol. VIII, pp. 14-42) published an article by Eunice J. Gates, entitled "Don José Antonio de Areche: His Own Defense," which was based upon many of the manuscript sources cited by Palacio Atard and which reached substantially the same conclusion. But his new study does go considerably beyond the Gates article in several respects. It cites additional archival materials (notably the instructions to Areche); it gives the reader a better understanding of the Peruvian background and of the nature of the various problems with which Areche had to deal; and it presents in an appendix (pp. 82-106) the text of two *consultas* of the Consejo de Indias regarding the case.

The author does not pretend to have given a definitive account of the visitation. As his title indicates, he has focussed his attention on the duel between Areche and Guirior, and when they return to Spain to continue it there, he follows them; but he points out that Areche's departure from Peru merely ended the first phase of the visitation, which was continued under Jorge Escobedo, and that we still lack a thorough, comprehensive study of the visitation in both its phases in the light of the many unused or little-used manuscript sources. His own modest monograph, though marred by inadequate use of previous studies, carries our knowledge of this intricate problem a long step forward. Perhaps its most interesting lesson is the folly of the Spanish

government's doctrinaire effort to apply the lessons of Mexico to the very different situation in Peru. A large part of the cost of this blunder was paid by Areche.

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

University of Pennsylvania.

La rebelión de Túpac Amaru. By DANIEL VALCÁRCEL. [Colección Tierra Firme, 31.] (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1947. Pp. 206. Illustrations. Paper.)

This general work, based almost entirely on documentary material, gives a clear account of the rebellion of José Gabriel Túpac Amaru (1780-1783). The leader was a descendant of the royal Incas and Spanish nobles, a man of some wealth and education who lived more like a European nobleman than an Indian. He championed the cause of the Indians and tried to get rid of their oppressions, suffered for many years under unscrupulous and greedy Spanish officials. First he used peaceful means—appeals to courts, viceroys, and the king, and endeavored to interest high church functionaries in the natives' cause. When those measures brought only temporary relief and *corregidores* (governors) kept increasing the economic burdens of the people by their *repartimientos*, or monopoly of merchandise, and by burdensome taxes, Túpac Amaru decided upon more forceful action. He began the revolution by hanging the hated Antonio de Arriaga, *corregidor* of Tinta province.

Many Indians from various towns in the bishopric of Cuzco immediately supported the Inca leader. The uprising spread until it became the largest Indian rebellion on the American continents. It extended from Tucumán northward through the northwestern part of Argentina, Bolivia, and Peru to Quito, Colombia, and Venezuela. Although Túpac Amaru was captured and cruelly executed, his relatives and followers went right on with his work. It was then that the revolution assumed its bloodiest phase; the Indians were now determined to exterminate the whites. The Spaniards were badly frightened and kept busy crushing the insurrection, but the superiority of their arms finally prevailed. A general pardon was issued and the remainder of the Inca's family saved for a time, but the Spaniards were not sincere in their offer. They merely awaited a pretext to exterminate the whole Túpac Amaru family. This opportunity soon came in certain minor revolts and false accusations against the pardoned rebels. Spanish justice then did such a thorough work that only one or two members of the family survived.

The great Inca revolt did not come suddenly. Many precursory uprisings had occurred for almost half a century before the big upheaval