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This thesis uses the loss of the Ocopa jungle missions to the rebellion of Juan Santos Atahualpa (1742-1752) to examine the changing political relationship between Church and State in mid-eighteenth-century Peru. Until the eighteenth century, Church and State had been traditional partners in the governance of Spain’s American possessions. With the ascension of the Bourbon dynasty in 1700, however, this partnership between Church and State began to deteriorate. This change was due in full measure to the adoption by many royal ministers, including Manso de Velásco, of regalism, an ideology inspired by the European Enlightenment’s emphasis on reason over tradition which championed the supreme authority of the monarch in all matters of state. Regalist ministers believed that political power in the Spanish empire should be centered in the monarchy rather than shared with other politically powerful institutions, such as the Church. The regular orders (Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, Mercedarians and later Jesuits) were particularly suspect since they answered to their leaders in Rome, and not to the king. I argue that Viceroy José Antonio Manso de Velásco, Conde de Superunda, abandoned campaigns against the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebels in 1751 because it weakened the power of the Franciscan Order in Peru.
This conclusion challenges previous historiography which contends that Manso de Velásco ended campaigns against the Juan Santos rebels because colonial resources were overextended by the 1746 Lima Earthquake and the Lima Conspiracy and the Huarochirí Rebellion in 1750. This thesis also calls for a re-evaluation of the periodization of the Bourbon reforms in the Spanish Americas, which some scholars argue do not begin in earnest until after the Seven Years War (1756 – 1763). I contend that Manso de Velásco’s actions against the Ocopa missionaries, along with other reforms throughout Peru, indicate an early Bourbon reform period which focused primarily on clerical reforms.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1709, Franciscan friars who were later based out of the College of Santa Rosa de Ocopa near Jauja, Peru, founded the first of twenty-three mission stations in a region of the eastern Peruvian high jungle called the Montaña Central. Because of the Franciscan vow of poverty and the missionaries’ inability to collect sufficient alms to fund the mission stations, the friars depended on the crown for financial support. Crown support continued, with some significant breaks, throughout the early eighteenth century. With these funds, the Ocopa friars were successful in converting only a few thousand jungle Amerindians as they built mission stations throughout the Montaña Central over the next few decades. In 1742, however, life in the Ocopa mission stations was interrupted by the rebellion of Juan Santos Atahualpa, a highland Indian from Cuzco who claimed to be the descendant of the last Sapa Inca, Atahualpa.\(^1\) With the help of the local jungle Amerindians, Juan Santos drove the Ocopa friars from most of their mission stations in the eastern high jungle. Peru’s viceregal government reacted immediately. Over the next nine years, the viceroy sent four expeditions attempting to crush the rebellion. In 1751, however, Viceroy José Antonio Manso de Velásco, Conde de Superunda, abandoned all efforts to retake the missions.

\(^1\) Though Tupac Amaru I (executed by order viceroy Francisco Toledo in 1572) was the last Sapa Inca, Atahualpa was the last Inca to rule all of the old Inca Empire before the Spanish invasion in 1532. Since Juan Santos argued for the rebirth of the Inca Empire with himself as Sapa Inca, adding the name Atahualpa to his own was probably to emphasize the Indians return to a pre-Hispanic existence.
Manso de Velásco claimed he did not have the resources to continue funding the costly expeditions to put down the rebels in the Ocopa mission stations. Two of the three regions that the crown had originally agreed to fund were now overrun by rebel Amerindians, leaving the friars with only two of their original twenty-three mission stations. Outside the Ocopa mission area, three events further justified Manso de Velásco’s decision. In 1746, an earthquake leveled most of Lima, and the subsequent tsunami killed nearly all of the approximately 6,000 residents of Lima’s port, Callao. In 1750, during the unrest that followed the devastation, the viceroy uncovered an Amerindian conspiracy to overthrow the government, which heightened fears of a popular uprising in the viceregal capital. These fears were exacerbated when one of the Lima conspirators, Francisco Jiménez Inca, escaped colonial authorities and led a rebellion in the adjacent highland province of Huarochirí. In 1751, the viceroy ordered the former mission stations closed to further evangelization. Instead of sending expeditions to retake mission property, he opted to establish a chain of fortifications at the mountain passes leading to the mission stations to contain the rebel Amerindians. At the same time, Manso de Velásco reduced the annual stipend that the crown had been paying the Ocopa friars by one half.

By 1751, however, the city of Lima was well on its way to recovery from the 1746 earthquake/tsunami. Many of the government structures in Lima had been rebuilt. Even immediately after the earthquake, the viceroy had been able to draw upon outside revenue to keep the city running. By 1751, tax revenue was increasing as businesses returned to normal activity. Manso de Velásco was remitting more money to Spain than his predecessor had. He had successfully crushed both the Lima Conspiracy and the
Huarochirí rebellion. Why then did he cut the friars’ funding and abandon the Ocopa missions to the rebels?

Manso de Velásco’s abandonment of the campaign against Juan Santos Atahualpa’s rebels can only be understood in a larger political context of Bourbon regalism. With the ascension of the Bourbon dynasty to the throne at the beginning of the eighteenth century, many royal ministers, including Manso de Velásco, began to adopt policies influenced by regalism, a philosophical trend throughout Europe that championed the supreme authority of the monarch in all matters of state. Inspired by the European Enlightenment’s emphasis on reason over tradition, regalist minded ministers believed that political power in the Spanish empire should be centered in the monarchy rather than shared with other traditionally powerful institutions, such as the nobility and the Church.2 In order to accomplish this regalist vision, royal ministers attempted to wrest power away from any institution that rivaled crown authority. One such institution, the ministers felt, was the regular clergy. Therefore, while Manso de Velásco may have believed the Ocopa friars’ work in the Montaña Central was a godly endeavor, continuing to support them was inconsistent with his regalist agenda. The Viceroy’s task in Peru was to strengthen crown authority and maximize remittances to Spain. By helping the Ocopa friars to retake their mission stations, Manso de Velásco would have decreased remittances to Spain and strengthened the political power of the regular clergy in Peru.

As early as Philip II (1556-1598) in the late sixteenth century, the influence of the regular clergy had impeded crown efforts to extend royal power over the Church in the
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New World. The *Patronato Real*, or Royal Patronage, allowed the Catholic Kings of Spain to nominate candidates for bishops within its territories and to control the tithe. This gave the crown great influence over the secular clergy. As Spain began the “spiritual conquest” of the New World, however, large numbers regular clerics traveled to the Americas. Regular orders, with their zeal and internal organization, contributed much to early colonization efforts. Consequently, the crown allowed the regular clergy (mostly Franciscans, Mercedarians, Augustinians, Dominicans, and later Jesuits) to fulfill many of the duties normally reserved for the secular clergy, such as operating rural Amerindian parishes. While the zealous regular clergy brought many to the faith, their presence created a particular dilemma for the monarchy. Except in pastoral matters, regular religious orders were supranational organizations, whose members answered not to local bishops but to their own leaders in Rome. These leaders, in turn, were ultimately accountable to the Pope. Furthermore, for those clergy who ministered in the New World, even Rome’s authority was limited. Long distances made effective coordination with Rome difficult, and left local provincial leaders with considerable autonomy.

As Bourbon government ministers began to advance regalist policies in the eighteenth century, the conflict over the King’s inability to control the regular clergy in the Americas escalated. One regalist minister argued that “from the moment they [took] vows, [regular clergy] should be looked upon as foreigners,” because they answered to their leaders in Rome and ultimately the Pope—not the king. While most Bourbon

---

reformers did not share this extreme view, they did believe that the autonomy of the
regular clergy was an impediment to reform.

Many royal ministers during the eighteenth century also began to adopt the
regalist notion that the regular clergy were detrimental to the economy of Spain’s empire.
Over the centuries, devout Catholics had donated money and large tracts of land to clergy
in both Spain and the New World. Convents and monasteries used these resources to
maintain themselves. During the eighteenth century, however, royal officials began to
believe that the Church’s hold on these vast resources adversely affected commerce
throughout the empire. They argued that if church property could be put in the hands of
commercial interests, it would be used more efficiently and create tax revenue for the
state. This was particularly important to crown authorities interested in raising revenue,
because the church was exempt from most taxes. Though the Spanish crown already
received a percentage of church tithes, many in the royal government saw greater
potential revenue in the sale of church property.7 Some ministers even began to argue that
monastic life removed too many individuals from the workforce, thereby damaging the
economy. While convents and monasteries labored to worship god, they did not,
ministers argued, help to further industry within the empire. Moreover, due to their vows
of celibacy, regular clergy had no children, and thus reduced the workforce of the next
generation.8 For these reasons, some royal officials contended that in order to increase the
prosperity of Spain and its empire, they must curtail the wealth and size of the regular
clergy.

7 Ibid., 67 – 70.
8 Ibid., 64.
Though Bourbon clerical reforms were intended to weaken the political power of the church, most royal ministers who pushed for regalist reforms did not see their actions as anti-clerical or anti-religious. These reformers understood that the clergy was an integral part of the Spanish empire. The influential Italian regalist Ludovico Antonio Muratori stated in 1749 that the state would be strong if “perfect and constant harmony [existed] between the Sacerdocio (clergy) and the Imperio (state)” and if “both [strove] together to deliver the people spiritual and temporal happiness.”

Many ministers believed that by removing clerics from political power, they would in fact be initiating needed reform for the clergy. Having been removed from political life, the ministers contended, the clergy would be free to focus on spiritual matters.

Reforming the clergy was one of the Bourbon monarchy’s first objectives. Clerical reform in the early Bourbon period (1700 – 1759) prepared the way for later Bourbon policies throughout the Spanish empire. Though Philip V (1700 – 1746) and Ferdinand VI (1746 - 1759) suffered from mental instability, which made it difficult to rule an increasingly regalist state, they leaned on the support of powerful royal ministers to help shape clerical reform. With the help of his regalist minister, Melchor Rafael de Macanaz, Philip V issued royal cédulas (decrees) in 1705 and 1717 that ended the construction of new convents or hospitals in America without permission from Spain. In 1703, he issued a cédula requiring that small rural convents (conventillos) have at least eight friars in permanent residence to be considered an official convent. This was an attempt to end the regular clergy’s practice of using conventillos as a base of operations for friars who were serving in rural parishes. By officially listing these friars as part of
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9 Ibid., 57.
the convent, they were putting them under the control of their own order’s hierarchy, rather than secular church authority. The cédula was most likely ignored, since it was reissued in 1708, 1727, 1731, and 1739; nonetheless, King Philip’s effort of publishing and republishing it demonstrates his desire for clerical reform. Philip’s son, Ferdinand VI, continued reform efforts with the aid of his royal ministers. These included Zenón de Somodevilla y Bengoechea, Marqués de la Ensenada, Ferdinand’s chief minister; his Secretary of State, José de Carvajal y Lancaster; and his Jesuit confessor, Francisco de Rávago. Particularly in the wake of the Lima Earthquake/Tsunami, these royal ministers worked to limit the power of the regular clergy in Peru’s viceregal capital. Under their guidance, Ferdinand issued a royal cédula in 1751 that attempted to limit the number of monasteries and convents that could be rebuilt within the city. While this reform was ultimately unsuccessful, others were not. Beginning in 1749, for example, the crown began the process of removing regular clergy from the rural Indians parishes, where regular clergy had been performing the duties of secular clerics since the early sixteenth century. The process took several years, but by the 1770’s, most rural Indian parishes were no longer under the control of the regular clergy.

While reformers were attempting to decrease the power of the regular clergy, they were also redefining the relationship between church and state. The state and the church had traditionally been partners in governing the Spanish empire. Particularly in the Americas, the regular clergy had been instrumental in the evangelization and
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12 Ensenada was the secretary of finance, war, marine, and the Indies or as one contemporary observer quipped “the secretary of everything.” Lynch, Bourbon Spain, 160.
acculturation of the native population. But by the early eighteenth century, the crown increasingly saw the clergy, particularly the regular orders, as an impediment to the centralization of power in the State. Therefore, reformist ministers showed less support for the activities of the clergy. While not all clerical reforms during the Bourbon period were effective, they marked a shift in the state’s mentality toward the church. The regular clergy could no longer count on the state for support as they had in the past. In many ways, this changing relationship probably had a more lasting damaging effect on the Church than actual reforms. It was this basic shift in state/church relations that led Spanish officials in 1751 to curtail state support for the Franciscan missionaries of Santa Rosa de Ocopa.
State-mandated clerical reform began earlier than most historians have acknowledged. During the later Bourbon period, Charles III and Charles IV enacted several spectacular empire-wide reforms, such as the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish empire in 1767 and the confiscation of Church property in Spain in 1798 and the Americas in 1804. These significant events have led some historians to argue that colonial Bourbon reforms did not begin until the ascension to the throne of Charles III in 1759. John Fisher chooses 1750 as the starting point for his extensive study on the Bourbon reforms in Peru. Fisher argues that although the first fifty years of the Bourbon period saw some changes in Spain’s political structure, Spain did not reform colonial policy in depth until it was defeated in the Seven Years War (1756 – 1763). John Elliott also argues that the Seven Years War was the beginning of the Bourbon reforms in Spain’s American colonies. In his seminal work, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America 1492 – 1830*, Elliot compares the changes in Spain’s and Britain’s colonial policies in the aftermath of this war. He argues that the war had exposed great weaknesses in their imperial systems that led both Spain and Britain to reevaluate their
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colonial policies. While a comparison between the Bourbon reforms in Latin America and the British reforms in North America after the war may be a useful historical method, it belies the fact that the Spanish colonial reforms, particularly clerical reforms, actually started in the aftermath of the War of Spanish Succession (1700 – 1713).

More recent scholarship has begun to discuss the extent to which the Bourbon crown enacted reform in the Americas prior to the Seven Years’ War. In *Shaky Colonialism: The 1746 Earthquake-Tsunami in Lima, Peru, and Its Long Aftermath* (2008), Charles Walker argues that to Bourbon reformist ministers, the 1746 Lima Earthquake/Tsunami exposed the disorderly, baroque backwardness of the viceregal capital. This realization inspired Bourbon officials in both Spain and Peru to enact a series of reforms to create a more modern, enlightened city. These reforms included limitations on the number of stories allowed in city residences (aimed at minimizing the destruction of future seismic events), restrictions on women’s clothing to improve the morality of Lima’s inhabitants, and limits on the number and size of the convents and monasteries in Lima. Walker, however, stops short at calling this the beginning of the Bourbon reforms. He instead argues that while these policies foreshadowed later reform, they had little lasting effect on Peru.

As for the Ocopa friars, early studies on the missionaries only briefly discuss regalist tendencies amongst crown officials and their effects on the mission stations. They focus almost exclusively on the Juan Santos Atahualpa Rebellion itself. These early
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works characterize the rebellion as a precursor to Peruvian independence in the 1820’s. In
the introduction and notes of his important 1942 document collection on the rebellion,
*Juan Santos, el invincible*, historian José Loayza describes the rebellion as a “proto-
revolutionary” expulsion of the Spanish from the Andes.\(^{21}\) Loayza’s interpretation was
heavily influenced by *Indigenismo*, a revisionist movement in the 1920’s and 1930’s that
attempted to glorify Peru’s indigenous past. While the documents in the collection have
proven to be a valuable historical resource, Loayza’s anachronistic approach has
unfortunately inspired other writers to link the Juan Santos rebellion to Peruvian
nationalism. One example is *The Rebellion of Juan Santos* (1973), where Mario Castro
Arenas narrates the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebellion primarily from the documents edited
by Loayza. While Castro Arenas discusses some complex political issues surrounding the
rebellion, he assumes Loayza’s fundamental premise of Juan Santos as a precursor to
independence.\(^{22}\) More recent scholarship, such as Steve Stern’s 1987 article, “The Age
of Andean Insurrection, 1742 – 1782: a Reprisal” argues that although the Spanish saw
the Juan Sanos Atahualpa rebellion as a threat to their hegemonic control over the
indigenous population, this rebellion had no relationship with the Creole-led
Independence movement of the early nineteenth century.

Jay Lehnertz made one the first serious inquiries into the possible causes for the
viceroys decision to stop actively campaigning against the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebels.
Lehnertz argued that Manso de Velásco withdrew his forces in 1751 because the Lima
Earthquake/Tsunami, the Lima Conspiracy, and the Huarochirí rebellion had simply

\(^{21}\) Francisco A. Loayza, ed., *Juan Santos, el invencible (manuscritos del año de 1742 al año de 1755)* (Lima: Editorial D. Miranda, 1942), xvii – xv.
overextended colonial resources.\textsuperscript{23} Lehnertz’s 1974 dissertation, “Lands of the Infidels: The Franciscans in the Central Montaña of Peru, 1709 – 1824,” is an ethno-historical study that focuses on the relationship between the Ocopa friars and the jungle Amerindians of the Montaña Central. Lehnertz argues that despite the friar’s faithful efforts, they had little impact on the jungle Amerindians’ culture and way of life.\textsuperscript{24} The Ocopa missionaries were too few and the territory was too vast for them to effectively convert and acculturate the natives. The Ocopa mission stations were therefore inherently unstable, making it impossible for the Ocopa friars, even with help from the Spanish soldiers, to resist the Juan Santos rebels. While this may have been a factor in the Ocopa friars’ expulsion from the Jauja/Tarma mission stations, Lehnertz fails even to consider the effects the Bourbon policies may have had on the friars’ inability to hold or retake their missions. Although he recognizes occasions where the state denied funding for the friars’ missionary efforts,\textsuperscript{25} he does not account for Manso de Velásco’s complete unwillingness to help the Ocopa friars after 1751.

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 13- 15.
\textsuperscript{25} As Lehnertz points out, the missions rarely received their annual funding from the state. Ibid., 316.
CHAPTER 3

EARLY PROBLEMS WITH THE STATE, 1709 – 1742

Though the relationship between the Ocopa missionaries and Peru’s viceregal
government would reach its nadir in the 1750’s, the state’s support of Ocopa’s missionary
efforts was inconsistent from the beginning. From the first entrance of missionaries into
the high jungle east of Tarma in 1709 to the outbreak of the Juan Santos Rebellion in
1742, mission officials struggled to maintain viceregal financial support for their
enterprise. Though the crown was committed to spreading Catholicism, it was surprising
that the Ocopa friars even received funding in the first place. During the War of Spanish
Succession Pope Clement XI had recognized the Austrian Habsburg prince, Archduke
Charles, as the legitimate king of Spain rather than the Bourbon king, Philip V. This led
Philip in 1709 to cut off diplomatic relations with Rome until the end of the war in
1713.\textsuperscript{26}

Fortunately, the Ocopa friars had influential allies in the \textit{Sacra Congregatio de
Propaganda Fide}. Founded in 1624 by Pope Gregory XV, \textit{Propaganda Fide} endeavored
to counter Protestantism in formerly Catholic lands. Using persuasive handbills,
broadsides, and other propaganda that gave the congregation its name, \textit{Propaganda Fide}
met with several important initial successes. With the help of a new missionary order, the
Society of Jesus, \textit{Propaganda Fide} helped retain the loyalty of several eastern European

\textsuperscript{26} Lynch, \textit{Bourbon Spain}, 107 – 108.
nations to the Catholic faith during the Thirty Years War. As the seventeenth century went on, the Propaganda Fide expanded its enterprise outside Europe.

By the 1680’s, Propaganda Fide had begun a new phase of expansion into the New World under the auspices of the Franciscan Order with the establishment of the Apostolic Institute. Based on two 1686 papal decrees issued by Pope Innocent XI, the Apostolic Institute was dedicated to the conversion of the Amerindians not yet incorporated into Christian society. Critical to the Institute’s effectiveness was its independence from local Franciscan leadership. The Franciscan order, headed by the Minister General in Rome, had divided the world into several provinces. Each province was under the leadership of a Provincial. The Provincials in turn presided over convents or colleges under control of local superiors. Therefore, if it had been part of the traditional hierarchy of the order, Ocopa and its mission stations would have been subject to the jurisdiction of local Franciscan provincial of the Province of the Twelve Apostles based in Lima. Each provincial, however, directed missionary efforts from their administrative center, allocating funds and personnel according to the center’s own internal needs. As a result, the frontier missions were notoriously understaffed and under funded. The Apostolic Institute hoped to overcome these problems by creating a system manned and funded by external sources such as the crown. Thus, most of the money that Ocopa received would not be controlled by provincials concerned with maintaining large convents in Lima. Also, this European focus meant that the vast majority of friars

30 Ibid., 294.
in the Apostolic Institute were peninsulars. Of the 510 friars, lay brothers, and other staff in the Peruvian Apostolic Institute from 1709 to 1800, 74% were born in Spain. This was in sharp contrast to the total population of Franciscans in Peru, which was made up of roughly 80% Creoles by the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{31}

After initial successes in Mexico, Guatemala, Panama and Colombia, the Apostolic Institute hoped to expand their efforts into Peru. In 1708, the Institute selected Fray Francisco de San José to head the new missionary effort. San José had been with the Institute since its inception and had gained leadership experience in several of its Apostolic College missions.\textsuperscript{32} Some time after San José’s arrival in Lima, the commissioner of Propaganda Fide in all of Spanish America, Fray Francisco Esteves, appointed him as vice-commissioner over the Apostolic Institute in Peru.\textsuperscript{33}

Upon arriving in Peru, San José quickly established three mission stations in the Montaña Central east of Tarma for the Institute. The area had been the focus of several failed missionary expeditions during the seventeenth century, the last one ending in 1694.\textsuperscript{34} It was perhaps due to this dubious reputation that provincial leaders in Lima were willing to turn over the area to the Institute. Getting provincials in Lima to give the Institute a highland base for their operations, however, proved more difficult. According to Lehnertz, provincial leaders felt threatened by the presence of the independent institute. Though the 1686 papal bull that founded the Apostolic Institute required that

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 328. Also see Antonine Tibesar, “the Alternativa: a study of Spanish-Creole relations in Seventeenth Century Peru,” The Americas, vol. 11, no. 3 (Jan., 1955), 242.

\textsuperscript{32} Julian Heras, Introduction to Cartas e informes sobre Ocopa y sus misiones by Jose de San Francisco (Lima: Convento de los Descalzos, 1997) 13-17.

\textsuperscript{33} Bernardino Izaguirre, Historia de las misiones franciscanas y narración de los progresos de la geografía en el oriente del Perú; relatos originales y producciones en lenguas indígenas de varios misioneros... 1619-1921 (Lima: Talleres tipográficos de la Penitenciaría, 1922-29), 39.

\textsuperscript{34} José Amich, Historia de las misiones del convento de Santa Rosa de Ocopa. (Iquitos, Peru: CETA, 1988), 132.
provincial authorities hand over two convents to serve as bases for the Institute’s frontier missions, Franciscan leaders in Lima resisted compliance. It was not until 1724 that the provincial leaders even partially complied by relinquishing to the Institute a small convent at Santa Rosa de Ocopa near Jauja.35

The Institute’s establishment of the mission stations in the Montaña Central presented San José with another problem: how to fund them. As members of a mendicant order, San José and his missionaries were dependent on alms for the survival of their missionary endeavors. While political pressure had caused the provincial superiors to turn over the alms of Franciscan-controlled parishes in Cerro de Pasco and Vico,36 San José argued in 1710 that alms would not suffice for a project of this magnitude.37 In order to maintain the Institute’s independence from provincial authority, San José needed to secure an outside benefactor. Using his influence in Spain, San José turned to the crown.

In a real cédula dated 12 March 1718, Philip V granted the Peruvian Apostolic Institute an annual stipend of 6,000 pesos per year and agreed to pay the travel costs of twelve missionaries sent from Spain.38 According to 1718 cédula the crown funded the Ocopa missions because it had a moral duty to evangelize among the people that lived in its territory. Though this was not an inconsequential consideration since the evangelization of the native population was what justified Spain’s rule in the Americas,39 there were more practical political reasons not stated in the cédula for their actions. Fray Francisco de San José had connections with a high ranking member of the Franciscan

36 Informe de Fray Francisco de San José to Padre José Sanz, General Commissioner of the Indies, 24 March 1721, Tarma, Peru. Found in San José, Cartas e informes, 55.
37 Memorial de Fray Francisco de San José, 1710. Found in Francisco de San José, Cartas e informes sobre Ocopa y sus misiones, Julian Heras, ed. (Lima: Convento de los Descalzos, 1997) 27-28.
38 Fernando Rodríguez Tena, Crónica de las misiones franciscanas del Perú, siglos XVII y XVIII (Iquitos, Peru: CETA, 2005), 223 - 227.
39 Ibid., 223 – 225.
Order in the Spanish court who helped lobby for his cause.\textsuperscript{40} The crown also may have recognized the strategic importance of the region. Salt mines just east of Tarma attracted jungle Amerindians from the surrounding regions, turning the area into important entrepot for native commerce. A food preservative, particularly necessary in warm climates, salt was used by the jungle Amerindians in the region as a form of currency.\textsuperscript{41} An earlier explorer to the region, the Franciscan friar Manuel Biedma, noted that whoever controlled the Mountain of Salt controlled the \textit{Montaña Central}.\textsuperscript{42} The enticement for the state to expand its hegemony by controlling the salt mines was something that San José was quick to exploit. In soliciting the king for funds for his missionary efforts in 1713, he mentioned that the mines were “celebrated even in court.”\textsuperscript{43} San José’s initial move into the region underscored his understanding of the region’s strategic importance to the crown. The first mission he established was Quimiri, located along an access road to the highlands; the second was Cerro de la Sal, actually at the site of the mines; and the third, Eneno, was the river port closest to the mines.\textsuperscript{44}

Within little more than a decade, however, crown support for the Ocopa missionary stations had begun to waver. In 1720, the English privateer John Clipperton, while raiding along the western coast of South America, took the president of the Audiencia of Panama captive, inspiring major panic within the viceroyalty of Peru.\textsuperscript{45} The viceroy, Diego Morcillo Rubio de Auñon, a mendicant friar and Archbishop of Lima,

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., 225 – 226.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 69 - 70.
\textsuperscript{43} “tan celebrado hasta la corte.” Memorial de Fray Francisco de San Jose, 25 November 1713. Found in San Jose, \textit{Cartas e informes}, 33.
bolstered the capital’s defenses and increased military readiness to counter the threat. In order to fund the increased military costs, he refused to pay Ocopa their yearly stipend. This action met with disapproval from Fray Francisco de San José. While San José’s subsequent letter to the King did not condemn the viceroy’s actions, it lamented the great loss of souls resulting from the lack of funds.\textsuperscript{46} Although a fairly minor incident in the history of the missions, the Lima government’s nonpayment of the stipend in 1720 set a precedent for later decisions to withhold funding. According to Jay Lehnertz, between 1726 and the outbreak of the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebellion in 1742, the local crown officials made only eight payments (see Table 1). And only one of them, the 1726 payment, comprised the full 6,000 pesos allotted by the king.\textsuperscript{47} While supporting evangelizing activities was important to the viceroy, strategic state concerns took priority, particularly after the outbreak of the War of Jenkins’ Ear against Great Britain in 1739.\textsuperscript{48}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1726</th>
<th>1729</th>
<th>1731</th>
<th>1732</th>
<th>1736</th>
<th>1737</th>
<th>1738</th>
<th>1739</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount in Pesos</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{46}Memorial de Fray Francisco de San Jose, 23 March 1721. Found in San Jose, \textit{Cartas e informes}, 61.
\textsuperscript{47} While this table found in Lehnertz, “Lands of the Infidels,” 316 is pieced together from several sources and may not be altogether definitive, that fact the viceregal officials sometimes paid less the total amount or at all is clear from the Fray Francisco’s letters. See San Jose, \textit{Cartas e informes}, 72 – 75, 78.
\textsuperscript{48} Lynch, \textit{Bourbon Spain}, 140.
The viceregal government also interfered with Ocopa’s ability to be completely autonomous from the provincial Franciscan leadership. Soon after taking control of Santa Rosa de Ocopa, San José attempted to secure a cédula real to elevate the new headquarters to a College of Propaganda Fide. The move would allow the Apostolic Institute to sever ties completely with the superiors of the Franciscan Province of the Twelve Apostles, giving the Ocopa friars full control of their jungle missions. The Council of the Indies, however, refused to issue the cédula unless supporting local recommendations accompanied the petition. Unfortunately for the friars, the responsibility to gather the pertinent information fell to viceregal government. Lima officials, responding to pressure from the Franciscan superiors in the city, neglected or refused to send the information. The application process was bogged down until 1746, when San José’s successor, José de San Antonio, actually traveled to Spain with the necessary documents. Even with the head of the Peruvian Institute present in Madrid, further problems delayed the issuing of cédula until 1757, well after most of the Ocopa missions had been overrun by the rebellion of Juan Santos Atahualpa.49

Many in the Spanish government were reluctant to support the Ocopa missions because, although they had many mission stations throughout the Montaña Central, they had converted relatively few jungle Amerindians.50 Map 1 shows the locations of several known Ocopa missionary stations before 1742. From Tarma, the Apostolic Institute started building mission sites along the Chanchamayo and Perene river valleys in 1709.

50 Although this complaint is repeated throughout viceregal records, probably the most acute criticism comes from Spanish reformers Jorge Juan and Antonio de Ulloa. See Jorge Juan and Antonio de Ulloa, Discourse and Political Reflections on the Kingdoms of Peru. Their Government, Special Regimen of Their Inhabitants and Abuses Which Have Been Introduced into One and Another, with Special Information on Why They Grew Up and Some Means to Avoid Them. Edited and with an introduction by John J. TePaske and translated by John J. TePaske and Besse A. Clement (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 166.
By 1711, they began to access the lower Perene river valley from Jauja via Andamarca. In a census taken by the Friars in 1736, the Ocopa missionaries listed that they had twenty-eight mission stations and 4,833 converts.\textsuperscript{51} In reality, however, the number of inhabitants was probably a fraction of what the friars reported. A 1739 \textit{visita}, or official inspection, revealed that the Jauja and Tarma frontier mission stations had only 851 converts, spread amongst nine stable mission stations.\textsuperscript{52} Even one of the larger missions, Eneno, had only 409 inhabitants in 1721, far below the ideal number of 400 families that was expected to be maintained in highland parishes.

The Ocopa friars, however, insisted that these figures belied the true number of people they had converted. They argued that massive epidemics had devastated most of their “spiritual harvest.” As had occurred with the initial invasion of the Americas, the European friars’ presence in the \textit{Montaña Central} had caused devastating virgin-soil epidemics among the jungle Amerindians. In the Tarma missions, epidemics of smallpox killed large numbers of converts in 1711, 1713, and 1715, in some cases more than cutting in half the mission stations’ populations. Other outbreaks of unknown diseases hit the Ocopa mission stations in 1721, 1724, and 1736-37.\textsuperscript{53} By 1734, the friars claimed that in total they had baptized upwards of 12,000 converts, but that many of them had died of disease.\textsuperscript{54} While this number is probably an exaggeration, anecdotal evidence suggests that large numbers of jungle Amerindians died between 1709 and 1742, robbing the Ocopa friars of many hard-won converts.

\textsuperscript{51} Mapa de los Mártires de Santa Rosa de Ocopa 1746, Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Mapas y Planos – Perú y Chile, 32. This includes 2 missions in Huánuco and 3 in Cajamarquilla.
\textsuperscript{52} The nine missions were San Fermín de Parua, Sonomoro, Quirimí, Nijandaris, Cerro de la Sal, Metraro, Eneno, Pichana, and Los Autes. Lehnertz, “Lands of the Infidels,” 116, 424n.
\textsuperscript{54} Real Cedula dando licencia para que de los conventos de España se envíen 30 misioneros de Cerro de la Sal y otras del Perú, 1734, AL-MRE, Peru, LEB-11-38, Caja No 93, 3r.
Disease, however, was not the Ocopa missionaries’ only problem. Both demographics and geography made establishing stable mission stations difficult. Most stations in the Jauja/Tarma frontier were not centralized population centers, but a diffuse system of villages. Jungle soil was notoriously infertile, and most locations could not support intensive agriculture. So instead the mission stations were divided into *ayllos*, small villages consisting of a few families that radiated out from the center mission complex where friars and other Spanish settlers lived. While the precise distance from each ayllo to the center complex is unknown in most cases, in Eneno, the ayllo of Epillo was 30 miles from the mission station’s chapel. This diffuse settlement pattern made it difficult for the friars to regulate orthodoxy.

The Ocopa Friars also found it difficult to attract jungle Amerindians to their mission stations in the first place. Jungle Amerindians were reluctant to submit to certain aspects of Catholicism. Ending the practice of polygamy, for example, was particularly difficult for them. In other regions of the Americas, missionaries could offer natives protection from hostile tribes or Indian slavers. In the *Montaña Central*, no such threats existed. The friars were reduced to enticing the Amerindians with gifts of steel tools. Distributing tools became a particularly problematic way of retaining converts, because the tools’ portability allowed natives, who were traditionally semi-permanent residents, to simply leave after receiving their gift.

The most significant problem for the friars, however, was their lack of manpower. During the period of 1709-1742 no more than a dozen friars with an equal number of *legos* (lay friars) and *donados* (servants permitted to wear friars’ robes) serviced the

---

growing missionary enterprise. 58 Ideally, one friar and one *lego* or *donado* would man each mission. Initially this schema was feasible, but as the friars expanded their enterprise, one friar was forced to service two or more demographically diffuse mission stations. Between 1736 and 1737, the missions of Eneno, Cerro de la Sal, and Metraro only had one friar between them. 59 The lack of manpower stemmed from the Apostolic Institute’s European-based system. Instead of looking locally, the Institute sought friars from Spain to fill its ranks. The Institute hoped that the crown would cover the travel costs for new missionaries. Though the crown eventually paid for twelve friars to travel to Peru in 1730, and then for thirty more in 1737, it was simply not enough. Of the friars that came in 1730, two died in transit, and four died in the missions. Of the 1737 group, eleven died in transit and one died in the missions. Most friars also simply left the Ocopa missions after a time for other posts in the New World. The average tenure for most friars in the Ocopa missions was only ten years. 60 The college of Ocopa never had enough friars to man their mission stations.

The Ocopa Friars’ lack of manpower was compounded by the continual territorial expansion of their missionary efforts. This became particularly problematic with the discovery of the Pampas of Sacramento, or the Gran Pajonal (see yellow area on Figure 2). Although the Ocopa missionaries knew about this region probably some ten years earlier, they did not enter the region until 1730, when local Amerindians led the friars to it. The Gran Pajonal is an elevated area that is colder and less tropical than the

58 Peruvian Institute started with 6 frairs, in 1930 ten more arrived, and in 1937 nineteen arrived. However, several friars died over the intervening years while several more simply left. Lehner, “Lands of the Infidels,” 75, 399n.
60 *Ibid.*, 399n. Also see Real Cedula dando licencia para que de los conventos de España se envíen 30 misioneros de Cerro de la Sal y otras del Peru, 1734, AL-MRE, LEB-11-38 Caja No 93, 3v – 4r.
surrounding regions. By most accounts, it was also more heavily populated. According to the Ocopa friars, the people in the Gran Pajonal had already been taught something about Christianity—probably by the Franciscan expedition led by Fray Manuel Biedma in the seventeenth century. The friars used the discovery of the Pampas to petition the crown to fund more missionaries to come over from Spain. They argued that the new missionary area would require more manpower to serve the large population. In the meantime, however, the discovery of the Gran Pajonal only exacerbated staffing problems as the friars struggled to service the region. During the first two decades after the Pampas were discovered, Ocopa could only spare enough friars for short forays into the region. No permanent mission stations were ever established, despite the friars’ claims of having five. Most of these so-called stations were probably the names of villages where friars had attempted to build a chapel.

The instability of the Ocopa missions provided not only criticism from government officials, but it incited unrest among the jungle Amerindians. From the outset, as friars pushed into new regions, local Amerindians were reluctant to cede control. The first ten years of the Tarma missions (especially the mission of Cerro de la Sal) saw continual conflict between the Amerindians and the friars. As the eighteenth century continued, long standing conflicts between these two groups intensified. In particular lack of control of the Gran Pajonal caused it to be a center for unrest. In 1737, just a few years before Juan Santos came to the Montaña Central, a major rebellion erupted in the missions, requiring an intervention from the viceregal government. On

---

61 Julian Heras, Introduction to Cartas e informes, 113 – 114.
62 Instancia de Fray José de San Antonio sobre nueva misión de religioso, 1760, AL-MRE, LEB-12-19, Caja No 95, 5v.
64 Ibid., 70.
March 20th, a local chief, Ignacio Torote, along with his son, Fernando, and twenty other men, raided the mission of Sonomoro in the Gran Pajonal, killing four friars. The missionaries hastily organized a military response within days but were unsuccessful in finding the wayward chief’s band. Following their initial failure, the missionaries successfully lobbied for 4,000 pesos from the viceroy to build a fort and pay for a local militia of 150 men. Before reinforcements arrived Torote had escaped deep into the jungle never to be seen again by the missionaries.65

---

CHAPTER 4
THE REBELLION OF JUAN SANTOS AND THE VICEREGAL RESPONSE, 1742 – 1746

Some years before 1742, a highland Andean named Juan Santos entered the Montaña Central. Little is actually known about Juan Santos. Accounts describe him as a Mestizo from either Cuzco or Cajamarca. He claimed to have been the servant of a Jesuit priest who had taken him to Europe and Africa. Some accounts even assert that he had come to the jungle to hide from the law after he had murdered his former Jesuit master in Huamanga. Whatever the reason for his arrival, Juan Santos attracted a significant following in the Ocopa missions. Playing on messianic millenarian themes, he claimed to be the successor of the last Inca, Atahualpa, having come to free the jungle Amerindians from the bonds of the Spanish friars. Juan Santos used a unique mixture of Christian, Andean, and jungle Amerindian beliefs to win the support of the various ethnic groups within the Montaña Central. Without alarming the Ocopa friars, who were too preoccupied trying to maintain the diffuse, undermanned mission stations, Juan Santos built a coalition that included highland Andean settlers, black African slaves brought by the friars, and jungle tribesmen.66

In June 1742, Juan Santos and his band seized the mission of Quispango in the Gran Pajonal. Heeding the Ocopa friars’ cries for aid, the crown moved swiftly to

---
eliminate the new threat. As in the case of Torote, the Viceroy hoped to use local troops, paid for with funds from Lima. In August, the local governor of Tarma, Benito Troncoso, led seventy troops into the high jungle to expel Juan Santos.\(^{67}\) Unfortunately for Troncoso, unlike his own militia, Juan Santos’ band was adept at fighting in the mountainous jungle. Relying heavily on jungle Amerindian archers, Juan Santos’ forces used tactics akin to modern guerrilla warfare, striking without notice and retreating before a counterattack could be organized.\(^{68}\) Royal troops floundered as they tried to protect the remaining mission stations. In 1743, Troncoso redoubled his efforts. Supported by money from the viceregal treasury, Troncoso led 212 men against Juan Santos with even more disastrous results.\(^{69}\) The failure began when royal troops arranged to use mule drivers from the adjacent highland province of Huarochírí, probably hoping they would be more loyal than local drivers from Jauja or Tarma. While the soldiers were attending Mass before departing, the mule drivers abandoned the expedition.\(^{70}\) By the summer of 1743, Juan Santos had captured the Spanish fortress at Quimiri. At the same time, a second column of rebels raiding from the east overran the missions of Pinchana, Eneno, and Cerro de la Sal. This two-prong attack sent the Spanish literally running for the hills as their army retreated to the highland city of Tarma in August of 1743.\(^{71}\)

By this point, Viceroy José Antonio de Mendoza, the Marqués de Villagarcía was not sanguine about the chances to retake the mission stations. He had estimated that he had spent 16,000 pesos fighting the Juan Santos rebels. After Troncoso’s failure in 1743,

---

\(^{67}\) Informe al Rey de España, Antonio de Mendoza, the marqués de Villagarcía, 9 November 1742, found in Loayza, ed. *Juan Santos, el invencible*, 15.


\(^{69}\) Diario de la entrada contra el rebelde Juan Santos, Benito Troncoso, Oct. 1743, found in Loayza, ed. *Juan Santos, el invencible*, 20 – 48.


\(^{71}\) Loayza, ed. *Juan Santos, el invencible*, 15 – 19.
Mendoza told the king that despite the crown’s promise to support the Ocopa missionaries, retaking the mission station was not advisable. The viceroy stated that although the Ocopa missionaries should be praised for their work to convert the “infidel,” “the restoration [of the missions] would be very difficult.” The crown, however, would not accept defeat. In 1744, the King replaced the aging Mendoza with the younger President of the Audiencia of Chile, José Antonio Manso de Velásco. The Marqués de la Ensenada told Manso de Velásco that his first task was to “assure the pacification” of the rebellious provinces in the east. Ensenada suggested that Manso de Velásco could even bring in troops from the Chile to help the defeat the Juan Santos rebels. Manso de Velásco acted quickly, ordering troops from Callao to Jauja and Tarma to serve in a royal force opposing Juan Santos and place them under the command of General José de Llamas.

The crown, however, was interested not only in defeating the Juan Santos rebellion, but also in assigning blame for its outbreak in the first place. In 1745, Troncoso ordered a hearing regarding the possible misconduct of several Ocopa friars toward the natives. The hearing was clearly an attempt to place blame on the friars for inciting rebellion among the Amerindians. The case centered on the actions of a then-deceased Franciscan friar, Domingo García. García had a local chief, Mateo de Assia, whipped for interfering in the punishment of his brother Bartolomé, who had been accused of adultery. Mateo de Assia and his village later aided Juan Santos, killing García in the process. It seems some believed that García’s excessive and unnecessary whipping of

---

72 “restauración se considera muy difícil,” Informe al Rey de España, Antonio de Mendoza, the Marqués de Villagarcía, 28 August 1744, found in Loayza, ed. _Juan Santos, el invencible_, 70.
73 Oficio de Zenón de Somodevilla y Bengoechea, Marqués de la Ensenada, 21 December 1744, found in _Ibid._, 74 - 76.
74 _Ibid._
both Assia brothers had convinced them to support Juan Santos.\textsuperscript{75} This belief was not shared by Mendoza, who was viceroy during the incident. He concluded, probably correctly, that the collusion between the Assia brothers and Juan Santos had been forged years before.\textsuperscript{76} The trial went forward anyway, but Governor Troncoso, who owed his position as governor partly to the support of the Ocopa Friars,\textsuperscript{77} ruled that García had not acted imprudently. From the testimony of six witnesses, Troncoso concluded that Bartolomé de Assia had indeed committed adultery, and that in trying to interfere with his brother’s punishment, Mateo de Assia had broken the law. As was common in Spanish colonial missions, García had every legal right to whip both brothers in an attempt to teach Catholic sexual morality to the “infidels” under Mateo’s leadership. Governor Troncoso was further persuaded in his ruling by the discovery of Fray Domingo’s decapitated head, which, despite being buried almost a month in moist jungle soil, was apparently “fresh, without corruption or bad odor.”\textsuperscript{78} Since resistance to corruption after death was a well known sign of sainthood, this confirmed to Troncoso that his opinion was correct: Fray Domingo’s actions had been just.

By the beginning of 1746, Viceroy Manso de Velásco had decided to take more direct control over the suppression of the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebellion from Lima. He amassed a second force, significantly larger than the first, in Tarma under General José de Llamas. This time, Manso de Velásco tried to change tactics. Despite the objections of Llamas, he ordered the departure of the expedition to be delayed until the rainy season, believing that he could surprise Juan Santos’ band. But this gamble did not pay off.

\textsuperscript{75} Causa contra Fray Domingo García, 8 October 1745, found in Ibid., 85 – 88.
\textsuperscript{76} Memoria de Antonio de Mendoza, the Marqués de Villagarcía, 24 June 1745, found in Ibid., 86.
\textsuperscript{78} Causa contra Fray Domingo García, 8 oct. 1745, found in Ibid., 106 – 109.
Driving rain and mud chafed the wool-clad Spanish troops, and, undernourished and underpaid, they returned to Tarma before they had even reached Juan Santos’s last known location. But before another expedition could be mounted, the viceroyalty was struck by a disaster that would complicate Manso de Velásco’s plan to recover the lost Ocopa missions.

---

CHAPTER 5

EARTHQUAKE, CLERGY, CONSPIRACY, AND REBELLION, 1746 - 1751

On 28 October 1746 at 10:30 in the evening, a massive 8.4 magnitude earthquake rocked the viceregal capital of Lima. The earthquake instantly killed about 1,500 in the city of Lima itself. However, the worst disaster was yet to come. At 11:00, the sea around Lima’s port, Callao, began to retreat. Suddenly, an approximately fifty foot wall of water bulldozed the bustling port town, killing all but a few hundred of its approximately 6,000 inhabitants. Many ships belonging to the large merchant fleet in the harbor survived the initial wave, but were subsequently destroyed by the backrush of debris-filled water from the leveled port city. Most of the viceregal government buildings had collapsed. Both towers of the Cathedral had fallen, and parts of the viceregal palace were uninhabitable. With Lima and Callao in ruins, disorder reigned in the capital. For the time being, the Viceroy no longer concerned himself with the distant rebellion, but worried about merely holding his capital together. Fear of another earthquake and tsunami were rampant as limeños began to rebuild their city.

81 Pablo Emilio Pérez-Mallain Bueno, Retrato de una ciudad en crisis: la sociedad limeña ante el movimiento sísmico de 1746 (Sevilla: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos, 2001), 54.
82 Walker, Shaky Colonialism, 1 – 9.
83 For a good example of this see Ibid., 157 - 158. Even years after the earthquake, somebody yelling that a tsunami was coming could send most inhabitants of Lima running for the higher grant.
Naturally, the task of supervising the rebuilding efforts fell to Manso de Velásco. For the reform-minded ministers in Spain, the new viceroy was the perfect man for the job. Born in the northern Spanish city of Torrecilla in La Rioja in 1689, José Antonio Manso de Velásco rose through the ranks of the Spanish government through a combination of military and political skill and patronage. In 1705, he joined the Spanish royal guards and saw combat in the War of Spanish Succession. In 1736, he was named Captain General of the Philippines, but the assignment was later changed to Chile, where he served from 1737 to 1745. In Chile, Manso de Velásco gained invaluable experience when he oversaw the reconstruction of Valdivia after an earthquake destroyed the city in November 1737. But Manso de Velásco’s 1744 appointment to be viceroy of Peru was not based solely on his experience. Closely aligned with his fellow *riojano*, the Marqués de la Ensenada, the viceroy was a committed regalist, who believed in centralizing power in the Bourbon state.\(^{84}\)

In taking on the task of rebuilding Lima, Manso de Velásco surrounded himself with likeminded *limeños*. These were prominent citizens of the city, including many members of the Audiencia, who shared his regalist vision for the Spanish empire. The viceroy’s critics, particularly members of the clergy, saw this group as a “*pandilla*” or street gang devoted more to making themselves rich than to restoring the well being of Lima. A particularly vocal critic was the Archbishop of Lima, Pedro Antonio Barroeta. He claimed that Manso de Velásco’s men were immoral, prone to gambling, promiscuous, and one was even a homosexual. He even went so far as to accuse one the viceroy’s closest associates, Judge Juan Marín de Poveda, of having leprosy.\(^{85}\) Some

\(^{84}\) *Ibid.*, 75 – 78.
\(^{85}\) *Ibid.*, 76.
sources indicate that the archbishop even considered attempting to excommunicate the viceroy. In stark contrast, royal officials in Madrid praised Manso de Velásco, as an efficient administrator. The court ministers were particularly impressed with his continual remittances of silver back to Spain, even immediately following the disaster. In 1748, his efforts earned him the title of Conde de Superunda, or “Count over the waves.”

Like many of his supporters in Spain, the Conde de Superunda saw an opportunity in the ruins of the viceregal capital. Along with his allies, both in Lima and Madrid, Manso de Velásco wanted to rebuild Lima, both physically and spiritually, on an enlightened regalist model. Of particular importance to this project was divesting the regular clergy of their influence, within the city and in the viceroyalty as whole. Starting in December 1746, just two months after the earthquake, Manso de Velásco wrote a series of letters to the Crown regarding state of regular clergy in Lima. While numbers of clergy in the city were comparable to most Spanish cities during this time, the earthquake’s destruction of the convents had exposed just how many regular clergy there really were. The viceroy criticized what he saw as severe overcrowding of the major convents, which he believed was causing laxity in the regular orders’ religious piety. The viceroy even posited that “Divine Providence” had sent the earthquake to facilitate the reformation of Lima convents. Manso de Velásco also targeted the regular clergy’s control of the rural Indian Parishes. These parishes became a significant source of income for the regular orders in the viceroyalty. Manso de Velásco contented that rather

88 Andrien, “The Coming of Enlightened Reform in Bourbon Peru,” 7
90 Andrien, “The Coming of Enlightened Reform in Bourbon Peru,” 3
than reinvesting tithes back into the parishes, the regulars stripped these parishes of all their funds to pay for their large urban convents.91

In response to Manso de Velásco reports and those of other colonial observers, the Crown moved against what they viewed as the excesses of the regular orders. Between 29 November 1748 and March 1749, Francisco Rávago and José de Carvajal convened a Junta Particular de Ministros (special council of ministers) with the archbishops elect of Lima, Bogotá, and Mexico City; four members of the council of Castile; and three members of the council of the Indies on Carvajal’s country estate to discuss reforming the regular clergy. Based on the reports of several government observers, including Manso de Velásco, the junta agreed that the Crown should only allow licensed convents and monasteries to rebuild, and that every order in the city should be limited to one religious house for each gender. Disagreements within the government on the exact details of the recommendations delayed action. In the end, the crown produced a vaguely worded royal decree in 1751, almost five years after Manso de Velásco’s initial complaint. When the decrees reached Lima, it was too little and too late. The vagueness of the official guidelines allowed the orders to contest or ignore them, and in the end, most convents were rebuilt.92 In part the recommendations for rebuilding the convents were so mismanaged because the junta had spend most of their time discussing the removal of the regular orders from their rural Indian parishes. These parishes had been a concern well before the earthquake, and the junta was eager for decisive action. Upon the junta’s recommendation, on 4 October 1749 the crown ordered the gradual removal of the regulars from the rural Parishes in the Archbishopric of Lima. The guidelines in the
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decree stipulated that when a regular cleric vacated an Indian Parish, a secular priest would fill the position. While at first this rule pertained only to the Archdioceses of Lima, Mexico City, and Bogotá, a later decree in 1753 extended it to include all of Spanish America.93

In addition to the junta’s actions in Spain, Manso de Velásco personally enacted several policies in the aftermath of the earthquake that further weakened the regular orders in Lima. Principal among them was a reform of the city’s censos. Censos were liens and loans that monasteries and convents made to private citizens, other religious institutions, and even the state. The interest charged on the censos was below market rate. And to avoid the appearance of engaging in usury, which was considered a sin by the Catholic Church, these loans were usually couched in terms of “contracts of purchase and sale in which the [religious houses] purchased the right to collect an annuity.”94 By the eighteenth century, however, this distinction began to fade as the use of terms such as principal (principal) and interest (rédito) came into normal parlance. In order to facilitate the rebuilding of the city, in January 1747 the viceroy froze all censo payments for two years, cut the principal of all censos in half, and reduced the rates of interest from the standard 5% to 2% or 1% depending on the type of censo.95 Manso de Velásco argued that by doing so he would allow Lima residents to rebuild their homes more quickly, since many limeños still owed money to the church for their old residences that lay in

95 Walker, Shaky Colonialism, 123 – 125.
ruins. Though this was helpful for most limeños, it impaired the religious houses’ ability to rebuild.

In 1750, the crisis in the city of Lima deepened when on June 21, a priest came to the Viceroy with the news that during confession he had learned of conspiracy to overthrow the government led by the city’s Indian population. According to the priest, on September 20, St. Michael’s day, a group of the city’s Indians would use the day’s celebration as a cover to burn the thatched roofs of the temporary houses in the outskirts of the city. While the citizenry was distracted by the fires, other conspirators would simultaneously storm the viceregal palace and the newly constructed fortress at Callao. As soon as the city was taken, all important Spanish officials would be executed, save a few members of each religious regular order to maintain Catholicism. Some rebels wanted to summon Juan Santos and crown him king, while others preferred a council of Indian nobles to run the new government. In the wake of the earthquake, viceregal officials ubiquitously blamed the resulting increase in crime on the non-white lower classes. So when whispers of an Indian uprising reached the viceroy, it only confirmed his greatest fears. Manso de Velásco moved quickly and arrested several people. Ultimately, six were executed in the main square of Lima, while others received lesser punishments.
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These executions, however, could not stop the conspiracy from spreading outside the city. While Manso de Velásco was arresting suspects in Lima, one of the conspirators, Francisco Jiménez Inca, was attending his daughter’s wedding in the adjacent highland province of Huarochirí. During the wedding festivities, Jiménez Inca recruited several more people to the conspiracy. So when word of his impending arrest arrived in Huarochirí, he was able to secure the protection of two local curacas (local Andean chiefs), Juan Pedro de Puipuilibia and Don Andres de Borja Puipuilibia. Spanish official were initially unconcerned, believing that when royal troops arrived to arrest Jiménez Inca, the Indians would simply hand him over. The Spaniards’ feeling of security was confirmed when Don Andres agreed to deliver Jiménez Inca. Unfortunately for the Spanish, it was a trap. On July 19\textsuperscript{th} as they waited in the village of Huarochirí for Don Andres to arrive with Jiménez Inca, Indians attacked the Spanish by surprise, killing several in the initial assault. Some, including the Spanish commander, José Antonio Salazar y Ugarte, barricaded themselves in the town hall but were killed when they tried to escape the next morning. The rebel’s successes, however, did not last. Within a few weeks, Spaniards from the mining region of the province marched a militia of conscripted Indian workers against the rebels, and the uprising was eventually crushed.\footnote{Karen Spalding, Huarochirí, an Andean Society Under Inca and Spanish Rule (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1984) 274 – 278.}

Viceroy Manso de Velásco blamed the Lima Conspiracy and the Huarochirí rebellion that resulted from it on several factors. In his report to the king dated 24 September 1750, the viceroy noted how the conspirators denounced the abuses of bad corregidores (local governors), judges, and priests.\footnote{Informe del conde de Superunda al Rey, 24 September 1750, found in Loayza, ed. Juan Santos, el invencible, 163.} Complaints against these groups
were common throughout colonial Spanish America. Principally Manso de Velásco claimed that the Lima conspirators hoped to address the issue of the exclusion of Indians from the priesthood. The viceroy attributed the “patronage [of] this sentiment [to] two friars of the order of San Francisco” who he described as possessing “indiscrete piety and poorly allocated zeal.” While he did not mention them by name in the document, the viceroy was referring to fray Calixto de San José Túpac Inka and fray Isidoro de Cala y Ortega. Born in 1710 in Tarma to a Spanish father and an Indian mother, Fray Calixto entered the Franciscan order as a donado in 1727. Over the next few decades, Calixto served in several Franciscan outposts in Lima, Spain, Guatemala, and Charcas. Fray Calixto was eventually posted to the Ocopa missions. Some historians have speculated that he had contact with the Juan Santos rebels in 1744.

In 1747, Fray Calixto began collaborating with several curacas and Indian governors to seek redress for the inherent inequalities of the colonial system. Following these meetings, in 1748, Calixto produced a manuscript using rhetoric based on the biblical Lamentations of Jeremiah, commonly known as Representación Verdadera. The Representación, which was by no means a declaration of independence, was nonetheless a pointed condemnation of Spanish governance in the New World. The Representación discussed the great discrepancy between Spanish law and actual practice within the colonies. The document was particularly critical of the exclusion of Indians

101 The issue of corrupt corregidores especially would haunt the Spanish colonial authorities as one of the major catalysts in the Túpac Amaru Rebellion in Cuzco from 1780 to 1782.
102 “Patrocinado este sentimiento dos religioso de la Orden de San Francisco ... indiscreta piedad y mal reglado celo,” ibid., 163.
103 Walker, Shaky Colonialism, 164.
104 The full name is Representación Verdadera y exclamación rendida y lamentable que toda la nación Indiana hace a la Majestad de Rey de las Españas y Emperador de la Indias El Señor Don Fernando VI pidiendo los atienda y remedie, sacandolos del afrentoso viperio y oprobio en que están más de doscientos años.
from high governmental offices and full membership in religious orders. In 1750, Fray Calixto and his traveling companion, Fray Isidoro, attempted to travel to Spain to present the document to Ferdinand VI. The two friars also carried a document intended for the Pope, entitled *Planctus Indorum* (Indian Lamentation). When the friars were not granted permission to travel, they made their way surreptitiously to Spain by way of Portuguese Brazil. When they were initially denied a royal audience, the friars passed the *Representación* through the window of the king’s carriage. At first the document was well received, but when Manso de Velásco’s missive regarding the friars’ suspected involvement in the Lima Conspiracy arrived from Peru, the *Representación* was labeled as “subversive” and its dissemination in Peru was banned.\(^{105}\) These events made it easy for Manso de Velásco to blame these friars for inciting rebellion.

Manso de Velásco’s emphasis on Calixto’s and Isidoro’s roles in inciting the Lima Conspiracy and Huarochirí Rebellion is significant. Manso de Vélasco had recognized in his 1750 missive to the king that a multiplicity of factors had led to these uprisings, including the depredations in Lima after the earthquake. But by stressing the involvement of Calixto and Isdoro in the uprising, Manso de Velásco was most likely trying to justify his clerical reforms after the Lima Earthquake/Tsunami. Calixto and Isidoro represented all that was wrong with the regular clergy. They had acted above the law by traveling to Spain without permission and they were advocating Indian rights – actions contrary to the regalist concept of social hierarchy. Accusing them helped Manso de Velásco make his case for reform with the royal ministers in Spain.

Although the Huarochirí rebellion and Lima conspiracy had failed, people in Lima were still concerned over the threat of another, more massive Indian insurrection. In his correspondence to the crown, Manso de Velásco claimed to be particularly concerned about Huarochirí. The region was considered “Lima’s Breadbasket.” Manso de Velásco also called it the vital “throat” of Peru; it was a crossroads for many of the routes from the coast to the sierra, specifically the roads leading from the capital itself to the rebellious region controlled by Juan Santos Atahualpa. Indeed, Manso de Velásco was concerned that Juan Santos might move from his base of operations in the jungle and march on Lima with support from the Indians in Huarochirí. Amerindians from Huarochirí had already shown a disregard for the crown’s suppression of the rebellion when a contingent of mule drivers from that region, who had been contracted to carry goods for the expedition of 1743, deserted the Spanish column.

Considering these dangers, Viceroy Manso de Velásco argued for a change in tactics against Juan Santos in his 24 September 1750 letter to the King. The viceroy believed that by solidifying his forces in the mountains, he could stop a general insurrection emanating from the eastern slopes of the Andes. Manso de Velásco claimed
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that since Peru had no ability to produce arms, and since all his soldiers were in Jauja and Tarma, preparing for the next doomed expedition, he had no resources to suppress potential rebellions closer to his capital. Rebels in Huarochirí and Lima, he argued, might even join with Juan Santos’ band, further complicating the problem. To emphasize the link between all three uprisings, the viceroy also included a map of the areas affected by rebellion (Map 2). The map was intended to show a geographic link between Lima, Huarochirí, and the Jauja/Tarma Frontier. In the map, small bumps frequently trespassed by large valleys depicted the Andes mountain range. Roads flowed easily from each rebellious region into the viceregal capital. Even the name of the map, “Lima and its outskirts” conveyed this false sense of proximity. For crown officials unfamiliar with Peru’s geography, the map and the letter combined must have given the impression that the viceroy was justified in removing troops from the frontier to take a more defensive posture near the capital. In truth, while the map accurately showed the distances between the regions, it ignored the physical realities of Peruvian geography. Though Huarochirí is only approximately 50 miles away from Lima and the Montaña Central is 150 miles away, travel to Lima from these regions could take several weeks. The small bumps on the map which evoke an image of rolling hills are actually part of the second largest mountain range in the world. Most roads, especially from Huarochirí to the jungle areas, were small trails that hugged the sheer cliffs over deep gorges. In sending this “stylized” map, Manso de Velásco was likely trying to create a sense of urgency of the potential treat to the capital that Huarochirí and Juan Santos posed in order to counter objections from the still powerful Franciscans who were calling on him to defeat Juan Santos.

Map 2: Mapa de Lima y contornos, 1750. Source: Mapas y Planos, Peru-Chile 33, AGI.
By the time map and letter had arrived, however, support for the friars in Spain was already beginning to wane. Manso de Velásco’s reports on the activity of the regular clergy had taken their toll on whatever support the Franciscans had enjoyed. Spanish ministers’ increasing wariness of the regular clergy, specifically of the Ocopa friars, is evident in a report written by two young Spanish naval officers, Jorge Juan y Santacilia and Antonio de Ulloa, entitled the *Noticias Secretas de América*.109 In 1735, Juan and Ulloa accompanied an officially sanctioned French scientific expedition to measure one degree on the equator. They stayed in the Andean region for eleven years, taking notes on both its natural wonders and its political intrigues. Upon their return to Spain in 1749, the Marqués de la Ensenada commissioned a report of their observations on the general state of the colonies. Only intended for a small group of crown officials, their report was damning, citing gross abuses by both government officials and the regular orders.110 Except for the Jesuits, Juan and Ulloa painted the regular clergy as undisciplined, greedy rabble who “rival[ed] the corregidores in extracting wealth from the blood and sweat of the people.”111 Juan and Ulloa accused the friars in the frontier missions of colluding with local Spaniards to exploit the Amerindians’ labor, which in turn incited the natives to revolt. As a prime example of missionary abuses causing revolts, the young reformers cited the Ocopa friars and the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebellion.112

109 The original title of the report written for the Spanish court was *Discurso y reflexiones políticas sobre el estado presente de los reinos del Perú; su gobierno, régimen particular de aquellos habitadores y abusos que se han introducido en uno y otro; Dase individual noticia de las causales de su origen y se proponen algunos medios para evitarlas*. In 1826, however, an Englishmen named David Barry published the report as *Noticias Secretas de América* by which it is more commonly known. See Kenneth J. Andrien, “The Noticias Secretas de América and the Construction of a Governing Ideology for the Spanish American Empire,” *Colonial Latin American Review*, 7:2 (1998): 175.
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111 Jorge Juan and Antonio de Ulloa, *Discourse and Political Reflections*, 102.
112 Andrien, “The Coming of Enlightened Reform in Bourbon Peru,” 5.
Juan and Ulloa argued that the Ocopa missionaries’ abusive behavior forced the jungle Amerindians to join Juan Santos. They believed that the Ocopa friars had “wasted” forty years attempting to evangelize a small group of 2,000 Indians. Those whom they had managed to convert, they abused so viciously that when Juan Santos appeared, they had no better option than to join him. As Juan and Ulloa said of the Ocopa missions’ Amerindian population, “could any Indian from any village – since they are treated so cruelly and contemptuously – have failed to take sides against tyrannical abuse? Certainly not.”\(^{113}\) While these words seem to justify the Amerindians’ actions, they were written out of political expediency rather than sympathy for the rebels. Juan and Ulloa were regalists, and much of their writings were a reflection of the Spanish enlightenment rather than a true account of what was going on in the Ocopa missions. The two young naval officers never even traveled to the Ocopa missions, or to most of the other places of which they claimed to have intimate knowledge.\(^{114}\) Instead of eyewitness observations, their report reflected the general sentiment of Spanish officials during the Juan Santos Atahualpa crisis. While it is unclear what impact the Noticias Secretas had on Spanish policy in the Ocopa missions, it demonstrates that at least some Spanish officials blamed the unrest in the eastern Peruvian jungle on the incompetence of the friars.

While Spanish officials in Madrid discussed these accusations, in 1750 Manso de Velásco sent a final expedition to subdue the Juan Santos rebellion. Just as in the 1746 expedition, Spanish forces under José de Llamas failed to even locate Juan Santos; his troop floundered in the high jungle, dying of heat stroke and infectious disease.\(^{115}\) This was the last time Spanish forces attempted to subdue the rebellion. During 1751, Manso
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\(^{113}\) Juan and Ulloa, *Discourse and Political Reflections*, 166 – 167.
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de Velásco ordered the jungle region closed to everyone, including the Ocopa friars.\footnote{While the exact date is unclear, Amich, who wrote a few decades afterward, claimed that in 1752 the friars tried to enter the region but were denied permission. \textit{Ibid.}, 183, 187.} The viceroy argued that “these expensive and ineffective expeditions [had been an] intolerable burden on these provinces,”\footnote{“Estas expediciones de excesivo costo y poco efecto son gravamen intolerable a las provincias.” Manso de Velasco, “Relación que hizo de su gobierno el Excmo. Sr. D. José Antonio,” 254.} and that given his limited resources, he could not marshal a military force large enough to counter Juan Santos’ hit-and-run tactics. Manso de Velásco opted instead for a policy of containment. He believed that Juan Santos had gained influence over the jungle Amerindians by promising them steel tools. Therefore, he argued, if the Spanish isolated the region, Juan Santos would no longer have access to these goods and Amerindians would return to “the proper subordination.”\footnote{\textit{Ibid}, 254 – 256.}

From a regalist standpoint, Manso de Velásco’s decision had another important advantage: it would reduce the influence of the Franciscans in the viceroyalty. Without even the prospect of regaining the missions, the Ocopa friars’ pretext for state support would be severely compromised. After the rebellion, the Ocopa friars only had two small missions outside the college of Ocopa itself, Pozozo and Tilingo located north of Tarma in the high jungle east of Huánuco. Why would the crown pay to send new missionaries from Spain or fund missionary activity in Peru if the Ocopa friars had nowhere to evangelize? In 1751, Manso de Velásco took his initiative one step further by cutting the Ocopa mission’s annual stipend in half, from 6,000 pesos per year to 3,000 pesos. Originally, the crown had awarded the money for the upkeep of their three major missionary areas: Tarma, Jauja, and Huánuco. Now that the friars had only their two
missions in Huánuco, the viceroy believed that such a large amount of money per year was no longer necessary.119

The Ocopa friars, of course, did not agree with this assessment and attempted to lobby the crown to continue to fund the missions and help them expel Juan Santos’ rebels. In 1746, José de San Antonio, the new commissioner of the Ocopa missions, had traveled to Spain to recruit more friars for the Apostolic Institute. When San Antonio received word of the reduction in funds in 1751, he presented his case to King Ferdinand VI. San Antonio appealed to Ferdinand’s personal religiosity with a presentation of the deprivations that the friars had suffered for the sake of converting the “infidels” in the eastern Peruvian jungle.120 This letter included a reproduction of a painting from 1737 that depicted the martyred missionaries of the eastern Peruvian jungle up until that date (Figure 1). The message was simple: the Catholic Monarch could not abandon this pious cause. San Antonio knew that only with the help of the crown could the Franciscans retake their former missions.

To counter Manso de Velásco’s plan to abandon the missions, San Antonio also presented his own plan for defeating Juan Santos. First, he asked for seventy additional missionaries, a renewal of their 6,000 pesos annual stipend, and back payment of the money that he claimed had been withheld during the rebellion.121 He suggested placing a fortress at the Cerro de la Sal so that when the jungle Amerindians went there for salt, they would have to listen to friars and be converted. If that did not work, then Spanish
Figure 1: Mapa de los Mártires de Santa Rosa de Ocopa, 1746. Source: Mapas y Planos, Perú y Chile 32, AGI.
soldiers should accompany the friars to reconvert the masses who had gone astray.

San Antonio suggested the building of additional fortresses in all the missions. This plan was strikingly similar to the configuration the friars had utilized before Juan Santos, except it involved more friars, more troops, and more fortresses. Like Manso de Velásco, San Antonio warned that if Juan Santos was not crushed, the rebels would march on Lima.122

On 3 August 1752, it seemed that these fears may have been realized when Juan Santos handily captured the highland city of Andamarca. Even more disconcerting to some Spanish observers123 was that even though Juan Santos’ army consisted mostly of jungle Amerindians, highland Andeans in Andamarca gave the rebels a warm reception.124 The capture of Andamarca marked both Juan Santos’ crowning triumph and his greatest failure. By raiding Andamarca, Juan Santos had extended his jungle movement into the highlands. But he was unable to hold a highland city so far from his base of power, and within a few days, his rebel army turned back to the jungle. The raid, however, concerned many local Spanish observers, who believed that Juan Santos’ multi-ethnic popularity could lead to a general insurrection.125 In response to their fear, many of the local Spanish authorities took action. On 17 August 1752, for example, the Marqués de Casatorres, corregidor of Jauja, risking serious legal repercussions, had three minor Juan Santos supporters executed without a trial.

122 Ibid., 156-158.
123 Testomonio de Marqués de Casatorres, 7 August 1752, found in found in Loayza, ed. Juan Santos, el invencible, 208.
125 Testomonio de Marqués de Casatorres, 7 August 1752, found in found in Loayza, ed. Juan Santos, el invencible, 208.
Despite the Andamarca raid and fears of a general insurrection, Manso de Velásco’s containment policy remained in place. In fact, the Audiencia of Lima fined Casatorres 6,000 pesos for overstepping his authority and executing the suspected rebels without a trial or the Audiencia’s permission.126 While the raid may have shown that Juan Santos was still a danger to colonial authority, the viceroy argued that lack of resources prevented any other course of action. But was this actually true? Certainly the earthquake had affected Lima’s ability to respond, but by 1752, was the viceroy still so short of resources that he could not fight Juan Santos?

126 “Causa seguida contra Julián Auqui, Blas Ibarra y Casimiro Lamberto…por traídos a la Corona…”, 1752, Sección Real Audiencia, Causas Criminales, Leg 15, C. 159, AGN, f. 26r – 29v.
Manso de Velásco’s first task after the earthquake was to rebuild Lima. This was difficult, since taxable commerce, such as the sale of luxury goods and sales in general, had diminished with the destruction of the city. Nevertheless, according to Spanish royal treasury records, during the nine years after the earthquake Manso de Velásco was able to raise enough revenue to rebuild the government structures in the city and continue sending remittances to Spain. As Graph 1 details, between 1746 and 1755 Manso de Velásco matched income (dark blue line) to expenditures (pink line) almost exactly, with the exception of 1750. A closer look at the finances reveals these figures to be deceiving. While total expenditures were increasing (to rebuild the city), so was income from the ramo (account) extraordinario de Real Hacienda (red line), a ramo that normally contained miscellaneous entries. In fact, the increases and decreases in these two accounts match up closely. Both total expenditures and extraordinario saw increases in 1746, 1747, 1748, 1751, and 1752, and decreases in 1749, 1750, 1753, and 1754. The two accounts increased and decreased in similar intervals, as the two year moving averages for total expenditures (black line) and extraordinario (green line) indicate. The Viceroy was drawing upon tax revenues from neighboring treasury districts and placing them in Lima’s multipurpose ramo, extraordinario de real hacienda, in order to pay for the
reconstruction of Lima.\textsuperscript{127} In a letter to Ensenada dated November 1746, shortly after the earthquake, Manso de Velásco admitted using profits from the taxes on mercury production in Huancavelica to rebuild Lima’s most vital government buildings, such as the viceregal palace, the chambers of the Audiencia, and the fortress at Callao. In later missives, Manso de Velásco indicated that in 1747, he had gathered 176,911 pesos from neighboring areas, using this and other sources of income.\textsuperscript{128} In truth, the viceroy probably used these sources of income more than he was willing to admit publicly. From before the earthquake in 1745 to its highest point in 1748, \textit{extraordinario} saw a 105\% increase. In 1748, the \textit{extraordinario} ramo held 1,131,508 pesos, comprising 53\% of the city of Lima’s total income. While Manso de Velásco sought sources of income from within the city, the destruction in Lima forced him to look outside the affected area to satiate the crown’s desire for remittances to Spain.

By 1751, however, when Manso de Velásco decided to end campaigns against Juan Santos and reduce the friars’ funding, the city’s financial situation regarding income had greatly improved. Manso de Velásco was depending less on outside sources of income as his city began to recover. As the table on Graph 1 indicates, in 1751 \textit{extraordinario} accounted for only 37\% of the city’s total income—down from 53\% in 1748—and in 1752 it comprised only 32\%, which was less than pre-earthquake levels (in 1745 \textit{extraordinario} made up 36\% of the budget).

At the same time that the city’s tax income was rising, the Viceroy had completed most of the government’s major rebuilding projects. By 1750, as Graph 2 demonstrates,

\textsuperscript{127} Cuentas de caja de Lima, 1748-53, Contaduría 1771, AGI.
\textsuperscript{128} Pérez-Mallaina Bueno, \textit{Retrato de una ciudad en crisis}, 118 – 119.
most of the work for rebuilding the viceregal palace, the royal mint, and the fortress at Callao had been completed. The final large reconstruction project for the crown, the rebuilding of the Lima Cathedral, did not start in earnest until after 1754. The crown had been reticent to assume responsibility for this task, believing that it should fall to the vecinos (prominent citizens) and the Church. In fact, except for the reconstruction of government buildings, the crown felt little obligation to rebuild any part of the city. Likewise, the care of the thousands of Limeños injured in the Earthquake was left completely to the Church. Traditionally, the Catholic Church had been colonial Latin America’s principal healthcare provider, but in the wake of the tremendously destructive earthquake/tsunami, the ecclesiastical hospitals struggled to cope. During the reconstruction of Lima, the viceroy only allocated 27,998 pesos for maintenance of hospitals in the city, as compared to the approximately 1.3 million pesos he spent on the reconstruction of government buildings. Even the burying of the dead was left to a secular religious brotherhood, the Hermandad de la Caridad. As historian Pablo Pérez-Mallainá Bueno so aptly stated, in the minds of Bourbon officials, “Charity [was] not a matter of State.” Crown officials felt it was their duty only to rebuild the apparatus of government and to maintain law and order within the city. Therefore, by 1751 when the Viceroy cut funding to the Ocopa missions, the government had already completed most of its major rebuilding projects.

At the same time, Lima also saw a reduction in military expenditures. The city’s largest expense after the earthquake was the military. In 1748, military expenditures made up 26% of total expenditures. This spike in military spending in 1748, as indicated

130 Ibid., 124 – 126.
on Graph 3, is most likely due to the cost of rebuilding the fortress at Callao, which was completely destroyed in the tsunami, leaving the viceregal capital exposed to attack from the sea. But as the rebuilding of Callao reached its completion, military expenditures too began to taper off. In 1752, military expenditures were 19% percent less than what they had been in 1745. Also, as the trend line (black) in Figure 7 indicates, despite massive upward fluctuations in military spending due to the rebuilding efforts, over his first ten years as viceroy, Manso de Velásco was spending less and less on military expenses. If Manso de Velásco believed he could not continue to fight Juan Santos in the east, it was not because he was spending his military budget elsewhere or was short of funds in

general. If revenue was increasing and expenditures decreasing, where were the excess funds going?

During Manso de Velásco’s administration (1745 to 1761), he sent approximately 3.5 million pesos back to Spain in the form of remittances. In the fifteen years before his tenure in Lima, previous viceroys had sent a little less than 1.5 million pesos combined. Of the 3.5 million pesos Manso de Velásco remitted to the metropolis, 2.5 million were sent between 1748 and 1752—the years during which he decided to limit funding to Ocopa. Had the viceroy continued to fund fully the Ocopa missionaries during his last ten years as viceroy, remittances to Spain would have been reduced by less than 1%.

Ensenada, however, believed that even the rebuilding the city of Lima was less important than increasing remittances to Spain. In letter dated 24 April 1748, Ensenada chastened Manso de Velásco for spending too much on the rebuilding of the viceregal capital. He instructed the viceroy to use only the 176,911 pesos that he had admitted taking from outside sources in 1747 on the reconstruction of government buildings. Manso de Velásco was reluctant to admit using outside money to fund rebuilding projects, and he omitted it from the official account of his tenure of office. Mounting pressure from Spain to streamline the colonial system made it difficult for Manso de Velásco to justify giving funds to support the rebel-torn Ocopa missions in the east.

While Manso de Velásco worked to streamline royal treasury expenditures so that he could remit more money to Spain, he was also filling his own pockets. Like many others before him, Manso de Velásco hoped to profit financially from his government post in the Americas. On his initial voyage to South America to become governor of
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Chile in 1737, his personal baggage contained boxes of clothing, jewels, and other valuables listed for “personal use,” including 150 pounds of tobacco. Manso de Velásco hoped to sell these luxury goods for an inflated price in Chile. To pay for these goods, the new governor borrowed nearly 15,000 pesos, clearly confident of a profit. By the time Manso de Velásco left his office as Governor of Chile in 1745, he had done little more than pay off his initial debts.\footnote{Pilar Latasa Vassallo, “Negociar en red: familia, amistad y paisanaje; el virrey Superunda y sus agentes en Lima y Cádiz, 1745 – 1761,” \textit{Anuario de Estudios Americanos}, vol. 60, iss. 2 (2003), 470 – 473.} But as viceroy of Peru, he had access to wealth much greater than anything found in Chile. As Viceroy, Manso de Velásco’s salary was 30,000 silver escudos (approximately 31,000 silver pesos) per year. Exactly how much of the money went to maintain his household remains unstudied. But upon arriving in Lima, Manso de Velásco worked quickly to set up a web of subordinates in key government positions in Lima, such as corregidores and treasury officials, to help advance his other business ventures.\footnote{While it is unclear whether these practices were actually illegal, his remittance back to Spain through his merchant connections were illegal. \textit{Ibid.}, 490 – 492.} Manso de Velásco also maintained close ties with trade guild members both in Lima and Cádiz.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 477 – 486.} Through this network of associates, in 1750, the year before the viceroy reduced the Ocopa missionaries’ annual allotment from 6,000 to 3,000 pesos per year, Manso de Velásco sent 80,000 pesos of his own personal earnings back to Spain. He would ultimately send back a total of 490,500 pesos.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 487.}
Despite Manso de Velásco’s order to stop the campaigns against the Juan Santos Atahualpa rebellion, the Apostolic Institute in Peru continued to grow. While in Madrid from 1746 – 1751, José de San Antonio, the commissioner of the Ocopa missions, pressed the king for more support. Though he was not successful in overturning Manso de Velásco’s decision to close the frontier, he still obtained several important concessions for the Ocopa friars. In 1751, San Antonio used his considerable political influence to persuade the king to issue a warrant making Santa Rosa de Ocopa a college de Propaganda Fide. This new status gave Ocopa and its mission stations freedom from supervision by Franciscan provincial leaders. Though the Franciscan Commissioner General of Peru challenged the warrant, a royal degree in 1757 and a papal bull in 1758 silenced his opposition.

In Spain, the Marqués de Ensenada, Carvajal and Rávago continued their efforts to reform the clergy. In 1753, they secured Universal Royal Patronage from the Pope, allowing the King to select not only bishops but all secular clerics within the Spanish empire. This success was one of their last; in April 1754, Carvajal died. Ensenada, though powerful, was not trusted by many of Carvajal’s old allies, particularly because of
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Ensenada’s perceived pro-Jesuit leanings. On July 21st, the new Secretary of State, Ricardo Wall, convinced the King to dismiss and arrest Ensenada. Shortly afterwards, Rávago was forced from his post as the king’s confessor.140 Though Manso de Velásco would remain Viceroy of Peru until 1761, without Ensenada’s patronage, enacting reform became increasingly difficult.

In 1761, San Antonio persuaded the crown to override Manso de Velásco’s decision to reduce the funding from 6,000 to 3,000 pesos. This was a considerable achievement, given the reservations expressed by the new viceroy, Manuel de Amat y Junyent. Amat, a regalist reformer himself, stated the funds would only help the friars to preach Catholicism if they obeyed the laws of the king.141 Others openly opposed the Ocopa friars’ buildup of resources after 1752. In 1768, Juan Agustín de Uztáriz, formerly Manso de Velásco’s agent in Cadiz, criticized the friars’ “bad example” as they waited in Cádiz to embark for Peru and begged the king to stop sending missionaries to Ocopa.142

Despite the crown’s concessions, the Ocopa friars never reestablished the missions they had lost to Juan Santos’ rebellion. Though Juan Santos’ raids ended after 1752, Manso de Velásco’s decree prevented the friars from reentering the Montaña Central. As for Juan Santos, in 1776 Ocopa friars claimed that Amerindians had witnessed Juan Santos being swallowed by hell in a flash of smoke and fire. While the friars may have wanted this to be true, most likely Juan Santos’ guerrilla force fell apart after they were unable to hold Andamarca, and he died in the Montaña Central sometime afterward. Not until 1779 were missionaries from Ocopa given permission to try to re-
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evangelize the territory lost in the rebellion. That year, they built a mission along the Chanchamayo river valley near Cerro de la Sal, but the mission was plagued with problems from the start. Internal conflicts over whether to even try to reenter the area divided the friars. From the moment the friars entered the valley, they were molested by arrow fire from the surrounding forest, despite the presence of a modest-sized Spanish force. The area proved just as unstable as it had been during the rebellion, and the friars were eventually forced to abandon it only a few months later. Not until 1847 did outsiders reenter the Jauja/Tarma frontier.

The Peruvian Apostolic Institute continued to grow in numbers throughout the colonial period, though it was a changed institution after the rebellion of Juan Santos Atahualpa. In 1751, the same year that Manso de Velásco closed the frontier, San Antonio obtained travel funds and sent twenty-eight new missionaries to Ocopa from Spain. In 1752, San Antonio escorted fifty-two more friars to the missions. Similar increases would continue every ten years throughout the rest of the eighteenth century. This was in stark contrast to the twenty-nine new friars Ocopa received between 1709 and 1750. Of the 288 missionaries who served in the Ocopa missions from 1709 to 1804, approximately 90% arrived after the friars’ expulsion from the Jauja and Tarma missions. With the new missionaries, Ocopa friars expanded into Huanta, Huánuco, Cajamarquilla, Manao, and Ucayali. But as time went on, the focus of the Peruvian Institute shifted away from the frontier mission stations to the College of Santa Rosa de
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Ocopa itself. Over the second half of the eighteenth century, new recruits were required to serve less and less time in the frontier missions as the ratio of friars to missions increased. While the friars did not completely abandon their frontier activities, after 1752 the Ocopa friars increasingly chose to work in highland communities, administration, or spiritual service within the college itself. The new friars also lacked the skills of those they replaced. Unlike many of the original Ocopa missionaries, many of whom had spent years in other missions before coming to Peru, most new recruits came from large monasteries in Spain. While the training they received in Spain was complete from a theological standpoint, it lacked the practical education frontier missions required. And with fewer chances to serve in frontier missions, practical experience became more difficult to obtain. Recruiting programs also contributed to lackluster missionaries. In order to gain more recruits, the Institute promised that after a ten year period (a decenio), friars could return to Spain at their own discretion, with the crown paying for their travel expenses. This program seems to have attracted friars more interested in advancing their careers than in a lifetime of missionary service. After their decenio, ex-Ocopa friars could claim frontier mission experience and more easily obtain administrative posts in both Peru and Spain. Overall, though it increased in numbers and funds after the loss of the Jauja and Tarma missions, the Peruvian Apostolic Institute became a weaker institution. It was, however, the changing political situation that finally ended the Apostolic Institute in Peru. In 1824, Ocopa was abandoned in the wake of the Battle of Ayacucho, and since most of the friars were peninsulars, they fled with the Spanish army.
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Viceroy José Antonio Manso de Velásco had many reasons to withdraw support from the Jauja/Tarma Frontier. The viceregal capital had been leveled by one of the most devastating earthquake/tsunamis in Peruvian history. In the wake of the destruction, leaders of the restless Indian population in the city had conspired to overthrow the government, causing many royal ministers, including the viceroy, to fear a general insurrection. Apprehensions were confirmed when one of the leaders of the conspiracy led a rebellion in the strategic highland province of Huarochirí. In the Jauja/Tarma Frontier, four expeditions had failed to capture Juan Santos, and his hit-and-run tactics made future military success unlikely.

There were, however, compelling reasons for Manso de Velásco to continue fighting against Juan Santos and his rebels and to fully fund the Ocopa missions. He had come to office with specific instructions to crush the rebellious provinces in the eastern Peruvian jungle. Rumors had connected Juan Santos with the Huarochirí rebellion and the Lima conspiracy. The Andamarca raid in 1752 demonstrated, at least theoretically, that Juan Santos could extend a military force into the highlands. Furthermore, the city of Lima was well on its way to financial recovery after the earthquake/tsunami. Tax revenues from the city were increasing. The capital was no longer a strain on its neighboring financial districts. Manso de Velásco was sending more than twice the
amount of remittances to Spain as had his predecessor. By this account, the viceroy had just as many resources as he had had when he began his term of office in 1744. So why did Manso de Velásco ultimately abandon the campaigns against Juan Santos and bar the friars from reentering the frontier?

Manso de Velásco’s decision to abandon the missions was directly related to the political context of mid-eighteenth century Peru. Regalist ministers in Spain hoped to limit the power of the Church and the regular clergy in particular. As the writings of Juan and Ulloa demonstrate, many in the royal government believed that the regular clergy, with the exception of the Jesuits, had become corrupt and posed a threat to the authority of the Crown. Ensenada, though a staunch supporter of the Jesuits, disliked the wealth and corruption that he saw in the regular orders.  

As his actions in the wake of the Lima Earthquake/Tsunami indicate, Manso de Velásco shared Ensenada’s views. In fact, his relationship with Ensenada provided Manso de Velásco with the power he needed to impose reform in Lima.

The Franciscans had been a particularly imposing obstacle to reforms, having led the opposition to the secularization of rural Indian parishes. Some people, however, such as Juan and Ulloa, accused the Franciscans of causing the unrest occurring throughout the viceroyalty of Peru. These indictments, plus Juan Santos’ capture of all but two of the Ocopa missions, presented Manso de Velásco and Ensenada with an opportunity. The Ocopa mission stations were the Franciscans’ only missions in Peru. If the Spanish ministers could ensure that Ocopa was not reclaimed from Juan Santos’ band, they could severely weaken the order’s power in Peru. Manso de Velásco and Ensenada, however, could not openly oppose the retaking of the Ocopa missions for the Franciscan order. The
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Ocopa friars, at least in theory, were fulfilling the mission of the Church and the Spanish Crown in the New World by evangelizing jungle Amerindians. Pious Catholics, as Manso de Velásco and Ensenada claimed to be, could only be supportive of such efforts. More importantly, while Ferdinand VI was interested in clerical reform, he was extremely pious and an ardent supporter of missionary activities. Manso de Velásco had to be careful when handling the problems of the Ocopa missions. He made excuses, delayed, or adhered only to the explicit letter of the king’s commands. Thus, when Manso de Velásco could not end the rebellion easily, he could claim to the Franciscans and the Crown that he had done all he could to retake the missions, but he had been simply unsuccessful. The end result was that the Franciscans lost the Juaja/Tarma mission stations, while Manso de Velásco and Ensenada did not appear to be impious or anti-clerical.

The ending of the campaigns against Juan Santos Atahualpa reveals many important aspects of the Bourbon reforms under Ferdinand VI. First, politics played a significant role in the regalist ministers’ ability to implement reform. Ministers had to deal with vying interests within the Spanish government and the Catholic Church, including the desires of the monarch himself. Second, there was no master plan. Reforms were enacted as those in power saw the need, or in many cases the opportunity, to implement them. Manso de Velásco could not have stopped the campaigns to retake the Ocopa missions without the justification that colonial resources had been exhausted by recent events. Third, the implementation of reform was not always a linear progression. Sometimes reforms were made and then rescinded, such as the halving of the Ocopa friars’ funds, which was reversed in 1761. Another problem was that long periods of time often passed between a royal decree and the actual implementation of a reform.
There are several historians, however, who believe that the late Bourbon reforms demonstrate these same problematic characteristics. John Fisher, in speaking of the later Bourbon reforms (after 1759), stated:

One wonders occasionally, during mercifully rare bouts of preconfessional examination of conscience, if the Bourbon reforms tend to bewitch all who study them. Did they really comprise the smooth, coherent masterly program of imperial change and revival that generations of commentators, from the very imperial policymakers of eighteenth-century Spain to the researchers of today, have identified? Might they not be more realistically depicted in terms of halting, uncertain, inconsistent desire for imperial modernization and centralization, characterized more by delay, contradiction, and obstruction than by decisiveness? Doubt is reinforced by the reflection upon the fact that the much-praised overhaul of the outdated imperial commercial structure, for example, allegedly accelerated by the evidence arising from the British opening of Havana in 1762, produced no substantial change until 1778 and even then the most productive part of the empire, New Spain, was to be denied full enjoyment of the limited benefits of free trade for a further decade.150

In hindsight, the Bourbon reforms, particularly the later reforms, seem to comprise a smooth, planned process. This illusion may have risen, as Fisher suggests, from a conscious effort on the part of later reformers who conscientiously displayed cohesion within the government. But as historians look more closely at the process of reform, in both the early and late Bourbon period, they begin to see that this process was driven by intense political debate and compromise rather than uncontested, ideologically motivated mandate. Taking John Fisher’s characterization of late Bourbon reforms into account, a re-evaluation of the periodization of colonial Bourbon reforms is in order. If late colonial Bourbon reforms were just as “halting, uncertain, [and] inconsistent” as early Bourbon reforms, then the early reforms should not be disregarded.

Particularly in regard to policies affecting the clergy, the early colonial Bourbon reforms made a significant impact. In 1749, for example, regalist ministers began the
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process of secularizing rural Indian parishes. In Ocopa, Manso de Velásco used the events during the 1740’s and 50’s to justify abandoning the Jauja and Tarma missions and reduce the friars’ funding. And finally, the passage of Universal Royal Patronage in 1753 gave the king total power to not only select bishops, but fill any secular clerical post within the empire. While these reforms may not have been as dramatic as the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish empire in 1767, they began the process of breaking down Spain’s traditional partnership with the Catholic Church in the governance of their empire.

The topic of early Bourbon reforms requires more study. While many major reforms took place after 1759, early reforms played a significant role in shaping Spain’s relationship with its colonies during the eighteenth century. Early Bourbon reforms not only helped to set the pattern for later reform, but in cases regarding the clergy, actually influenced events during the time period in which they were initiated. Clerical reforms in the early eighteenth century marked the beginning of a change in crown policies throughout Latin America. In light of this new understanding, early Bourbon reforms, and early clerical reforms in particular, should be included in future studies of Spanish colonial policy in the eighteenth century.
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