

ALONSO DE ZORITA AND THE RATIONALITY OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN SOCIETY

von David M. Traboulay

It is ironical that the Spanish colonization of Mexico, which was characterized by excessive suffering on the part of the native population, witnessed the expression of some of the humanistic trends that arose in Europe at the turn of the sixteenth century. The educational, social, and political activities of the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, and Jesuits were the fruit of reforms that were taking place in Europe prior to the conquest. A resurgence of studies on the works of Thomas Aquinas, the influence of Erasmus in Spain, and the reforms of the religious orders formed the ideological basis of the pro-Indian movement in its struggle with the colonists.¹ ALONSO DE ZORITA, a layman, was a member of this movement that was conducted for the most part by the religious orders. His work is especially significant in that it provides the analytical framework by which one can understand more clearly the struggle of the pro-Indian missionaries.

ALONSO DE ZORITA was a tireless worker for the pro-Indian cause. A graduate in law from the university of Salamanca in 1540, he must surely have been exposed to the humanistic ideas of Vitoria. He came to Santo Domingo in 1548 and spent some nineteen years in the New World, serving in the audiencias of Santo Domingo, Guatemala, and Mexico before retiring to Spain in 1566. His *Brief and Summary Relation of the Lords of New Spain*, written in his retirement, contained his observations on the customs of the native population and the effects of the Spanish colonization on it.² Trenchant in his criticism of the Spaniards, he minced no words in describing the catastrophic consequences of the Spanish conquest. Yet, in his sensitive portrayal of the social relationships of the native Mexicans, he implicitly revealed his own humanistic vision and spirit that must without doubt have been the inspiration for his well-known integrity and commitment to justice. This spirit was forged, at least in part, by his acquaintance with LAS CASAS, BERNARDINO DE SAHAGÚN, GERÓNIMO DE MENDIETA, TORIBIO DE MOTOLINIA, ANDRÉS DE OLMOS and FRANCISCO DO LAS NAVAS, among the friars, and PABLO NAZAREO, the Indian rector of the college of Santa Cruz de Tlaltelolco, whose humanistic writing ZORITA said he used in writing his book.³

In his treatment of the government of pre-conquest Mexico, ZORITA labored to show that the rulers were not tyrants but men of sterling character whose concern for the welfare of their people was of paramount importance.⁴ Generally, the eldest son succeeded his father but if he were incapable of ruling the choice fell to another son or grandson. If no worthy successor could be found, the nobility then selected the successor. In this way "like the great Alexander, the rulers were more concerned with leaving a successor capable of governing their lands and vassals than with leaving their inheritance to sons or grandsons".⁵ The sacred character of the ruler was

demonstrated in the ritual he had to undergo. The ruler-elect spent a year or two in a temple performing penance. At night he slept on a mat, getting up at appointed times to burn incense before the altar. During the day he sat on the ground. The point behind this exercise was to remind him that he should be always vigilant for his people. After this preparation, he was invested at the temple. ZORITA was anxious to show the king of Spain that the religious underpinning of Indian government paralleled that in Spain. Of course, he was quick to point out that though they performed many commendable religious acts like giving thanks to their idols and distributing alms, "their works were like bodies without heads because they had no knowledge of the true God".⁶ Yet, ZORITA was mindful that his political opponents had used Indian religious practices as the justification for their dominion over the natives. So, he emphasized that the natives attended to their religious devotion with seriousness, dignity, and humanity. In its exhortation to fasting and discipline, he seemed to imply that Indian religion was in some respects similar to Christianity. He did not mention the rituals where human sacrifice was offered, as other writers had done, particularly those opposed to better conditions for the Indians. But that was because the polarisation of political life on the Indian question was so extreme, that it was difficult to present a more balanced treatment of this question. It was sufficient for him to show the humane and civilized aspects.

The ruler was reminded that he was the instrument of God's justice to punish the wicked and help the weak. He was to be "a great shelter and protection for all", to listen to the advice of the aged, and encouraged to follow in the footsteps of his predecessors: "Consider that your forbears knew hardship and care in ruling over their realm and did not sleep free of care; they strove to increase their realm and leave a memory of themselves. The order of things that they left was not established in a single day. They took care to console the poor and afflicted, the people of small means. They honored the aged because they found good counsel in them. They willingly assisted the needy."⁷ Contrary to charges that the natives were ignorant and ungrateful, ZORITA firmly and sincerely stressed their generosity and the rationality of their society. It was fear for the cruelty of the Spaniards, he remarked, that caused this natural and spontaneous kindness to turn to distrust. The underlying philosophical idea ZORITA was endeavouring to communicate was that in the matter of succession and election of rulers the natives were following the principles of Natural Law and, in a sense, "Canon and Civil Law, although they were ignorant of this".

The Thomist interpretation of Natural Law was in vogue in Spanish universities in the sixteenth century and formed the basis of the development of the theory of the dignity of all human beings.⁸ For Aquinas, the Natural Law was the rational creature's participation in the eternal law, an imprint of the dictates of Divine providence.⁹ They constituted commandments of reason that were required for the common good. By the correct use of his intellect, man was therefore capable of living a moral life because morality derived its goodness from the rule of reason. The Salamanca theologians

sought to clarify this notion. Obviously, it was relevant to the development of their own positions on the colonization of America. For them, respect and dignity should be extended to Indians no less than Spaniards because they were rational beings. In his analysis of Indian customs, Zorita clearly wanted to confirm the rationality of the native peoples. Indian political and social relationships merely supported the conclusions of the theologians. FRANCISCO DE VITORIA and DOMINGO DE SOTO had argued that such precepts as justice, worship of God, and temperance were natural and self-evident. They could be grasped by the intelligence and generally supported by experience. As SOTO put it, natural law was common to all humanity: "For there can never be any men, however incoherent and barbarous, so long as they are in their right minds, to whom this kind of truth is not obvious."¹⁰ The imperative towards justice and morality did not then depend upon revelation nor conflicted with Christianity. What this association between 'natural', 'rational', and 'just' implied was that the commitment to rule justly and mutual social obligations was rooted in the nature of man. In the light of this principle, ZORITA's picture of Indian society becomes clearer and more significant. Not only was it a historical document; it was also inspired politically. His firm commitment to the pro-Indian movement was a major factor in the composition of this work, to counteract the opposition who held the opinion that the Indians were irrational and barbaric and must be converted to Spanish ways and Christianity by force, if necessary.

ZORITA placed the blame for the chaos of Mexican colonial society squarely on the Spanish destruction of the native political and social structure. Hierarchical though it was, he seemed to feel that the Indian system gave to the society peace and order, so foreign to the political and social relations of his own time.¹¹ The supreme lords or *tlatuques* had civil and criminal jurisdiction over the people. Subject to them were the *tectecutzin* and the *calpullec*. The former received the dignities of the nobility because of service to the state or exploits in war; the latter were the elders of barrios or villages. The *tectecutzin* had domain over the people attached to their palace, who provided the lords with personal service in their households and brought them fuel and water. They worked certain fields for their lords and served them in times of war. In return, the lords were obliged to defend and protect them, providing them with lodgings, meals, and wages. The lords were therefore appointed to look after both the "general and their private good". The *calpullec* were the heads of barrios, a social unit that was fundamental to ancient Mexican society. Each province had several barrios and ZORITA asserted that the lands were apportioned when the people originally came to that land.

His description of the clan or *calpulli* was of great significance because it was the heart of the Ancient Mexican society.¹² It was precisely the destruction of this that the failure of Spanish colonial policy lay. Members of a clan held their land communally, not individually. Although they could not alienate their land, they enjoyed its use for life and left it to their heirs. If a family died out, the land would be assigned to another member of the clan

who needed it. The chief elder assigned land to those members of his clan who did not have land according to their "needs, condition, and capacity to work it". If land that was already cultivated was vacated, it would be rented to someone from another clan for a part of the harvest. In no way could an elder take land away from a member of his clan if it was being cultivated. However, if it was not, through negligence, he was warned that it would be taken away. By virtue of their membership in the clan and their right to share in the communal lands, the members had to give a portion of their harvest as tribute to the lords. There were exceptions to this rule. Serfs or *mayerques* tilled the lands of the nobility while some free peasants were assigned to provide services and goods instead of tribute. The tribute did not depend upon the caprice of the lords but was agreed upon after a meeting between members of the clan and their lord, who kept records of the allotments of land and tribute. ZORITA felt that the proper functioning of this system was the main reason for the harmony and unity of Indian society before the conquest. It was a different story after the conquest. Ignorant of the communal character of Indian land tenure, the Spaniards apportioned land individually. Through bribery and deceit the land of the natives was being constantly reduced and surrounded by land held by Spaniards. Worse, cattle owned by Spanish ranchers were ever destroying the crops planted by the natives.

Sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons of the supreme lords formed the fourth class of the nobility and were called *pipiltzin*. They served as ambassadors, ministers and executors of justice. Exempted from the payment of tribute, they received a stipend and board from the ruler.

Stressing the autonomous growth of Indian communities, ZORITA emphasized that not even their tribute-system militated against this. Each community paid tribute from the crops that were grown there and so did not have to leave their surroundings to find tribute elsewhere. There was therefore no rupture in the family relations as happened under Spanish colonial rule. Tribute was generally paid in maize, peppers, beans and cotton for which each town set aside certain fields. It was also given in the form of water, fuel, and domestic service for the rulers's household. The custom was for the ruler to assign to each town the tribute expected which then allotted to each family that portion of the collective tribute it had to provide. The rational character of Indian economy was carried out harmoniously. As ZORITA put it: "Thus the peasants worked the tribute fields and harvested and stored the crops; the artisans give tribute from the things they made; and the merchants gave of their merchandise-clothing, feathers, jewels, stones-each giving of the commodities in which he dealt."¹³ The various economic activities were rationally linked. Cotton, for example, was given when collected from cotton-producing towns to those that could not produce it to be worked into cloth. A small quantity of gold dust was exacted as tribute which was collected from river beds without difficulty. Indian society did not have a monied economy but a system of bartering certain things for others, a mode which ZORITA found to be "most conformable to nature". For the most part the tribute was small and the paternalistic ruler took special care not to burden some towns more

than others. The large population of pre-conquest Mexico, the well-planned economy, and a benevolent ruler concerned for the welfare of his people reduced economic and social hardships to a minimum. When asked to compare the native system of taxation with that under the Spaniards, ZORITA replied that "one Indian pays more tribute today than did six Indians of that time, and one town pays more in gold pesos today than did six towns".

Work was not the alienating experience it had become under the Spaniards. The Indians did their communal work in their own towns and so "did not have to leave their homes and families, and they ate food they were accustomed to eat and at the usual hours". They accepted their responsibilities for the construction of temples, homes for the lords, and public works. Rising early, they went to work after the morning chill had passed, worked without being hurried or harrassed, and stopped before the evening chill had set in. When they returned home, they found their meals prepared, after which they enjoyed the company of their wives and children.

The self-reliance of the Indian contrasted markedly with the dependency of the Spaniard. The Indians knew all that was necessary to earn their livelihood. Familiar with both rural and urban tasks, they did not need others to build their homes nor did they have to search for materials for everywhere they "find the wherewithal to cut, tie, sew, and strike a light". They knew the names of all the birds, animals, trees, what herbs could be used for medicinal purposes, and what could be eaten. All knew "how to work stone, build a house, twine a cord, and where to find the materials they need".¹⁴ They lived in small huts, some of which were thatched. Satisfied with a little food and simple dress and accustomed to sleeping on a mat on the floor, these meek and patient natives did not strive for wealth nor offices. Childbirth, with or without the help of a midwife, occurred without the comforts or attention accorded such an event in Spanish families. As for the upbringing of their children, great care was placed in making them "healthy and strong, cheerful, able and teachable".¹⁵

Parents instilled in the minds of their children the values of their society. ZORITA insisted that these values did not contradict Christian values. On the contrary, they prepared the way for the acceptance of Christianity. He showed this by reporting a speech an Indian lord gave to his subjects in Texoco just after the process of conversion had begun. The lord told his people that the missionary was "like a great spreading leafy tree under whose boughs we find shade and air, consolation and instruction". He urged his people to place themselves under God's protection for God was "like a very pretty, lovely bird under whose wings all find shelter and protection".¹⁶ Faith, service, and good works were necessary for God's mercy and blessings, he reminded them. For ZORITA, all this showed how wrong were those who denied the Indian "any intelligence and will allow them no human trait other than the shape of men". Both lords and commoners were vigilant in instructing their children to be virtuous.¹⁷ At the age of five, a ruler's son was sent to the temple to be trained by priests until he married or went off to war. His daughter was constantly reminded to be discreet in speech and

conduct. Often she never left her home until marriage or if she did, she had to be accompanied by elderly women. At the age of five, her nurses taught her to embroider, sew, and weave and urged her to be clean. Above all, she was taught to respect and obey her parents and teachers and to work diligently. The lower nobility and commoners also took their children to the temples to serve their gods. They saw to it that their children followed the occupation for which they showed the ability and inclination. But generally sons followed the occupation of their fathers. Mischievousness and lying were especially frowned upon. If a son were caught lying, his father punished him by pricking his lip with a thorn. When asked how the alleged Indian reputation for falsehood was started, old Indians replied that the Spaniards were so haughty and cruel that, in their fear of displeasing them, they assented to everything, however incredible. Fear and mistrust had made them wary of speaking out directly and openly.

There were separate schools for the sons of the nobility and commoners.¹⁸ Sons of the nobility were sent to special temple schools or *calmecac*, commoners to village schools. Each school was headed by an elder who supervised the education of the students. The students cultivated the fields that were set aside for the support of their school and were expected to observe the rigorous discipline set up by their teachers. Their training was Spartan, "for they ate but a little hard bread, and they slept with little covering and half exposed to the night air in rooms and quarters like porches". Clearly their education was to prepare them for the responsibilities of adult life, be it family life or war. When they reached marriageable age, usually at the age of twenty, they were expected to ask permission from their teachers in addition to their parents' consent. An indigent student received aid from his school at the time of his marriage while the family of a rich student was expected to give gifts to his school and his teacher when he left school. The graduate was encouraged to uphold the values he learned, to work hard to support his family, not to neglect his children, to be brave in war, to respect his parents, honor the aged, and follow their advice.

Parental advice confirmed the training at school. Quoting speeches a priest had translated for him, ZORITA reported that fathers of the classes of nobles and merchants urged their sons to have reverence for God and serve Him with love, to respect the old, console the poor and ill, and to love and honor all.¹⁹ They were not to hurt others, engage in adultery, or be lewd. Restraint and humility were to be practiced in social relationships. A portion of their food should be given to the needy and if given something, however small, they should receive it with gratitude. Hard work and frugality were important attitudes: 'Life in this world is filled with hardships; it is not easy to satisfy one's needs.' To this his son replied that he was grateful for the great good that his father had given him and for the counsel "that issue from your bowels, the bowels of a father that loves me". Peasants and commoners advised their sons to serve their masters well and to be content with their lot: "Do what pertains to your office. Labor, sow and plant your trees, and live by the sweat of your brow. Do not cast off your burden, or grow faint, or be

lazy; for if you are negligent and lazy, you will not be able to support yourself or your wife and children." Like the sons of the nobility and merchants, they too were encouraged to respect the old, parents and the afflicted, and warned against idleness. Mothers counselled their daughters at the time of their marriage. Daughters of upper class families were told to be modest and pleasing to their husbands. So too were those from the lower class but they were reminded that "hardship and suffering are our lot". They were to do their household work, weave and embroider dutifully. This picture of Indian education might seem idealistic but it corroborated the experience of the Dominican FRAY JULIAN GARCES, a student of the renowned Spanish humanist ANTONIO DE NEBRIJA. As a teacher at the school of San Jose and the college of Tlatelolco, he felt that his Indian students showed greater facility for learning than the Spaniards.²⁰ He found them neither boisterous nor unruly, neither stubborn nor mischievous, neither pretentious nor vain, neither harmful nor quarrelsome. They did not indulge in complaints, gossip, insults and other vices typical of Spanish boys. Drinking or eating inordinately was unthinkable for them and they did not ask for more than they received at the dinner table. When they were told to sit, stand, or kneel, they did so readily. He marvelled at the fertility of their minds for they were able to master every type of discipline, even Latin. They could count, read, write, paint and performed every mechanical and liberal art clearly and quickly. As for being assigned difficult tasks, they did not utter one word of complaint. Their mastery of the organ and plain chant was so good that Spanish musicians were not needed. Unlike Spanish boys, they had such a sense of shame that they were careful how they appeared in public.

ZORITA's opponents had condemned the bellicose nature of Indian society. He admitted that wars were frequent but mitigated this by showing that they understood the notion of a just war.²¹ The killing of a merchant or an ambassador was considered a legitimate cause of war. The ruler would then convene a meeting of all the elders and warriors, and explain the reasons for his decision. If the assembly felt in was a just cause for war, they would give their consent. But if the reason was not of consequence, they advised against war. ZORITA insisted that the ruler sometimes accepted their advice. They nevertheless supported the ruler if he continued to summon them on the same issue despite their disagreement out of respect. The decision to make war was sent to the enemy who then held deliberations whether to defend themselves or not. If they considered themselves too weak to resist, they offered gold ornaments, feathers and other ornaments as symbols of their surrender. Towns that had yielded peacefully gave less tribute than those which had surrendered after defeat. The question of laws of war was an important one for sixteenth century theologians. Undoubtedly, the horrors of the war in Granada during the closing years of the fifteenth century, the conquest of the New World, and the Turkish threat had exercised a profound impact on their imagination. In his description of the Indian process of war, Zorita seemed familiar with their positions and implied that the Indians had complied generally with the conditions necessary for a just war. Rejecting the

non-violent tradition, the theologians held that in special cases the power to make war was necessary to protect the welfare of the community, and to provide the conditions for a just and secure peace. The right of self-defense extended to avenging wrongs perpetrated against the community and could be claimed by a legitimate ruler as representative of the community. However, the only just cause of war was a wrong suffered, and a great one at that. For the effects of war were so catastrophic that vigilance should be taken lest war be declared over minor offences. That was why the ruler should assemble a council of the wise men of a community to examine carefully the cause and justice of the intended war. War should be declared only reluctantly and should be prosecuted "only as far as is necessary to defend one's country, and obtain one's rights, and ultimately as a result of the war, to ensure peace and safety".

The Indian system of government and justice was an equitable one, respected and obeyed by the people. A Minimum of conflicts occurred and harmony prevailed, ZORITA contended. Theirs was a society of laws where justice was carried out wisely. Judges played an important part in dispensing justice. In each city, the ruler was represented by two judges, whose salaries came from the produce of fields that were set aside for them. They heard cases from daybreak to two hours before sundown. Appeals were heard by twelve superior judges, who collaborated with the ruler before passing sentence. Every twelve days the ruler convened a meeting of all the judges to discuss the more difficult cases. Judges were not permitted to receive a fee or gift from anyone, whether rich or poor. Failure to follow this would result in a stern reprimand and, after the third offence, his hair was cropped and he was stripped of his office. There were ordinary judges in each town to decide cases of less importance. They were empowered to arrest wrongdoers and did the preliminary investigative work on more complex cases which were later presented to the council for resolution. Laws were carried out firmly. Adultery, sodomy, creating a scandal were punishable by death, and no one was exempt. The married daughter of the wise ruler, NEZAHUALPILLI, was put to death for adultery although her husband had pardoned her. Wine was prohibited except for the sick and those who were more than fifty years old. The hair of an offender was cropped publicly and his house razed. For the most part, however, litigation was held to a minimum in Mexican Indian society. As an Indian lord told ZORITA: "When we were pagans, there were very few lawsuits, men told the truth, and cases were decided very quickly."²³ ZORITA recalled two cases from his own experience to demonstrate the basic Indian sense of justice. Some Indians had come to him in Guatemala to reclaim land that was taken from them by other Indians. When the offenders were summoned before ZORITA, their replies surprised him. One offered to return the land without further ado, and the other suggested that his land be divided because he had found it neglected and had planted cacao trees on it.

In recording the customs, institutions, and attitudes of the indigenous people Zorita hoped to show that they were a rational and intelligent people.

He felt that those who said that the Indians were barbaric and uncivilized simply did not know at first hand Indian society. This fallacy could have been perpetuated by a dependence upon unreliable sources or by the fact that the Indians were not Christian or even because their customs and language were different from the Spaniards. How else could one explain the contradictory statements of Hernando Cortes when, in his letter to the Emperor, he called the natives uncivilized after praising their rationality and declaring that their mode of life "was almost the same as in Spain, with just as much harmony and order" earlier in the same letter.²⁴

ZORITA's treatise was therefore a defense of Indian civilization. But it was more than that. In describing and explaining the structures and values of the native society, he sought to show the destructive effect that the political, social, and economic policies of Spanish imperialism was producing on that society.

Social relationships were of primary concern in the Indian value system. From early in his life, he was taught to respect his parents, elders, women, and the sick. His worth as a human being depended upon how he carried out his responsibility to his family, and clan. Harmony in the collective was to be maintained and so willingness to compromise was stressed while aggressiveness and disputativeness were avoided. The spirit of individualism was absent. Rather, it was his family and clan that gave meaning to his life. Honor, kindness, and hospitality were the important moral values. Solidarity with one's family and clan helped to create an orderly world in which tensions were reduced to a minimum. Religion provided a context of ultimate meaning for the central value system. The deity was viewed as a benevolent one, bestowing infinite blessings on the collective. In return, social responsibilities were to be carried out with love. There was of course no political democracy in Indian society. It was believed that the hierarchical political order was somehow divinely ordained. Loyalty to one's father, the ruler of one's clan, and the supreme ruler was the important political value. The political authority had the obligation to bestow blessings on society. In return, the people considered it their responsibility to respect the demands of their rulers. Mutual trust fueled the reciprocal character of this political relationship. Economic values were not as important as the religious and cultural values of the society. The communal ownership of property and the self-sufficient nature of the economy precluded the development of the capitalistic spirit. Luxury was avoided and the Spartan training of the young obviously helped to develop a spirit of frugality which made the desire for material comforts superfluous. The lack of a monetary system also reinforced the self-sufficiency of the economy. These then were the values that cemented the structure of Indian traditional society. ZORITA saw clearly and profoundly the incompatibility between the Indian system and that imposed by the Spaniards which gradually over the span of his experience in the New World would insensitively dismantle the traditional structure of Indian society.

The conquest brought America within the orb of the massive Spanish

empire. Its resources of precious metals, sugar, tobacco, and hides helped make Spain the greatest empire in the sixteenth century. Indeed, the economic rise of Europe was in part due to the gold and silver that flooded Europe from America. Spain's extensive imperial commitments and wars were financed by it. In the first half of the sixteenth century treasure was exported to Antwerp which became the distribution center from where gold and silver from America passed to Germany, Northern Europe, and England. Spanish economic life grew to depend more and more on America. Demand in the Indies for foodstuffs and manufactured goods meant that these industries were intensified in Spain. The prosperity of the cities of Toledo, Seville, and Burgos, among others, was to a large degree due to the trade that developed with the Indies. It was then the demands of the structure and values of Empire that delivered the shattering blow to Indian society. The bitter criticism with which he would go on to describe Spanish colonial institutions and attitudes was motivated, to be sure, by his advocacy of the pro-Indian movement, but more by the clarity of his vision.

Before the colonial relationship between Mexico and Spain was defined, Cortes distributed the recently conquered land among his men who demanded of the Indian lords tribute, personal services, and slaves in excess of what was given before the conquest. The portents of cruelties similar to those perpetrated against the natives in Española and Cuba earlier forced CHARLES V to write to Cortes, prohibiting the practice of *encomienda*.²⁷ Spaniards were to allow the Indians to live in liberty and it was urged that conversion should be effected peacefully and not by force. This remarkably humane instruction was of course the result of the struggle of LAS CASAS and his supporters who had singled the *encomienda* as the most significant reason for the destruction of the native population in the islands. Cortes, however, refused to comply with the emperor's wishes. He argued that the Spaniards had no other means of support than the Indians and, if they were freed, they would have to abandon Mexico. Moreover, he contended that if the *encomienda* were abolished the Indians would return to the slavery of their own system, the mere thought of which moved them to serve willingly the Spaniards. Still, he promised the emperor to mitigate the excesses that were practiced in the islands. An end to the *encomienda* would result in the loss of his new empire and the souls of the natives, Cortes added.

ZORITA did not support such duplicity. He saw the *encomienda* as a pernicious system that operated throughout the Indies such that one might think there was "one common directive". He charged unequivocally that the system was destroying the Indians everywhere and, if not stopped, would destroy them completely. Through forced labor for the construction of Spanish towns the Indians had to work far from their homes, disrupting "their whole tempo of life, the time and mode of work, of eating and sleeping". The demolition of the old Mexico city and the rebuilding of the new city was likened to the plague that beset ancient Egypt. Quoting the opinion of FRAY TORIBIO DE MOTOLINIA, ZORITA wrote: "The seventh plague was the building of the great city of Mexico. In this work, during the first years,

more people were employed than in the building of the temple of Jerusalem in the time of Solomon. So great was the number of Indians in actual construction, in bringing food for the workers, and in providing food and service from their towns for the Spaniards, that a man could scarcely make his way through some streets and over the causeways, broad as they are. In the work of construction some were crushed by beams, others fell from heights, and others were caught beneath buildings that were being torn down in one place in order to erect others elsewhere. The Indians not only had to do the work but had to get the materials and pay the masons, carpenters, and stonecutters. What was more, they must bring their own food or go hungry."²⁸

The system whereby the colonist received an allotment of Indians who had to give him labor services and tribute would gradually result in the decimation of the Indian population. Statistics showed that the population declined from 16,871,408 in 1532 to 2,649,573 in 1568.²⁹ To be sure, epidemics such as smallpox, typhoid, malaria, measles, and influenza were significant contributors to this. For ZORITA, however, the principal reason lay in the insatiable demand for cheap Indian labor to work the mines, the sugar and cacao plantations, the cattle ranches, and the wheat farms. Reduced to servitude, countless Indians died in the mines or on their way to the mines loaded with heavy materials. Some fled to the surrounding woods, abandoning their families, and so Indian towns became depopulated. Work in the mines saw the enslavement of thousands of Indians. During the conquest, there was no shortage as Indian prisoners were legally enslaved. After it, the *encomenderos* resorted to the practice of purchasing slaves which invited all sorts of abuses. They would make preposterous demands of gold as tribute only to collect slaves as a substitute for money tribute because they knew well that Indian towns did not have money. Even women were taken from their families and sent to the mines.

Another oppressive colonial practice was the use of Indians as carriers or *tamemes*. Men, women, and children were forced to carry the merchandise and furniture of entire Spanish households to far away places. Trekking over fields and mountains in different climates from their own communities, they spent most of the year on this type of work. Household service which some Indians were expected to give to Spaniards was also no bed of roses. To serve the allocated one week, they often had to set out from their homes two weeks before. So, one week's service occupied five weeks of their time. As ZORITA put it, the roads were "filled with Indian men and women, exhausted, dying of hunger, weary and afflicted; and the roads were strewn with the bodies of men, women, and even their little ones, for they used them to carry food—something these people had never before done"³⁰

Their life was further disrupted by having to work on Spanish farms. Not only had they to fence the sheep, cattle, and pig farms, but they also had to construct the farm buildings, roads, bridges, watercourses, stone walls, and sugar mills. More, they had to provide the materials at their own expense and bring them to the sites on their backs. They had to fetch water and

wood, clean the stables, and remove the rubbish. It was no wonder that Spanish farms had increased while those of the Indians diminished. ZORITA could not have been more explicit. The rise and prosperity of Spanish towns and fortunes were carried out at the expense of Indian lives and communities.

The resources of Indian communities were continuously being drained by the excessive tribute they had to pay.³¹ Some were reduced to such straits that they were forced to sell their land and even their children. Thrown into jail when they were unable to pay, they were sometimes tortured to tell where their gold was. From a declaration of the tax paid to Cortes in 1533, it was learned that the province of Cuernavaca had to give every eighty days 4800 blankets, 20 shirts, 20 skirts, 20 bed-covers, and 4 cotton pillows. Besides providing field and house service, they had to cultivate every year 20 cotton fields and 8 of maize, as well as harvesting and storing the crops. Every thirty days they had to take 7000 pounds of maize, 300 of peppers, 200 of beans, to the mines in addition to supplying Indians for work in the mines. The Crown made an effort to remove the abuses of the tribute system and ordered new assessments be made. ZORITA was critical of this new system of counts and felt that it did not in any way alleviate the wrongs done to the Indians. In the first place, the *encomenderos* found a way to use the system to their advantage by appointing their favorites as assessors or offering bribes; secondly, if the Indian community asked for a re-assessment, they had to bear the cost of the process which was an added burden. Thus, the Indians exhausted whatever little money they had in lawsuits while the tribute remained based on the first count. Despite the initial good intention behind the new system, the per capita assessment resulted in tribute being collected from "cripples, blind and maimed persons, and other wretches who cannot work and even lack food". Moreover, no attempt was made to consult the people in determining the extent of the tribute. Had they done this, they would have realized that the Indians possessed very little other than their labor and that the exorbitant tribute meant that they had almost nothing to spend on food and clothing, not to mention for expenses relating to the marriage of their children.

ZORITA drew attention to the increase of Spanish herds which were threatening to overrun the entire country, a tendency which he had also observed in Guatemala and Colombia. In spite of Indian vigilance, cattle herds roamed and destroyed their crops. The *encomenderos* seized Indian lands for cattle pasture, had the Indians build enclosures, but did not seriously try to refrain from encroaching upon the areas where the Indians planted their crops. To compound the matter, they drove their herds prematurely to summer pasture at the time when the harvest from the grain and tuna fruit fields remained to be gathered. Complaints and lawsuits were so futile that the process brought further expenses than compensation. The consequences of the insensitivity of the economic activity of the colonists, whether it was in the mining or agricultural sectors, were devastating and disrupted the Indians' "way of life, their routine of work, diet, and shelter,

and, in taking them from their towns and homes, their wives and children, their repose and harmony".³²

Critical of the Spanish colonial administration, he felt that the "multitude of laws, judges, viceroys, governors, *presidentes*, *oidores*, *corregidores*, *alcades mayores*, a million lieutenants, and yet another *alguaciles*" were incapable of correcting the wrongs done to Indian society. For their interests lay, for the most part, with the colonists. The undermining of the traditional authority of the Indian aristocracy ruined those political values of authority and obedience that he felt necessary for any community.³³ This was not entirely accurate. In the early stages of the colonization, Spaniards were more interested in tribute and gave the Indian nobility the responsibility of collecting the tribute. They proved to be no less insensitive than the colonists as they sought the means to buttress their own privileged status. ZORITA contended that these Indian supervisors were not the "natural lords" but commoners and upstarts who did not possess the natural goodness and virtue and concern for the community that marked the pre-conquest aristocracy. In continuing to defend the concept of the rationality of the government of the indigenous society, he risked embellishing the Indian aristocracy when he already had abundant evidence to prove the irrational effects of the new colonial economic system. Be that as it may, the denigration of the Indian nobility was certainly one of the more lasting effects of the colonization. As the native population declined, they were unable to collect the prescribed tribute and were often jailed and subsequently disgraced.

Painted in very dark colors, his analysis portrayed faithfully the fate of the native people at the moment of his departure from Mexico. But it failed to tell the story of the struggles of the reform movement in which he himself played a not inconsiderable part, or of the successes they achieved in getting the Crown to change its policy, however transitory in the long run. From the fall of Mexico City in 1521 political pressure from the reformers in Mexico and in Spain compelled the Crown to institute measures against the *encomenderos* in an effort to mitigate the disastrous effects the conquest had brought to the native society. The letter of CHARLES V in 1523, the report of the Junta of Barcelona in 1529, the official policy of the second Audiencia that commenced in 1530, and the New Laws of 1542 all inveighed against the *encomienda*, demanding its eventual prohibition.³⁴ Indeed, the second Audiencia had the power to annul fraudulent titles to *encomiendas* and to reorganize these with those that became vacant into royal administrative units called *corregimientos* to be governed by royal officials, whose principal duties were to educate the Indians and to introduce a more just system of tribute. Indians were to be given the opportunity to serve in the government with the Spaniards in the hope that relations between the two races would become better. The enactment of the New Laws abolishing the *encomienda* appeared to be the logical outcome of the long struggle waged by the reformers. But it was the suspension of the enactment of the laws that proved to be a more realistic indicator of the political and economic trend in the New World. The surge of protests in Mexico and Peru must surely have

frightened both TELLO DE SANDOVAL, who was charged to execute the laws, and the Crown into suspending the laws. Still, the testimony of the missionaries on the matter of the New Laws showed that the *encomienda* had become institutionalized over the years and generally accepted as the way to colonize the New World, however imperfect it was. The Dominicans who were active in the struggle against the oppression of the Indians felt that the *encomienda* was necessary to preserve Christianity and to develop the country economically: "As everyone knows, the Indians are weak by nature and not acquisitive, and are satisfied with having enough to get along on from day to day. And if there is any way to bring them out of their laziness and carelessness it is to make them help the Spaniards in their commerce. In this the Indians are benefited through their wages and thus they will become fond of commerce and profits – as indeed some of them have already done – in imitation of the Spaniards . . . And besides this, great good comes to the state and his Majesty from having the Indians help the Spaniards in their commerce and on their estates, because without Indians all trade and profit cease."³⁵ Their position strengthened the argument of the colonists who pleaded against abolition by reminding the Crown that both the Crown and the Church stood to lose revenue from trade and tithes if the abolition were enforced. Fearful of the instability that might arise socially and economically, and realizing their dependency on the existing system for their growing economic interests, the reformers rejected the abolition of the *encomienda* proposed by Las Casas as being too radical. It did not mean an end to the pro-Indian movement. Indian policy was to be focused on defending Indian community life and making the *encomienda* work humanely.

Spanish encroachment on Indian community lands took place gradually.³⁶ Initially, the colonists demanded tribute and labor. Later, they saw the need for land in order to exploit the labor supply and for their large herds of cattle. The devastating effect this had on the Indian communities forced the viceroy and the missionaries to press for legislation to put a stop to this. Out of this early struggle arose the main features of an Indian policy that would be gradually defined. In nature protectionist, it aimed at preserving Indian communities from the encroachments of Spaniards, maintaining Indian social and economic institutions, and gradually to integrate them into the Spanish colonial system. The generally glowing description that ZORITA presented of Indian communities must be seen in the context of this policy. His use of Spanish legal and theological notions to defend the rationality of the Indian reflected the central strategy of the pro-Indian reformers which was to show the similarity of Spanish and Indian community traditions as they strove to first protect and then assimilate Indian communities to Spanish municipal institutions. Countless new towns were established with a "public square, then the town hall, prison, and community bank, the commons and municipal pastures".³⁷ The church was the most imposing building and streets were laid out at right angles to the square. This planning was not dissimilar to native villages which also were built around a central square. Indian in origin, too, was the idea of having community crops from which

town officials were paid. These towns were administered by Indian officials – a town governor, two *alcaldes*, and several minor officials. The proper functioning of these towns depended to a large extent on the community banks. Missionaries took charge of these banks and worked hard to ensure that funds were constantly flowing into these banks in order to pay for expenses incurred by the town. The cultivation of maize, beans, and peppers, the development of the silk industry, sheep and goat raising, and certain joint ventures with Spaniards whereby Indian towns received two thirds of the harvest for supplying the land and labor and the Spaniards the other third for providing the oxen, plows, and other implements, were some of the ways Indian towns raised funds for their community banks. As for land tenure, it was again Indian precedent that formed the basis for Spanish policy. In the redistribution of land by viceroy VELASCO I in 1550 at Metepec, each Indian was given 40 fathoms of land around his house. He and his descendants had the use of that land as long as they cultivated it. Tenure was untransferable and legal ownership was vested in the community, in accordance with the ancient Calpulli practice. However, the high hopes placed in this policy were not achieved. Indeed, the difficulty of instilling a spirit of profit among the Indians, Indian ignorance of livestock-raising, and epidemics were factors that contributed to the decline of Indian towns. Conceivably, the close supervisory control that the missionaries exercised over Indian life prevented these towns from developing.³⁸ But the underlying reason was the expansion of the colonists' sphere of economic interests. The intensification of livestock-raising and sugar cane cultivation started a process in which the colonists sought every means to appropriate land and extend their holdings. Untilled land was granted to the colonists and native nobility sold land from their vast estates under pressure of bribes and intimidation. Many Indian towns were in due course surrounded by Spanish fields, and eventually absorbed by the great estates or haciendas.

By 1546 the continuity of the *encomienda* was assured. Both the Crown and the reformers then directed their energy towards producing a more equitable tribute system. No question caused greater anguish than this as streams of complaints poured in about its inhumanity. Royal legislation implied that the tribute should be less than before the conquest and should not be accompanied by personal service, a law more honored in the breach than in its observance. The divergence between law and economic reality could be observed in the *visita* of DIEGO RAMIREZ made between 1551 and 1555. Despite royal efforts to put an end to the more oppressive aspects of the tribute system, he found that “(1) the *audiencia* made special grants to the *encomenderos* to collect more tribute than the amount stipulated on the tribute list; (2) the Indians were forced to pay more than they were assessed, either by their *cacique*, by the *corregidor*, or by the *encomendero*; (3) the Indians were overworked; (4) the Indians were forced to perform personal service; (5) the Indians were forced to carry heavy loads as beasts of burden; (6) land was taken from the Indians illegally; (7) the Indians were forced to carry their tribute from the town in which they lived to the *encomenderos*’

places of residence; (8) old taxations were continued after a plague or something similar had depopulated the land; (9) the caciques were defrauding the Crown of its income by hiding many Indians when a new tax list was to be drawn up; after the taxation was made the Indians who had been hidden were forced by the cacique to pay tribute to him; (10) the corregidor and the cacique worked to deprive the Crown of income and to overtax the tributepaying Indians; (11) Indians hid themselves so that after the tax list was drawn up they could return and help their families pay the smaller taxation; and (12) the the Indians made continual complaints, many unwarranted, asking for new taxations".³⁹ The findings of RAMÍREZ and later ZORITA's treatise offered clear evidence that the Crown had failed to end the rampant abuses of the tribute system.

ZORITA's proposals then were offered in the light of the failure of the prevailing policy. In castigating the encomenderos, he left no doubt that he shared LAS CASAS' view that the continuance of the encomienda was responsible for the demise of the native peoples. But the struggle to end it succumbed to the economic interests of the Crown and the colonists in the 1540's. The focus of pro-Indian activism shifted to reforming the tribute system. ZORITA recommended that itinerant judges visit regularly the towns, farms, and textile factories to assess the value of their lands and products and to ascertain the population of each town.⁴⁰ They would also protect the ancient privileges and liberty of the Indian nobility by exempting them from tribute. Before determining what tribute each town should pay a representative of the town, whether Indian or encomendero, would meet with the judges to discuss the assessment and reach a consensus on the amount of tribute. In this way popular consent would be obtained before tribute was levied. An assessment should be the same for four or five years. If a town found it impossible to meet its tribute through an epidemic or crop failure, appeal should be made to the audiencia for relief. Since this process was likely to take time and money before resolution, Zorita suggested that the town official or religious report crop failures and epidemics as soon as they occurred. After the assessment had been made according to the economic activity and population of the town, the natural lords should be empowered to apportion to each member what he had to pay for they knew best what each person was able to pay. The tribute roll should then be sent to the corregidor and subsequently to the audiencia.

Members of the community should be assembled in the church in the presence of the corregidor and the priest who instructed them and informed of the amount of tribute the community as a whole and each one specifically must pay. Any surplus would remain with the community while a deficit would be made up by the community. For ZORITA, popular understanding and agreement were necessary to prevent "the evil of suits and counts, and the costs, assessments, and official visits they bring in their train". Tribute should be kept in a special community house to which the natural lord and two other town officials would have keys. A money box would remain in the house for the tribute that was paid in money and to keep the account books

"in which is set down who are the tribute-payers for each year, what the tribute comes to, what was taken in or taken out of the house and box, what was expended, and by whose order, and the like".

To eliminate the abuses committed by the *encomenderos*, he suggested that their share of the tribute should come from the community treasury and that in no way should they be allowed to have business in Indian towns. They were accustomed to frequent Indian towns, demanding service and supplies without pay. ZORITA felt that the only solution lay in preventing them from visiting Indian towns except on days appointed for the collection of tribute. Urging the Crown to return to the pre-conquest practice of soliciting tribute in the form of produce rather than money, he proposed that land be specifically set aside for this purpose. The *encomendero* would provide the seeds of the crops the Indians were to grow while the Indians would be responsible for sowing and cultivating the fields, harvesting and storing the crops in the provincial capital.

ZORITA insisted that this would not only ameliorate the burdens imposed on the Indians but it would make the economy more rational and beneficial to the whole society. Payment of tribute in money had forced the Indians to abandon their traditional agricultural activity in favor of commerce. The result was a shortage of food. If the Indians were allowed to plant maize, beans, and chili peppers, there would be an abundance of food for the whole society. Moreover, the material condition of the Indians would become better since these products were in demand. To cover the expenses of the community and to provide for the upkeep of the lord, ZORITA recommended the cultivation of pieces of land in a similar fashion.

He questioned the excessive demands for labor of the *encomenderos* and charged that it was their insatiable thirst for luxury and extravagance that warranted it. After all, he contended, they possessed mines, estates, and other profitable businesses. If they were not satisfied, they should seek gainful employment. ZORITA was of the opinion that the satisfaction of the labor demands of Spanish towns could be carried out more advantageously for the Indians than was the practice. Indian towns should be ordered to send a fixed number of laborers to Spanish towns every week for hire together with loads of fuel and vegetables. However, wages and prices should not be fixed and the Indians should be allowed to sell their labor and produce at the market price, as opposed to the current practice of fixed wages and prices whereby they received one-half of what they received in their own towns. In this way "the assignment of people for labor in the Spanish towns will be made with due regard for the needs of the Indian town in which they live and of the Spanish towns where they are to work".

In determining a more just tribute policy ZORITA proposed a system that was for the most part similar to that practiced in Indian society before the conquest. The pre-conquest system was not based on equality. Indeed, it might appear to have been arbitrary. The burden of tribute fell on the commoners, the *macehuales*, and not on the more privileged classes of nobles, magistrates, and distinguished warriors who along with the sick, the

poor and the young were exempt from tribute. However, ZORITA understood the complexity of the issue. What was clearly needed was a system that would make the transition from the native economy to the Spanish monetary economy less disruptive to the Indian communities than was the case during the early years of colonization. His recommendation of the main lines of preconquest tribute, unequal though it was, was based on the awareness that the underlying motivation of the Indian system was to provide order and harmony in the community.

ZORITA has been accused of being unfair in his criticism of the Spaniards, and exaggerating the felicity of Indian society.⁴¹ But his analysis of the social and economic conditions in Mexico agreed with others of his own time. The visitador, DIEGO RAMIREZ, found that "the economic needs of the Spaniards, their dependence upon Indian labor and its produce, seldom allowed the enlightened laws of the Crown to be put in operation". It was true that through the efforts of the reformers the Crown enacted legislation to limit the excesses of the colonists. But the gap between law and reality was great, as the report of RAMIREZ demonstrated. Moreover, what more convincing proof of ZORITA's analysis could there be than the astounding decline of the Indian population? A study of population trends between 1550 and 1570, the period between the two great epidemics of 1544-1546 and 1575-1579, showed that the population declined at a rate of 2 to 4 percent a year, thereby corroborating ZORITA's analysis that the increasing labor demands and social dislocation were the primary reasons for the population decline.

If ZORITA painted pre-conquest Indian society too brightly, one must remember the intense political debate that prevailed at the time over the rationality of Indian society. Perhaps he was unaware that at the beginning of the sixteenth century Indian society had evolved into a complex structure where "urban life, the increasing complexity of functions, the increase of the dominions and the accompanying task of administration, and the emergence of commerce all ineluctably and irremediably changed the ancient ways".⁴² When he came to Mexico he had already seen the catastrophic effects of Spanish colonization in the islands. His experience in Mexico had filled him with horror that the same fate would befall the native Mexican people. Embellished though his treatment of the Indian nobility might be, his description of the dynamics of Indian society and its emphasis on social relations placed in stark relief the cruelty of early Spanish colonial society, and afforded posterity the valuable opportunity to see that Indian culture, "so suddenly destroyed, is one of those that humanity can be proud of having created".

In 1561 ZORITA and FRAY JACINTO DE SAN FRANCISCO proposed a plan to pacify the warlike Chichimec Indians who had been at war with the Spaniards since the opening of the silver mines at Zacatecas in 1546. Faithful to the philosophy of non-violence of LAS CASAS, they proposed to invite the Indians to settle in towns where all lay Spaniards would be prohibited from entering. Here they would change their nomadic ways and follow a peaceful, agricultural life. Following the rejection of this request, ZORITA returned to Spain in

1566. He continued his interest in colonial matters and corresponded with his friends in the pro-Indian movement. It is not known when he died but it is assumed that his death took place shortly after 1585 when he completed the *Relación de las cosas notables de la Nueva España*.

¹ See RICARDO G. VILLOSLADA, *La Universidad de Paris durante los estudios de Francisco de Vitoria*, Analecta Gregoriana, XIV, Rome, 1938; MARCEL BATAILLON, *Erasmus et l'Espagne*, Paris, 1937.

² ALONSO DE ZORITA, *The Lords of New Spain*, translated and with an introduction by BENJAMIN KEEN (London, 1965). It is not known when ZORITA wrote this treatise. Keen suggests that it was written before 1570.

³ *IBID.*, 60–63. The life and works of FRAY BARTOLOME DE LAS CASAS are well known. See my article in ZMR 61 (1977) 128–136; FRAY BERNARDINO DE SAHAGÚN studied at the university of Salamanca and professed as a Franciscan friar in 1529 when he set out for Mexico. He learned the Mexican languages and wrote a monumental work on the rites, customs, and mode of government of the natives. See BERNARDINO DE SAHAGÚN, *General History of the Things of New Spain*, Florentine codex, translated from Aztec into English by A. J. O. ANDERSON and C. E. DIBBLE, Salt Lake City, 1950–55; FRAY TORIBIO BENAVENTE MOTOLINIA (Fray Toribio took the name Motolinia, “poor man”, in Mexico) came to Mexico in 1524 as one of the original twelve missionaries requested by Cortes. In addition to his missionary activity, he made an intensive study of the Indian languages, customs, and history. See F. B. STECK, *Motolinia's History of the Indians of New Spain*. Washington, Academy of American Franciscan History, 1951; FRAY FRANCISCO DE LAS NAVAS, came to Mexico as an aide to Bishop Juan de Zumarraga in 1528. He wrote a grammar of the Mexican Language. See the translation by REMI SIMEON, *Grammaire de la langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine*, Paris, 1875; PABLO NAZAREO was one of the Indian graduates of the college of Santa Cruz de Tlaltelolco. He translated the epistles of St. Paul and the Gospels into the Mexican language. See F. B. STECK, *El primer colegio de América, Santa Cruz de Tlaltelolco*, Mexico, 1944.

⁴ *IBID.*, 89ff., 300 n. 22; R. S. CHAMBERLAIN, *The concept of the Señor Natural as revealed by Castilian law and administrative documents*, *Hispanic American Historical Review*. XIX (1939), no 2, 130–137; C. GIBSON, *Spain in America* (New York, 1966), 26. Gibson saw the Aztec aristocracy as aggressive expansionists, engaged in “human sacrifice and the methodical exaction of tribute”.

⁵ *IBID.*, 90.

⁶ *IBID.*, 96.

⁷ *IBID.*, 98–101; for a discussion of speeches as a genre of Aztec literature see A. M. GARIBAY K., *Historia de la literatura Nahuatl*, 2 vols, (Mexico, 1953–59), vol. 1, 401–448.

⁸ B. HAMILTON, *Political Thought in Sixteenth Century Spain*, (Oxford, 1963) 11–29.

⁹ AQUINAS, *Summa Theologica*, I, II, 90, 91.

¹⁰ HAMILTON, *op. cit.*, 16.

¹¹ ZORITA, *op. cit.*, 103–105.

¹² *IBID.*, 106–111; for a discussion of the Calpulli see M. MORENO, *La Organización política y social de los Aztecas* (Mexico, 1931); A. MONZÓN, *El Calpulli en la organización social de los tenocha* (Mexico, 1941); H. DRIVER, *Indians of North America* (New York, 1961).

¹³ *IBID.*, 187.

¹⁴ *IBID.*, 163.

¹⁵ *IBID.*, 165.

¹⁶ *IBID.*, 167.

¹⁷ *IBID.*, 135–152.

- ¹⁸ *IBID.*, 138; ALFONSO CASO, *The Aztecs: People of the Sun*, trans. by L. DUNHAM (University of Oklahoma press, 1958), 85-88.
- ¹⁹ ZORITA, op. cit., 141-151.
- ²⁰ GENARO GARCÍA, *Documentos inéditos o muy raros para la historia de Mexico* (Mexico, 1907), 237-258.
- ²¹ ZORITA, op. cit., 134.
- ²² B. HAMILTON, op. cit., 157.
- ²³ ZORITA, op. cit., 126.
- ²⁴ *IBID.*, 161.
- ²⁵ J. H. PARRY, *The Spanish Seaborne Empire* (New York, 1970), 99-135.
- ²⁶ F. BRAUDEL, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Phillip II*, trans. by S. Reynolds (New York, 1972), vol. I. 462-542; EARL J. HAMILTON, *American Treasure and the Price Revolution in Spain, 1501-1650* (Harvard University Press, 1934), 301.
- ²⁷ L. B. SIMPSON, *The Encomienda in New Spain* (Berkeley, California, 1929), 82; S. A. ZAVALA, *La Encomienda India*, 2nd. ed. (Mexico, 1973), 48ff.
- ²⁸ ZORITA, op. cit., 206.
- ²⁹ S. F. COOK AND W. BORAH, *The Indian Population of Central Mexico, 1531-1610* (Berkeley, Cal. 1960); C. GIBSON, *Spain in America* (New York, 1966), 63.
- ³⁰ ZORITA, op. cit., 209.
- ³¹ *IBID.*, 219-229; J. MIRANDA, *El Tributo Indígena en la Nueva España durante el siglo XVI* (Mexico, 1952).
- ³² ZORITA, op. cit., 212.
- ³³ *IBID.*, 174-179.
- ³⁴ SIMPSON, op. cit., 80-179.
- ³⁵ *IBID.*, 170.
- ³⁶ F. CHEVALIER, *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico*, translated by A. EUSTIS (University of California Press, 1963).
- ³⁷ *IBID.*, 191ff.
- ³⁸ R. RICARD, *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico*, trans. by L. B. SIMPSON (Berkeley, Cal., 1961), 153.
- ³⁹ W. V. SCHOLES, *The Diego Ramirez Visita* (Columbia, Missouri, 1946), 48.
- ⁴⁰ ZORITA, op. cit., 243-249.
- ⁴¹ J. GARCIA ICAZBALCETA, *Nueva Colección de Documentos para la Historia de Mexico*, vol. 3 (Mexico, 1941), XVIII.
- ⁴² J. SOUSTELLE, *Daily Life of the Aztecs on the Eve of the Spanish Conquest*, trans. by P. O. BRIAN (Stanford, Cal., 1961), 86.