

<p>Historical Writing</p> <p>Garcilaso de la Vega</p> <p>Montesinos</p> <p>Incan History according to Montesinos.</p> <p>Strong and Weak Incan Kings.</p>	<p>The lack of historical writing by the Incans prevents an accurate appraisal of their evolution in terms of skills and ability.</p> <p>William H. Prescott overcame some of the historical blindness by collecting chronicles of the conquerors and mestizo decedents of the Incans like Garcilaso Inca de la Vega. Nevertheless, Bingham sees Garcilaso’s account as being biased by his permanent residence in Europe. Instead, he prefers Fernando de Montesinos’s account of Peru’s history. This Spanish monk brought modern medicine to Peru and, despite his clerical prejudice, he highlighted the importance of <i>amautas</i> in the cultural evolution of the Incans. He also recorded medical advances like quinine or <i>cinchona</i> and <i>huilca</i>, a hallucinogenic snuff. Montesinos’ history focuses on the Incan king Vilcanota and his pacification of hostile forces, on his son Tupac Yupanqui (who inherited the crown), and on Huaman Tacco, his great-grandson and <i>amauta</i>. In his version of Incan history, Pachacuti was not a great leader but rather fell prey to unwise military tactics. Thanks to him the Incan reign disappeared for 400 years until Titu Huaman Quicho restored it. Titu Huaman Quicho raised Pachacuti from the dead (Bingham fails to mention huacos and mummies) and the kings of Tampu-tocco rule for another 400 years. Only when Pachacuti VII rules do the Incans reclaim territories taken away by the barbarians that originally attacked Pachacuti. Afterwards he began a program of eradicating superstition and outlawing written texts or <i>quilcas</i>, which he said caused pestilence. Thus, evolved the <i>quipus</i>. According to Montesinos it was Manco Capac that extended the Incan land north and built the great walls. Inca Atahualpa was a weaker “vacillating” monarch.</p>	<p>Bingham did not read in Spanish, nor was he aware of Guamán Poma de Ayala.</p> <p>He believes that the Europeans were more objective than the mestizos.</p> <p>His vision of ruling seems Darwinian. The most fit ruler.</p>
---	---	---

Before recounting the history of the Incans that he sees as the most accurate, Bingham recognizes the obstacles that inhibit an accurate portrayal of Incan historic “evolution”. These mainly are no Incan writing system and prejudiced accounts of history made by mestizos and European historians. Of the two prejudiced accounts, Bingham prefers the European one, where limited advances are made in medicine and Incan rulers fail or succeed according to their ability to survive militarily. He sees the Incans as “benevolent despots”.
