“Becoming Colonial” O’Toole Lecture 2b

*Study Questions -* “We Are the Other” **Tom Cummins**

1. What did Franz Fanon mean when he explained that “knowing” meant objectification? How is “knowing” about not really knowing?
2. What are representations?
3. What is the colonial problematic of familiar forms and distinct people? What makes colonial paintings distinct?
4. Who created **colonial portraits** of native elite and Inca kings in Spanish colonial society? Who saw these portraits (p. 203)? What were the purposes of these portraits?
5. According to art historian Tom Cummins, how were the portrait paintings part of the “**acculturation** process” (p. 208) of Andean nobles, Inca descendants, and Andean commoners? Did the portrait painting teach and indoctrinate indigenous Andeans “passive acquiescence” to “Spanish rule and relentless economic exploitation” (p. 208)?
6. How did the ***kurakakuna***assist in Spanish colonization of Peru, of the Inca empire, and of the Andes? What was the position of *kurakakuna* in Spanish colonial society (p. 209), and what were their privileges?
7. How is Cummins arguing that the *kurakakuna* were active while native (commoner) Peruvians (or *indios tributaries*, “tributary Indians”) were passive participants in, or observers of, Spanish colonialism? How does he employ **evidence** from the Corpus Christi painting (circa 1675) to support his **historical interpretation**?
8. How do the portraits indicate the Spanish **transformation** of Andean *kurakakuna* into “a reasonable semblance of the colonists themselves” (p. 211)? What **evidence** does Cummins employ from the portrait of don Marcos Chiguan/don Marcos Chiquathopa to support his **historical interpretation** that the representation of don Marcos is one of “a transformed and coopted elite” (p. 211)?
9. How does the portrait form itself codify the status of the colonial *kurakakuna* (p. 211)? How does the representation prove the *kurakakuna*’s right to be colonial leaders of indigenous Andean commoners (p. 212)?
10. Cummins asserts that the claim of the colonized is an **epistemological shift** (p. 212) by exploring independent messages of image and text (p. 217). How did the colonial Inca and the colonial *kurakakuna* employ images and texts to prove their legal claims in colonial courts? Which parts of their representations were fictions (p. 218)?
11. How did the colonial *kurakakuna* transform the Inca tassel or *maskja paycha* (mascapaycha) and the rainbow, among other Inca signs (pp. 219, 220)? Who were the audiences for these representations (p. 222)?
12. Cummins argues that, in addition, the colonial Inca representations “legitimatized the authority of the *kurakakuna”* and “also justified all native subservience to Spanish authority” (p. 223). How does the **evidence** from colonial processions support Cummins’ **historical interpretation**?
13. How did colonial representation of the Inca mean “no place for an independent Andean identity or will” (p. 224) according to Cummins? How then was “Indianness” or the “other” in these portraits really Spanish (p. 224)?

A note: *Kurakakuna* is the plural of *kuraka*, which means local indigenous leader in the Andes. People in the past employed, and scholars in the present employ *cacique* and *curaca* to mean local Andean indigenous leaders.

*Study Questions – “*[Don Marcos Chiquathopa](http://vistas-visual-culture.net/themes/pre-columbian-images-06/" \t "_blank)”

1. Examine the portrait of don Don Marcos Chiguan/don Marcos Chiquathopa. Do you find evidence in this **primary source** to support the **historical interpretation** of the **secondary source**, Tom Cummins? Is this a representation of a “transformed and coopted elite” (Cummins 211)?
2. What evidence can you extract from the portrait to counter Cummins’ argument? How did don Marcos Chiguan/don Marcos Chiquathopa employ Inca signs and Spanish forms to articulate his interpretation of his status as a colonial *kurakakuna*?