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**Abstract**

Conflicts between the Spanish Crown and colonizers created tumultuous conditions in which enemies became allies and the seeds of nationalism were sown amidst treachery and betrayal. This chapter examines the chaotic nineteenth century and how it set the stage for debates that have lasted to the present regarding how Andean nations should be conceptualized and constituted and how to define citizenship.

**Introduction**

The national histories of Andean nations are built on the foundations of the so-called *Historia Patria* that sought to explain independence as the struggle of oppressed nations against a despotic colonial power. These narratives, however, fit uncomfortably with the reality of how the wars of independence actually unfolded and make it difficult to explain the complicated paths that led to the establishment of new states in the first quarter of the nineteenth century and the progressive development of ideas of nationhood which, in some cases, have persisted to the present day. The Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador we know today emerged in 1830 after the failure of the Bolivarian experiment of Colombia, which we now call Gran Colombia. Bolivia and Peru did not become independent republics until 1824 and 1825, respectively, and briefly attempted to form a Confederation between 1836 and 1839. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first charts the processes that led to independence as well as attempts by historiographers of the Andean Republics to identify “precursor” moments or foundational myths. The second concentrates on how liberalism and republicanism underpin these nations inhabited by diverse populations. These are instances when, according to traditional history the “nation” expressed its desire to be free from colonial power. In the first section, we review these origin myths of independence. In some countries, the uprisings of Tupac Amaru and Tupaj Katari have been identified catalysts for independence.[[1]](#endnote-1) Others have sought them in the establishment of *Juntas* (Governing Boards) in 1809 in the cities of Chuquisaca, La Paz and Quito. In the second section, we look at the debates over who had the right to citizenship began during the monarchical crisis. These debates became more acute during the nineteenth century, a time that can be understood as the moment when the new republics sought to integrate their varied populations that include a large number of indigenous peoples.

**Precursors and Juntas: Independence and Its Origins**

Historiographers have debated extensively whether independence resulted from long-term causes, namely the changes brought by the differences in style of government of the Habsburg and the Bourbon dynasties; or if it instead resulted from the sudden shock of the Napoleonic invasion to the peninsula in 1808 and the intense reverberations felt throughout the Hispanic Monarchy.[[2]](#endnote-2) In the Andes long-term causes have dominated the understanding of the period since the repercussions from unrest caused by the great rebellions of 1780 were particularly long lasting. This is because tax-riots seen from Bogotá to Arequipa were contemporaneous with the Túpac Amaru and Tupaj Katari rebellions that took place around the cities of Cusco and La Paz. All were, to a large degree, reactions to the changes introduced by the Bourbon Reforms.

Neither the War of Spanish Succession (1702-1715) nor the Seven Years War (1754-1763) caused as much disruption in the Andes as the Napoleonic invasion, even though the loss of communication with the Peninsula was comparable on all three occasions (Kamen, 1969; Stein and Stein, 2003; Esdaile, 2015). The main difference between the first two conflicts and the latter was the implementation of the reforms introduced by the Bourbons. Initially conceived to increase control over government in the peninsula they were eventually rolled out to the colonies, dramatically altering the conditions in the American continent and in the Andes, in particular. The reforms included an opening of trade, increased taxation, and militarization through the development of local militias, as well as administrative changes that led to the creation of new viceroyalties: New Granada (1717-1739) and Río de la Plata (1776).[[3]](#endnote-3) The enlightenment also brought with it new notions that had long-lasting impact in the Americas (Hamnett, 2017). Fresh views on sovereignty supported the revolution in Britain’s thirteen colonies leading to the Declaration of Independence and a Constitution. These same ideas led many in the Andes to reflect on their relationship with those who governed them, given the project of centralization that characterized the Bourbon Reforms.

Regina Grafe and Alejandra Irigoin have argued that while in the British Empire those in the colonies were, due to their economic scheme of representation and government, “shareholders”; in the Spanish Empire, the political economy made them “stakeholders” (2011).[[4]](#endnote-4) Grafe and Irigoin (2006) argue that the reason the Spanish Empire remained so stable for so long, governed without the need for force, was because elites and corporate groups negotiated their relationship directly with the King, and thus participated in their own governance, often by purchasing appointments. The Bourbon reforms challenged this arrangement, just at the time when the sovereign’s authority to tax, and the relationship between government and the people within its jurisdiction was being viewed more critically. The success of the Independence of the United States of America further fueled these critiques.

The late eighteenth century was also a time of demographic and economic growth in the Andes, as populations had begun to recover from the acute displacement of initial colonization. Although the mining industry in Potosí did not flourish at the same rate as Mexico’s, it continued to thrive, remaining at the center of a very large economic area reaching from Buenos Aires to Lima (Grafe and Irigoin, 2006). The Viceroyalty of the Rio de la Plata divided the territories around Lake Titicaca whose people had considered themselves as part of the same unit since before the arrival of the Inca. This led to severe disruptions in the region, further aggravated by growing fiscal pressure on the local populations. But discontent with taxation was not limited to the region that had been separated by the new viceroyalty in 1776. Anti-tax riots extended in 1780 and 1781 from Arequipa to the Comunero revolt in Bogotá, the very same year the uprising of Túpac Amaru and Tupaj Katari erupted. The Great Rebellion, as it came to be known, impacted large areas of the southern Andes from Arequipa to Cuzco and La Paz, and lasted for over eighteen months.

The works of Walker (2014), Serulnikov (2003) and Thompson (1996) make it clear that the region was beset with discontent, which led to the mobilization of a variety of populations. Their work also shows how these movements nevertheless failed to become multi-ethnic coalitions fighting for emancipation. The work of David Garrett (2005) also highlights that it is not possible to think of Indians as a homogeneous group, as the needs and realities of nobles, for instance, were very different from those of the people subjected to taxation and who lived in the commons, or from Indians who had left their lands in search of work, becoming *forasteros*. It was precisely because these nobles, who could trace their ancestry back to the Incas, opposed Tupac Amaru that he was defeated. But despite the support they gave colonial authorities and the loyalty they displayed, the institution of the *cacicazgo*, or *kurakazgo* (chiefdoms) as it was known in the Andes, was severely weakened by the important backlash against Inca identity after the Great Rebellion. Quechua was banned, along with the use of indigenous clothing, and the reading of the *Comentarios Reales* written by Garcilaso de la Vega, as colonial authorities were convinced that the reading of this text had helped spark the rebellion (Walker, 2014).

The years that followed, although quiet in the Andes, witnessed the French Revolution, which in turn gave way to unrest in the Caribbean colony of Saint-Domingue. The latter resulted in the first ever slave revolt (1791) from which a new nation emerged. The creation of Haiti in 1804 led to fear among elites that French revolutionary ideas would spread to the Andes (Rosas and Ragas, 2008). Similarly, the severe disruption caused by the Great Rebellion, especially the virulent targeting of European and American Spaniards, resulted in a view held by historians in the first half of the twentieth century that, in the Andes at the end of the eighteenth century, fear was so pervasive that it made it impossible for multi-ethnic coalitions to form. This fear has been used to explain why, after such a large mobilization against colonial systems in the 1780s, independence took so long to achieve (Rosas, 2009). This view—that fear prevented the coalescence of a multi-ethnic front—is representative of the historiography produced in Lima, the capital city that tends to imagine itself as not being indigenous. It was built from a nationalist Peruvian perspective that attempted to explain why the country failed to seek its independence when other countries did.

In the 1970s this view was reassessed in the historiography written for celebrations of Peru’s 150 Years of Independence, which took place during the military regime led by Juan Velasco Alvarado.[[5]](#endnote-5) The place of Tupac Amaru shifted to become the first “precursor” in the very long fight for independence and self-determination. The statue to commemorate the 1824 Battle of Ayacucho built in the battlefield in 1974 is 44 stories high, each representing a year of fighting. But, despite this nationalistic view, the turmoil in the Andes in the 1780s did not result in the disintegration of the monarchy, which remained intact until the 1820s.[[6]](#endnote-6)

Between the 1785 and 1805 calm was restored. And it was not until the 1808 Napoleonic invasion of Spain that disruption returned. In 1806 and 1807, emboldened by their victory at Trafalgar, the British had attempted to take over Rio de la Plata and the reaction against them was immediate, with local militias defending themselves against what they saw as an invasion. Support in money and kind was sent to the port from the Andean region (Sobrevilla Perea, 2015). What could have been seen as an opportunity to gain independence from the Spanish crown was instead considered a threat to local government.

Only a year later, Napoleon’s troops invaded the Peninsula leading to the abdication of King Charles IV, in favor of his son Ferdinand VII, but when he was taken captive and he abdicated to Joseph Bonaparte, the reaction in America was quite different. At this point, the whole Hispanic monarchy was plunged into a severe constitutional crisis. Bonaparte attempted to bypass it by enacting a constitution in Bayonne, which was approved by some hastily assembled representatives, but the majority did not consider this to be legitimate (Fernández Sarasola, 2006). As the King was sequestered, but still alive, no new King could be proclaimed. The population in Madrid and many other cities rose up in insurrection and established self-governing Juntas, appealing to the idea that in the absence of the King, sovereignty belonged to the people.[[7]](#endnote-7) In contrast to the fate suffered by the Spanish ruling dynasty, the Portuguese monarchs relocated, with the aid of the British to Rio de Janeiro. From there, Ferdinand VII’s sister, Carlota Joaquina, wife to King Jõao VI of Portugal, attempted to be named regent (Ternavasio, 2015).

In the Andes there was initially no reaction, just the conviction that the authority of the absent King should be respected. But as the power of the regional Juntas in the Peninsula grew, and a Central Junta was established in Seville, the desire among some American elites to have their own representation in regions that had seen their power diminish with the creation of the New Viceroyalties of New Granada and Río de la Plata intensified. In this context, the Juntas of Chuquisaca, La Paz and Quito were created in 1809. Each was established in reaction to specific factors, but all responded to the desire to have a direct relationship to the crown that did not depend on the vice-regal capitals. On May 25th, a Junta was established in Chuquisaca when the instructions sent by the Junta of Seville via an envoy were rejected. A meeting of the judicial court, the *Audiencia*, vetoed the prospective regency of the Infanta (Roca, 1998).

In 1809 the Junta asserted its independence from both Lima and Buenos Aires but was dismantled without the use of force. Tensions in the region continued and fears that the Infanta would be named Regent led to a popular uprising that resulted in the creation on July 16th of a Junta in La Paz, organized around municipal authorities. Much more radical than its predecessor, the Junta mobilized people from a variety of backgrounds, and troops were sent from Cuzco by the Viceroy in Lima, which brought about the end of the uprising in three months (Sobrevilla Perea, 2012). A month later on August 10th, the Creole elites in the *Audiencia* of Quito declared a Junta that no longer recognized the jurisdiction of the viceroys of either New Granada or Peru (Nuñez Sanchez, 2008). Representatives were elected for each of the neighborhoods in the city and envoys were sent to Cuenca, Guayaquil and Panama with the intention of extending its control. But troops were sent from Bogotá and Lima and, like the Junta in La Paz, by October the insurrection had been completely extinguished.

Despite being extremely short-lived and not directly advocating independence, the republics of Bolivia and Ecuador identify in their national narratives the creation of these Juntas as the moments when independence took place. Considering that Bolivia did not emerge until 1825 and Ecuador not until 1830, it is interesting to see how these Juntas of 1809 have captured the imagination of historians searching for the origins of a national sentiment. In reality these Juntas were much more about asserting regional independence from Lima, Bogotá and Buenos Aires by claiming a direct link to the absent King, than about a desire for independence from Spain. Although the Juntas of La Paz and Quito had some popular backing, in both cases they were vehicles for the Creole elites that aimed to assert their position, in large part reacting to the loss of autonomy with the creation of the Bourbon Viceroyalties. As a result, the Viceroy of Peru, Fernando de Abascal, was strengthened as he regained control over regions that had been lost with the Bourbon Reforms.

The Juntas of 1809 also signaled that the colonial authority in the newly established Viceroyalties was weaker. This became even more evident in 1810 when Juntas were created in April in Caracas, in May in Buenos Aires, in July in Bogotá, and in September in both Quito and Santiago. Once again, national historiography has identified these as the moments when independence was achieved even though all the Juntas, with the exception of the one in Río de la Plata, were defeated, and wars were waged for a decade or more before independent republics were finally established. All of the Juntas were the creation of Creole elites, who sought to use them as the mechanism to maintain their privilege in a period of acute uncertainty. The Juntas were also a reflection of how the ideas of the enlightenment had penetrated these social groups and how incipient notions of belonging had begun to develop around smaller localities, often around *Audiencias* (Judicial courts). The monarchical crisis engendered by the Napoleonic invasion led to a reevaluation of belonging and of the relationship that individual regions had with the greater Hispanic monarchy.

**Liberalism and Republicanism in the Andes**

Prior to the United States Constitution and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, most of the population considered the notion that people were equal, absurd. Legal systems had been established to maintain difference not to encourage equality. But the revolutionary processes of the late eighteenth century challenged this as new ideas regarding individual rights began to circulate simultaneously with novel notions of sovereignty and legitimacy. This was undoubtedly one of the greatest changes brought by the Enlightenment as it resulted in a direct challenge to existing systems of governance. Citizenship, as we understand it today, was created in the newly formed Republics of the United States and France (Waldinger, Dawson, and Woloch, 1993). How it was conceptualized varied but provided an alternative to what existed at the time.

In the Andes, colonial authorities had established in the sixteenth century a legal fiction by creating two spaces of jurisdiction, called the Republic of Spaniards and the Republic of Indians (Levaggi, 2001). But this was problematic from its inception since mixing between colonizers and colonized began with the conquest itself creating a new category of people, the *mestizo*,that did not fit into either legal category (Barragán, 1997). A diverse population continued to grow, with further mixing taking place with slaves and freed blacks that accompanied the first conquistadors and continued to arrive to the Andes throughout this period (O’Toole, 2012). There was not only a growing number of *mestizos* but a whole host of other categories proliferated that developed with the mixing of peoples of all backgrounds and resulted in what was described at the time as a caste system (Thompson, 2007).

This complexity was not due only to the great variety of people who were part of the caste system, or even to the fact that position within them was not fixed since it was possible to purchase certificates stating an individual’s whiteness (Twinam, 2015).[[8]](#endnote-8) Rather, the additional complications arose because even within the Republic of Spaniards differences were drawn between those born in Europe and those who hailed from America. Further, in the Indian Republic, distinctions were made between noble Indians, with access to property, education and wealth (Garrett, 2005); common Indians who had to pay taxes to have rights to communal land and in the Andes had to participate in the *mita*, the collective force labor in mines and textile mills; or *forasteros*, Indians who had abandoned their communal lands and given up both their rights and their obligations. Natives were those who were not part of the colonial system or its legal structure, and were considered savages until missionaries incorporated them.

This complex tapestry of legal categories and people was the context into which war erupted. For those of peninsular origin at the very pinnacle of society their main interest was in maintaining the status quo so that they could retain control over the administration of the colonies as well as of most of its wealth. Only two examples of how to break up with their metropolis were available to them, the American, which allowed for the maintenance of slavery and the preeminence of colonial elites, and the Haitian one were former slaves dominated. After the Napoleonic invasion, some of these Spaniards born in America—who were known as Creoles— reevaluated their situation and began to think that this was an opportunity to recast their relationship with the Crown. Some authors such as Simon Collier (1983) and David Brading (1991) have described this as a consequence of the development of what they call “creole patriotism,” a movement that sought more autonomy and was devoted to the aggrandizement of the locality of origin. But not all American-born Spaniards saw the Imperial crisis as an opportunity to sever ties with the Metropolis and many remained committed to remaining part of the Hispanic Monarchy to the bitter end.

Neither those fighting for breaking their ties with the crown nor those who aimed to maintained their relationship with it could be assured of support from those of indigenous origin, or from the variety of *castas* (Méndez, 2005; Sobrevilla Perea, 2015; and Echeverri, 2016). The armies and militias on both sides were made up from people from all the *castas*, and it was not necessarily the case that someone’s ethnicity would make them more inclined to support one side or the other (Blanchard, 2008; Echeverri, 2011; Sobrevilla Perea, 2011). From 1809 onwards the colonial militias that had sometimes been organized along ethnic lines other militias which highlighted the locality of origin, became the bases for the armies that were set up all over the Andes, initially to fight over the creation of Juntas, and eventually to defend the King or to fight for independence.

Who was going to be incorporated into the political entities that were being created and in what way varied greatly depending on the proposed projects. In Venezuela in 1811, for instance, it was clear to those who were part of the *castas* that Creoles had no intention of including them as equals in their projected Republic. This was one of the reasons the castas supported those who fought against it (Blanchard, 2008). In the confrontations between the Junta of Buenos Aires and the Viceroyalty of Peru in the Altiplano around Lake Titicaca between 1810 and 1816, Indians of all kinds fought on both sides of the conflict, as did Creoles and even European Spaniards (Sobrevilla Perea, 2015). The first changes of a liberal nature were in fact proposed by those in the Peninsula as they were attempting to maintain their relationship with the American possessions at the time when the Napoleonic occupation was threatening to destroy the Hispanic Monarchy from within.

In 1810, the Regency decided to call for the meeting of a parliament. In honor of the medieval institution it was given the name of *Cortes* and it assembled in the port city of Cádiz under the protection of the British. Representatives were elected for the whole monarchy and America was declared to be an integral part of the Monarchy and not a colony (Garriga and Lorente, 2007). All men who hailed from Europe or America over the age of 25 who were homeowners could vote and be elected, in a process that was indirect and took place at three different jurisdictional levels, the parish, the districtand the province. In the Peninsula elections were held at the city level whereas in America representatives were elected for Viceroyalties and Captaincies-General (Rieu-Millan, 1990). As most of the elected representatives could not travel, those who met at the Cortes were mainly alternates who were based in Cádiz, and they took quite radical liberal measures.

In the Andes, the Cádiz Cortes abolished the *mita* and the Indian Tribute in 1811, important interventions that reflected the Cortes’s extremely liberal posture (Peralta Ruiz, 2008). They backed these actions despite opposition of the Peruvian representative who argued the *mita* should be extended to all the people who lived in the areas close to the mines. But as Indians were now considered equal to Spaniards, most representatives to Cortes thought it unfair that Indians should pay taxes because of their ethnic origin, or work for free. In an even more surprising turn of events, many of the indigenous people of the Andes chose to continue paying tribute on a voluntary basis (O’Phelan, 1997). Many Indians considered it their duty to pay because they received access to communal land in exchange. This was the beginning of one of the most enduring issues for nineteenth-century liberals in the Andes: whether Indians should pay tribute and if their control of communal lands should be guaranteed by their payment of tribute.[[9]](#endnote-9)

The Constitution passed in 1812 was built on liberal notions, but as Roberto Breña has argued, it differed greatly from either the American constitution or the French one of 1792 because it was written in defense of an absent King and not as an attempt to break away from him (Breña, 2015). It was firmly Catholic and although it presented the two hemispheres of the Monarchy, as equal, with citizenship granted to both, representation was not balanced, as less populated Spain had more representatives than America (Sobrevilla Perea, 2016). Some areas that had declared Juntas rejected the Cádiz Constitution because they were not given equal representation. But whether it was implemented or not, the Cádiz Constitution served as a blueprint for all the other constitutions written in the region after independence. This experience established a strong and enduring link between having a constitution and a legitimate government.

The Constitution had yet another problem, the official denial of citizenship to those of African descent. In practice, a loophole existed which permitted those who had defended the King to vote. This meant that in some regions African descendants could not vote whereas in others, they could. As a consequence, some areas with large black populations rejected the constitution while others embraced it (Eastman and Sobrevilla Perea, 2015). As a result, large areas of the Andes, from Popayán in present day Colombia to the *altiplano* (high-altitude plateau) in present day Bolivia, to regions throughout Peru, the Cádiz Constitution was enacted and put into practice, introducing liberalism to large areas with indigenous, African, and mixed populations and providing these groups with citizenship.

One of the most revolutionary consequences of the extension of citizenship to these populations was the explosion of electoral fervor in the Andes. Not only were deputies to Cortes elected but also in all urban areas with more than 1000 inhabitants, municipal authorities were to be chosen yearly. Although indigenous people had voted in the colonial period, an important change was introduced as those chosen governed not only the republic of Indians, but in many cases mixed administrations of Spaniards and Indians. As Nuria Sala i Vila has shown, this meant that municipal authorities who were indigenous could be found in places where Spaniards also lived (1993). Elections spread throughout Andean societies and in spite of the great variation in levels of participation, they became ingrained in the idea of legitimacy, and in some regions, such as Peru, the franchise remained open for most of the nineteenth century.

However, the Constitution was short-lived. In 1814 after the defeat of Napoleon, Ferdinand VII was returned to Spain and he sought to recapture his power as absolute King. This proved to be very difficult and in some areas he was no longer able to regain control. In July 1816, the city of Tucumán declared the Independence of the United Provinces of South America. The latter was an entity that had the illusion of encompassing the provinces previously under the control of the Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata, but with autonomy established in Paraguay since 1811, conflict raging with Montevideo and war over the provinces of Upper Peru, this seemed elusive at best.

In the north of the continent those who had risen against the King were subdued by an expedition sent from the peninsula with the veterans from the Peninsular Wars. This prolonged the wars from 1815 to 1821, but did not impede the creation of Colombia under the stewardship of Simón Bolívar. Colombia encompassed all the provinces of the Viceroyalty of New Granada. War also extended to the south, but eventually Chile became an independent republic in 1818, and from there a naval force was sent to the coast of Peru. Under the command of José de San Martín, independence was declared in Lima in 1821, although a large contingent of Americans and Spaniards continued to defend the King in the Andes until their final capitulation after their defeat in the Battle of Ayacucho in 1824.

Warefare sealed the fate of each of the Andean republics. They emerged from more than a decade of fighting, but without much clarity over what their exact contours should be. New nations had to be built from scratch, taking into account of distinctive concepts of self and nation. Initial attempts to build large federations were greeted with skepticism by those in the regions that had fought with an idea of more control over their destiny. The Río de la Plata descended into conflict over what kind of relationship the provinces should have with the capital of Buenos Aires, a conflict that was not resolved until the 1860s. Paraguay asserted its independence, as did the newly created Republic of Bolivia, which took its name and first constitution from its Caracas-born liberator.

Bolívar dreamt of a vast Federation of the Andes with a constitution that gave its leader power for life to govern a wide swath of the continent, from the Caribbean to the southern Andes. But just as Bolívar’s constitution was approved in Bolivia and Peru in 1826, he hurriedly returned to Colombia where the union he had built was perilously close to disintegration. In 1830, the union finally splintered and three new Republics emerged: Venezuela, Nueva Granada and Ecuador. Bolívar died shortly afterwards of grief and ill health at the age of 47. He had sealed the end of the Hispanic monarchy in South America and the new republics were governed either by his disciples—like Juan José Flores in Ecuador, Antonio José de Sucre in Bolivia and Andrés de Santa Cruz in Peru and later Bolivia—or by his former foes, such as Francisco de Paula Santander in New Granada and Antonio José de Paez in Venezuela. They aimed to build nations and differences among them in the newly created states whose borders were not completely established, and whose histories remained to be written.

**Nineteenth-Century Nations**

From the fulcrum of war new nations emerged which, in their first years, were consumed by conflict over how exactly they should be governed and organized. The issue of legitimacy lingered from the time of imperial crisis and continued to plague the new states. Some new republics saw constitutions and elections as a basis for making a claim to legitimate government, but, often, emboldened by their military success or frightened by their possible enemies, the leaders who emerged from the wars of independence competed over the control of the state apparatus. New nations were built on the basis of what existed: a deeply powerful and influential Catholic church, colonial legislation, a military apparatus inherited from more than a decade of war, diverse populations, as well as vast territories with cities and hinterlands with strong local identities that were difficult to integrate.

These conditions contributed to a long and complicated process of establishing nations, which lasted well into the last third of the nineteenth century. Wars became a conspicuous feature during this period. Confrontation took place between the new republics, sometimes to establish borders, other times to support one side or another of a civil war. Leaders emigrated freely from one republic to another aiming to strengthen their opposition to those in power. Internal conflict became endemic making the difficult task of creating new state structures harder still. Nations were still porous, their borders and citizenship ill-defined until at least the 1840s.

Towards midcentury, a new generation of liberals came of age and sought to implement the changes they considered had not been achieved by those who fought for independence. In most cases this meant the abolition of slavery that remained in all the Andean republics until the 1850s, with the exception of Chile and Bolivia, where it had been abolished it much sooner. Indian tribute became once again an issue of contention in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia where it had been reintroduced after a short-lived abolition. Many discussions over citizenship that had taken place during the period of the Cádiz Constitution were rekindled. Should Indians and African descendants, some of whom were still slaves, have the same rights? Could they be considered equal to whites?

Who was to be a citizen and what rights were to be guaranteed were major issues of debate throughout the nineteenth century and even the twentieth. Communal lands that had been protected by tribute began being disaggregated, and corporate rights and obligations came to an end, placing indigenous people in vulnerable positions. The idea that they should be equal in the face of the law was not equated to the notion that they should have some legal protections. Liberals also reevaluated their relationship with the Catholic Church to diminish its power and wealth. In some areas such as Colombia this led to war; in others like Peru and Ecuador the Church continued to work with the state to control large indigenous populations. In time, liberals managed to dismantle local systems of finance backed by local parishes and ended the control of the ecclesiastical courts. The tensions between regionalism and centralism endured adding further fuel to the fire of these first years of independence, which were dominated by men of the military.

In the first hundred years of existence the new republics that emerged the in the Andes strongly established themselves as independent nations. Many of the ideas of “imagined communities” proposed by Anderson ( 1991) developed during the nineteenth century after independence and not before, as many nationalist historians have argued. Indians, African descendants and mixed people were integrated with variable success into the ideas of what constituted the nation, some by promoting ideas of mixed nations, such as Colombia and Venezuela. Other nations, such as Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia, kept an uneasy relationship with the indigenous majorities, while Chile and Argentina imagined themselves as increasingly white and civilized as they destroyed many of their indigenous populations.

As the nineteenth century progressed, liberals were in ascendancy in all the Andean nations. Ideas of science and progress dominated elite circles that had managed to consolidate their control over the political and economic arenas in the new nations. By the time of the War of the Pacific (1879-1883), the independence of Panama (1904), the war between Colombia and Peru (1932-1933) and the Chaco war between Paraguay and Bolivia (1932-1935) things had changed dramatically and a sense of nation had emerged strongly in all the Andean nations. Nevertheless, in spite of the development of nationalism the promise of equality ushered in by the Enlightenment and independence was not realized. Instead, and as time went on, inequality increased in all the Andean nations.
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