Section 1: The Long Term

Chapter 1: How (Not) To Make A Durable State

Natalia Sobrevilla Perea

The great transformations brought by the age of revolution at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth resulted in the final dismemberment of the composite Hispanic Monarchy (*monarquía española*) and the emergence of over a dozen new states, which embarked on the process of creating nations. This was not only the case as regards the new republics that arose in the Spanish transatlantic possessions from Mexico to Chile but also with respect to Spain, which had to redefine itself and build a nation on the remains of an empire that still included the islands of Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines as well as territories in the mainland with important cultural and linguistic differences such as those found in the Basque country, Galicia and Catalonia. The key question was how to build a durable state.

The tendency to study Spain and its American possessions severed from each other, as if they had not been part of the same imperial structure, has resulted in two very distinct and fruitful historiographical traditions, one focused on the Iberian Peninsula and the other concentrated on Hispanic America. Until recently however, only a few studies have aimed to bring together their deeply intertwined history. This has been, in no small measure, due to the interest in Atlantic history, as well as the use of new methodologies less encumbered with borders, such as cultural history.[i] In the light of such approaches, this essay paints an overarching picture of the rise and fall of the Hispanic Monarchy on both sides of the Atlantic. By looking at shared elements in the *longue durée* it hopes to shed light on the institutions that shaped the process of nation-building in the period that followed the Napoleonic invasion of Spain.

This vantage point has been chosen because it is only by looking at the way in which the Hispanic Monarchy came into being that it is possible to understand fully what emerged after its downfall and to identify the main problems that continue to mar the nations and states emerging in its wake. In their recent article in defence of *longue durée*, David Armitage and Jo Guildi, posit that this perspective "allows us to step outside of the confines of national history to ask about the rise of long-term complexes, over many decades, centuries, or even millennia."[ii] Jeremy Adelman noted in his 2004 review essay, "Latin American Longue Durées," that Latin Americans have long been enamored by the *longue durée*, citing on the one hand Octavio Paz and on the other the great influence of the French School of the Annales in the region.[iii] Very little has been done, however, to study both sides of the Hispanic Atlantic using this view in spite of the relevance of their shared history.

The inspiration for approaching them together does not stem from culturalist explanations that tend to portray the Hispanic world as less developed because of deeply ingrained cultural traits, a view championed by authors as diverse as Richard Morse, Brian Loveman and Claudio Veliz.[iv] This work draws its inspiration instead from Max Weber's sociological interpretation of the role played by the Catholic Church in shaping institutions and from what political scientists and economists call path dependence.[v] I argue that the way in which the Hispanic Monarchy was constituted by the amalgamation of the crowns of Castile and Aragon, with their histories of expansion and dynastic unions, as well as how the colonial enterprise was carried out resulted in deeply embedded systems of government and governance that created particular idiosyncrasies. The way in which the composite monarchy unraveled from the eighteenth century onwards and the attempts the new Bourbon monarchs made to stem this decline are also considered as they created some of the challenges with which the new states had to grapple in the nineteen century. By looking at Europe and

America I hope to present a richer picture of the differences and similarities that characterized both areas in the national period.

The Establishment of the Hispanic Monarchy

The composite Hispanic Monarchy emerged at the end of the fifteenth century with a union of crowns when Isabel of Castile (1474-1504) and Ferdinand of Aragon (1476-1516) married. Driven by a religious zeal that led them to be called The Catholic Monarchs (*Reyes Católicos),* they defeated the final remnants of the Moors in Granada, expelled the Jews from Spain and embraced the colonial enterprise with the discovery of what was then believed to be a passage to the Indies through the west. Both Aragon and Castile were already composite monarchies.[vi] In the case of the former, there had been a union of Catalonia, Aragon, Valencia and their Mediterranean possessions, while the latter was made up of Castile, León, Toledo and the aggregation of Murcia, Córdoba, Jaén, Seville and Granada, more recently taken from the Moors. Galicia, Asturias and some of the Basque provinces had also pledged their allegiance to the crown of Castile without complete incorporation. Each territory maintained their particular institutions through a direct relationship with the monarch, with laws and practices differing by locality.[vii]

Throughout the fifteenth century the Hispanic Monarchy grew, fuelled to a great extent by the wealth of gold and silver that came from the recently acquired transatlantic colonies. The way in which these regions were colonized and administered responded to the knowledge available to the Catholic Kings. Most historiography has highlighted the leading role played by the crown of Castile and the experience gained during the Reconquista. The Queen had personally financed Columbus' expedition and regarded the lands gained as belonging only to Castile. Practices such as that of naming *adelantados*, individuals who received royal charter to embark on the project of colonization, and of issuing *capitulaciones*,

orders by which the crown reserved itself some prerogatives, had been at the centre of the long wars with the Moors. Towns and later cities played an important role in the conquest and settlement of America, just as they had with the Moors.

Other institutions, however, such as the viceroyalties established in the cities of Mexico and Lima, to govern the northern and southern American regions in the name of the King, were shaped by Aragonese experience in the Mediterranean.[viii] The King of Aragon had reigned over his Italian possessions using the vice-regal system since the Duchy of Athens was set up in the fourteenth century.[ix] This was in part because it was clear that these lands did not belong to the crown but personally to the King, and because their constitutional system demanded he should have a representative if absent. A viceroy governed Sicily since 1415, Sardinia since 1417 and after the defeat of the French in 1504 this was also the case of Naples.[x] Ferdinand appointed viceroys to represent him in Catalonia in 1479, Galicia in 1486, Navarre in 1512, and Aragon itself in 1517. The only other viceroyalties created in the peninsula after his death were those of Valencia in 1520,[xi] and Portugal between 1580 and 1640 when dynastic arrangements brought it to the Spanish monarch.[xii] Although by the early eighteenth century European Viceroyalties had disappeared, that of Navarre stubbornly remained in place until 1843.[xiii]

The other institution that represented the King was the *Audiencia* or royal court. This was a Castilian institution, first established in Valladolid in 1371. The Catholic Kings started a process of rolling these out, by creating one in Ciudad Real in 1494. This was quickly followed by one created to govern the newly conquered region of Granada in 1505. From then on the creation of these judicial entities gathered speed and they were established at the same time on both sides of the Atlantic, with the setting up of the Audiencias of Seville in 1525, Canarias in 1526, Santo Domingo in 1526 and New Spain (Mexico) in 1527.[xiv] This was a case, therefore, not so much of the imposition of new colonial structures in the

Americas, as the development of new systems of government for a range of territories that were acquired at the same time. Recently acquired, Seville and the Canary Islands had to be incorporated into the government of Castile just as much as Santo Domingo or Mexico.

In other parts of the Hispanic Monarchy the Real Audiencia took longer to become entrenched. This was the case in Aragon where the collegiate and itinerant vice-chancellery set up between 1319 and 1387 was settled in Zaragoza by 1528. Judicial prerogatives were maintained, particularly those linked to the *Generalitat* (an administrative region that was initially set up for taxation) in Catalonia and Valencia, which the Habsburg monarchs swore to respect in public ceremonies.[xv] Even so, an Audiencia was created in Valencia in 1506.[xvi] Much earlier, even before the creation of the one at Ciudad Real, Ferdinand had set up an Audiencia to organize justice in Catalonia in 1493. It is therefore evident that the union of the crowns led to some systematization within the monarchy, even if it was limited to the lower courts of justice.

The Habsburgs came to rule Spain after Juana (1504-1555), the daughter of Queen Isabel, inherited the throne of Castile upon her mother's death. Juana's marriage to Phillip of Ghent brought the Low Countries into the realm, and made Flanders central to dynastic aspirations in the fifteenth and sixteen centuries. This process reached its zenith when Charles (1516-1556), the grandson of the Catholic Kings, took over Castile due to his mother's incapacity, and, not long after, was crowned Holy Roman Emperor. Encompassing the Holy Roman territories, as well as large sections of Italy, the Low Countries most of the western Mediterranean islands, all of Iberia, bar Portugal, and the Spanish Americas, this was the largest empire of its time. According to John Elliot, Charles understood it to be an aggregation of parts and scrupulously respected each individual system of government.[xvii] The union in fact did not last long, for Charles divided the realm, giving the German lands and the Holy Roman Empire to his brother Ferdinand and the rest of his possessions to his

son Phillip (1556-1598). This period coincided with the expanded use of the Audiencia. New courts were created in Panama in 1538, Guatemala and Lima in 1543, in Guadalajara (New Galicia) and Santa Fe de Bogotá (New Granada) in 1548, Charcas (Upper Peru) in 1559, Quito in 1563 and Manila in 1583.[xviii] In Europe, new Audiencias were only established outside the mainland, in Las Palmas in 1568, Mallorca in 1571, as well as in Italy, Sardinia in 1564 and Sicily in 1569.[xix] The Audiencia was key because it mediated the relationship between the King, who was the ultimate arbiter of law, and his people, especially in the places where there was no viceroy to directly represent the monarch in courtly ceremony.[xx]

The other institution central to governance in this extensive collection of territories was the Catholic Church. The Hispanic Monarchy that emerged from the Reconquista was conceived as a Catholic Monarchy. The American venture that followed was undertaken with this same religious zeal and the conversion of the newly discovered people was seen as a unique opportunity to expand the mission of Christ. In 1494, the Pope himself divided this new world at the Treaty of Tordesillas between the Spanish and Portuguese crowns, so they could enlarge the Catholic family. Catholicism was important not only in the new Atlantic and Pacific possessions where new subjects had to be incorporated in the true faith, but also much closer to home in the Italian, Mediterranean and even Peninsular regions where different languages, customs and practices were commonplace. The Pope had granted different Iberian kingdoms permissions for their missionary work in places like the Canary Islands as early as the fourteenth century. During the Reconquista, the kingdoms gained the right to collect ecclesiastical taxes, which was important to support their enterprise financially. [xxi]

Once expansion moved beyond Europe, the Hispanic Monarchy received the right to Royal Patronage in 1523. This meant that the King of Spain could control every administrative aspect of religion, not just taxation but most crucially who was appointed to

ecclesiastical positions.[xxii] This support of the "defenders of the true faith" was understandable in the context of the Counter-Reformation, with Spain deeply involved in bloody campaigns in Flanders and the Netherlands. Catholicism was not just the glue, which brought together a vast and diverse empire, but also one of its main arms for governance. The Church administered faith, through catechism and conversion, and held a monopoly over University-level education. Births, deaths and marriages were recorded in the parish, and ecclesiastical courts had jurisdiction over what today is family law. The newly created Inquisition ensured compliance. The Church also played a crucial role in the economy. Convents and monasteries had throughout the middle ages managed vast tracts of land, but in the recently acquired possessions they were at the very vanguard of the colonization process with the establishment of missions and in many cases managing large haciendas and textile-producing proto-factories known as *obrajes*.[xxiii]

The King's deputies in the viceroyalties, the courts of justice and the Catholic Church administered the realm, yet control was not absolute and there was plenty of room for those living in the provinces to maneuver. This Ancien-Régime composite monarchy allowed interest groups to lobby and receive special graces directly from the King. As the head, he united a vast and diverse realm conceived as his body, administered centrally by Councils each dedicated to particular areas of governance. John Elliot has argued that by devolving much of the power to the Viceroys and the Audiencias, but limiting these through Councils and requiring everything to be overseen by Madrid, a system of checks and balances was established that drove everyone to paralysis.[xxiv] At the height of the Habsburg period in the seventeenth century, all posts from the lowest level of government to the highest were purchased. This made it possible for local elites from Mallorca to Charcas, Sicily to Mexico, and Guatemala to Manila, to exercise their power and govern in name of the King.[xxv] To

govern this immense empire the Habsburgs balanced centralization with a high level of devolution.

The Unravelling of The Hispanic Monarchy

Steeped in the historical experience of Rome, the Spanish were very aware their empire would eventually unravel.[xxvi] The sixteen-century *Comunero* revolt in Castile, rebellions in Portugal, Sicily, Naples and Catalonia in 1640 and the eighty years of war in the Low Countries highlighted the difficulties in building a cohesive union. Although the Netherlands had been *de facto* independent from Spain for many years prior to the peace of Westphalia in 1648, this official recognition mattered.[xxvii] Historiography has described the seventeenth century as one of decline, but revisionists such as Christopher Storrs have noted that in spite of the important losses in Flanders, Charles II (1665-1700) managed to maintain much of his European possessions in the face of growing threats, in no small measure due to his ability to integrate them successfully while respecting their traditional systems of governance.[xxviii] This was a period of great expansion in the Americas as the viceroyalties grew in importance and grandeur at the height of the Baroque. Exploration continued and new territories were occupied and exploited. Gold and silver mines, as well as sugar, indigo and cacao plantations continued to provide great wealth. The Catholic ethic was central to the endeavor as missions reached into the deepest jungles claiming new souls, and towns of all sizes teemed with convents and monasteries.[xxix] Even though the wars of religion had ended, Catholic zeal still animated Spain's foreign policy.[xxx]

While the Hispanic monarchy continued to be the most important defender of the faith, the ideas that made the Enlightenment possible developed. Spain remained anchored in the past even as the Age of Discovery fuelled new ways of thinking, and as colonialism, with the terrible blight of slavery, set the engines of capitalism in motion. The death of Charles II

without an heir in 1700 jolted Spain back into the centre of European power politics. Concern with the balance of power in Europe and the desire to take territories close to home and have access to extremely lucrative transatlantic trade led two pretenders to pursue war in order to secure the Spanish succession: the grandson of the King of France and the son of the Emperor of Austria.[xxxi] In 1701, as the last testament of the last Habsburg prescribed, the Bourbon Duke of Anjou was sworn in Madrid as Felipe V, King of the Spains (*Las Españas,* in the plural). An alliance was formed between England, the Netherlands and some Germanic states in support of the Austrian candidate, Charles. Two years later Portugal and the Duchy of Savoy joined them and in 1704 they won the most important battle of the war at Blenheim. The elites in Castile wanting to remain at the core of the Hispanic Monarchy backed Felipe.[xxxii] But the Bourbon grip over the European possessions was shaky, and by 1706 Charles controlled them all from his court in Valencia and Barcelona.[xxxiii] Andalucía had lost Gibraltar to the British as early as 1702 and was under constant pressure from Portugal.[xxxiv] In 1707, the pro-Habsburg allies took Menorca.[xxxv] On the mainland victory at the battle of Almansa in 1707 ensured Bourbon control of Valencia and allowed the retaking of Aragon.[xxxvi] Felipe V (1700-1724) abolished all traditional rights in this region as punishment for backing his rival and overhauled the system of government with the decrees known as the *Nueva Planta* [New basis].[xxxvii] Even though this confirmed the monarch's absolute power, the loyalty of Basque and Navarrese provinces was recognized as they retained their traditional rights and *fueros*.

The long-held Catalan antipathy to the French due to constant border conflicts had led them to support Charles. The latter remained in Barcelona until his proclamation as Austrian emperor in 1711, when he departed for Vienna leaving his wife in charge. The union of Austria and Spain was seen with great suspicion in many quarters in Europe, especially after 1712 when Felipe renounced his right to the French crown.[xxxviii] This paved the way to the

final peace agreement signed at Utrecht in 1713 where all the Hispanic Monarchy's European possessions passed to the Austrian Habsburgs, while the Bourbons retained the Iberian Peninsula, the Balearic Islands and the overseas territories.[xxxix] In spite of this Catalonia, Mallorca and Ibiza remained in open rebellion well into 1715 when they were retaken by force and the *decretos de nueva planta* implemented.[xl]

The War of Spanish Succession also played out in colonial outposts where empires met. In the South Atlantic, at the River Plate, the Spanish and Portuguese competed for control of the Colony of Sacramento. In the Caribbean, privateers attempted to take islands and targeted the Spanish and French fleets, in order to capture their precious metals. In North America, expeditions were sent from the Carolines to attack Spanish Florida and the border between New England and the French territories of Quebec was hotly contested.[xli] The peace of Utrecht showed the degree to which economic considerations had been paramount for the British who gained the right to send one ship per year to the Spanish colonies and a monopoly over their slave trade for 30 years through a contract known as the *asiento*.[xlii]

Once confirmed in power, the Bourbon kings set out to reorganize their reduced yet still enormous empire and focused on the administrative and economic dimensions, which included an overhaul of the tax system. The changes in the peninsula were echoed in the colonies with the complete restructuring of the governance of their oversees possessions with the installing of *intendencias*, modeled on the French system. In northern South America, the Viceroyalty of Nueva Granada, with its capital in Santa Fe de Bogotá, was created. 1717 saw a first attempt to do this, but financial difficulties led to its suspension in 1729 and a second and definitive effort was carried out in 1739. The Crown wanted to reassert its power by prohibiting the sale of positions and many in the Americas saw it as a second conquest. The Jesuits, who had been expelled from Portugal, France and their dominions, came under scrutiny as they were thought not to be serving the King directly, because they obeyed the

Pope. They were eventually expelled from the Hispanic Monarchy in 1767.[xliii] This had great economic and social impact because of the crucial role they played in missions, *haciendas* (large farms) and in education. One of the consequences was that American-born Jesuits wrote about their provinces of origin in such as way as to foster local identities.[xliv]

In 1776 two major events convulsed the Americas. Best know is the declaration of independence of the thirteen colonies that succeeded in separating from Britain, but more impactful in the Hispanic Monarchy was the creation of the Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata [River Plate].[xlv] This new territory controlled a vast area that had developed in the eighteenth century and had in Buenos Aires the most significant port in the South Atlantic. This was in no small part because of its confrontation with the Portuguese at Sacramento and the growing importance of the silver trade coming from the mines of Potosí. The Cerro Rico had been producing silver for the Hispanic Monarchy since its discovery in the sixteenth century and it articulated all of the economy of the southern Andes. These new administrative structures, however, brought great disruption to the region mainly because they were accompanied by more punitive taxation. Discontent was rife and it led to the Tupac Amaru rebellion in 1780.[xlvi] This was the largest uprising seen in the Americas to date with unrest extending over all over the central and southern Andes from its epicenter in Cuzco and lasting for nearly six months. It continued until 1781 in present-day Bolivia and made the great frustration of the indigenous people living in these areas clear, as they clamored for the King and against bad government. To address this a new Audiencia was created in Cuzco in 1785.[xlvii]

The King was unimpeachable; the system of government, corrupt. Reform only brought disquiet from the Comunero revolt in New Granada to anti-tax riots in the city of Arequipa.[xlviii] Another of the changes was in the development of an armed local militia. In nearly three hundred years the Hispanic Monarchy had not needed a large coercive force in its American possessions, but, since the advent of the Bourbons, local militias were

developed to defend the territories from external threats. These together with some veterans who came from the peninsula defeated the uprisings. Local identities were central to these militias and it is telling how they were organized based on regional adscriptions with companies of *biscaínos*, *catalanes*, *patricios* [Basques, Catalans and locals] alongside those from the Americas such as the *arribeños* from Upper Peru. Some companies were structured on caste identities such as Indians, and free Afro-descendants, the Pardos and Morenos.[xlix]

By 1789 when the French Revolution and the wars of the Convention erupted, the Hispanic Monarchy was already in some degree of disarray. Initial victory against them in the Pyrenees at Rosellón in 1793 was reversed a year later when the French entered Catalonia, Navarre and some of the Basque provinces. In 1795 the Chief Minister Godoy signed a peace treaty ceding the Spanish part of Hispaniola to the French, whose sugar-producing colony of Saint Domingue occupied the other half. The island had been engulfed in a slave revolt since 1791 and in 1793 British troops were sent from Jamaica, but there had been no success in stemming the rebels inspired by the ideals of the French Revolution.[1] In 1801 Toussaint L'Ouverture occupied the whole island and proclaimed a constitution. This success was contemporaneous with the rise of Napoleon in Europe. So, in 1802 Bonaparte sent an ill-fated expedition where most of his men perished. In 1804 Haitian independence was declared. The second nation in the Americas emerged with slaves ousting their masters. This offered a great contrast to the first where a federation based on a Constitution sworn in 1783, joined slave-owning states with those that proclaimed freedom for all.[li]

The rise of Napoleon had a great impact on the Hispanic Monarchy, even though by 1804 France's American ventures were all but over with the loss of Saint Domingue and the sale of the Louisiana to the United States. With the defeat of the French navy at Trafalgar in 1805 it became increasingly difficult for the Spanish to traverse the Atlantic and in 1806 and 1807 the British attempted to take over Buenos Aires.[lii] In 1807, due to the blockade, Charles

IV allowed Napoleonic troops to enter Spain to invade Portugal. As the army took positions not just at the border but also in strategic points throughout the peninsula, public discontent led to a mutiny in the town of Aranjuez in March 1808. Crown prince Ferdinand VII was proclaimed King after the abdication of his father.[liii] Napoleon then lured the Bourbon royal family to Bayonne and obtained their abdications in favor of his brother Joseph. This was met with serious opposition in some quarters in Spain, unleashing a constitutional crisis of unheard of proportions. The royal abdications at Bayonne were the real turning point for the Hispanic Monarchy, which was abruptly jolted out of the Ancien Régime.[liv]

The Constitutional Challenges of Establishing States

The process that unfolded after the Napoleonic takeover of the peninsula in both Spain and Spanish America heralded great change on both sides of the Atlantic. The royal abdications were unprecedented and differed from previous dynastic complications because, had the King died, an heir would have been crowned, but as the monarch and his possible heirs were all prisoners, this was not an option.[lv] There was a swift reaction against the invasion particularly in Madrid, Valencia and Zaragoza.[lvi] Napoleon attempted to establish a new constitution in Bayonne, but few representatives attended the discussions. In opposition to the Bonapartists government, eighteen local *Juntas* [governing committees] were set up claiming to be caretakers in the monarch's absence, with the one in Seville calling itself the *Junta Suprema de España e Indias* [Supreme Committee for Spain and the Indies].[lvii]

The abdications broke the traditional constitutional arrangements, so, as José Carlos Chiaramonte has persuasively argued, some anti-Bonapartists appealed to old theories of natural law, *iusnaturalismo*.[lviii] The concept was simple yet revolutionary: as the people had given power to the King, in his absence that power returned to the people. In the Americas, the first reaction was complete support for the Bourbon King through effusive ceremonies[lix]

Juntas were, nonetheless, established in Montevideo, Chuquisaca and La Paz, as well as in Quito between 1808 and 1809.[lx] It was no coincidence that these were the cities that had lost most autonomy with the creation of the Viceroyalties of New Granada and Río de la Plata. By emulating the *Juntas* in the peninsula they took an opportunity to claim more autonomy while still declaring their support to the King.[lxi] The Viceroy of Peru disbanded several of these *Juntas* and took the opportunity to re-establish his influence over territories lost following the Bourbon administrative reforms. More distant Montevideo entered into prolonged conflict with Buenos Aires.[lxii]

In 1810 a new string of *Juntas* sprung up all over the Americas, in Caracas, Buenos Aires, Bogotá, Cartagena and Santiago de Chile.[lxiii] In September, a revolution erupted in Mexico when Father Miguel Hidalgo took the banner of the Virgin of Guadalupe and rallied his congregation against bad government and in defense of the absent King. Meanwhile, in the peninsula, the fighting against the French continued and representatives to a meeting of the Cortes [Parliament] were called to Cadiz, one of the only cities to remain unoccupied and enjoying British military support. The British had also transported the entire Portuguese royal family from Lisbon to Rio de Janeiro in 1808. From there, Queen consort, Infanta Carlota Joaquina, sister of captive King Ferdinand claimed the regency of Portugal, to little effect.[lxiv]

The Napoleonic invasion catapulted Spain and its American possessions into modernity, as it was no longer possible to follow the established constitutional practices. The French revolution had changed the way in which legitimacy was conceptualized and, although those in Spain and America claimed they were acting in the name of the monarch and in defense of tradition, they had changed the basis of the governing pact by handing sovereignty to the people who then gave it to the King.[lxv] The elections of representatives to the Cadiz Cortes were so revolutionary precisely because they were based on the idea of representation. Deputies were elected by the citizens of the Hispanic Monarchy to represent

their locality.[lxvi] It was also at this point that the American territories were conceptualized as equal, and not as subordinate colonies of Spain. As elections took some time to organize and representatives had to travel far and wide, the Cortes were initially set up with interim deputies. As the Catholic Church was the only possible institution that could provide logistical support, elections took place at parishes where the records of the people in each locality were held. Political ritual was born within the churchyard, with elections being carried out after the priest preached in mass on the importance of the choices being made.[lxvii]

In 1812, the Constitution was enacted, intended to govern the whole Hispanic Monarchy; the King was head of state not because of his divine right to govern, but because of the will of the people.[lxviii] The Cortes were dominated by the first generation of *liberals*, the term itself coined at Cadiz. They granted citizenship to all adult men who could trace their origins either in Spain or America. This included the indigenous, but excluded those of African descent, although exceptions were made for those who could prove they were worthy.[lxix] In spite of these liberal measures, the Constitution included a declaration that the Monarchy was Catholic and that the faith would be defended. This has confounded some who imagine this as incompatible with liberalism, but as José María Portillo Valdés has shown, it was logical considering the deeply religious world from which these men came.[lxx] Catholicism continued to be at the centre of identity in the vast crumbling Hispanic Monarchy.[lxxi] It was also the basis on which citizenship was built as the first of the three levels of these indirect elections was carried out in the parish overseen by local priests. Constitutions were read out to those who could not read during service.[lxxii]

Not all the territories in the Americas sent representatives to Cadiz, and in some areas alternative constitutions were put forward. This was the case in Caracas and many provinces of New Granada where new charters emerged at a dizzying pace.[lxxiii] In the south, Chile and the Río de la Plata were unsure of how to react and, although they did not engage directly

with the Cadiz Cortes and were governed by their local *Juntas*. But they did not renounce their relationship with the King just yet.[lxxiv] In the Americas, conflict erupted between those who wanted to maintain their links with the Hispanic Monarchy and those who wished to sever them. In Mexico, this led to the confrontation between Hidalgo and his supporters who, after his death, continued to fight in the jungles on the periphery and even enacted their own constitution in Apatzingan in 1814. In Venezuela, staunch backers of the monarchy allied themselves with some of the poorest sectors of society and began a bloody confrontation that lasted a decade and that succeeded in bringing down two attempts to create an independent republic. Lima, with Viceroy Fernando de Abascal at its helm, sent out expeditions from Peru that recaptured Quito, Santiago and the provinces of Upper Peru for the King.[lxxv]

After Napoleon's defeat, Ferdinand VII returned to the Spanish throne in 1814. His first action was to abolish the Constitution and disown those who had participated in its passing. Liberals sought refuge in London while many of those demobilized after the conflict in Europe traveled to the Americas, some to fight on the side of the King with the expedition led by Pablo Morillo, and others as volunteers recruited by Bolívar.[lxxvi] This retrenchment resulted in the declaration of independence by the United Provinces of South America in Tucuman in 1816. It was not clear at that point where the borders of this new entity would be, or how it should be governed, but it did allow for an army to cross the Andes on to Chile and secure independence there in 1818.[lxxvii] A blockade against the Viceroyalty of Peru was then established by the newly created navy, which was mostly manned by the British. In 1819, Spain negotiated with the United States the sale of Florida and new borders were established in North America.[lxxviii]

Until 1820, even though there was conflict raging and the Río de la Plata had effectively broken free, the Hispanic Monarchy still hoped that there could be a way back. The March 1820 Revolution in the peninsula in favor of the Cadiz Constitution made that

impossible.[lxxix] The King was forced to accept the charter and a Liberal regime took over in the peninsula. This had important repercussions in the Americas. In Mexico and Central America, it made the Plan de Iguala possible. This cemented independence from Spain for a Mexican monarchy with an iron-cast guarantee that the Catholic religion would be maintained and defended. The failure to convince a Bourbon prince to take the crown resulted in the crowning of Agustin de Iturbide, the leader at Iguala, as Emperor of Mexico.[lxxx] The monarchical option was explored in Buenos Aires and in Lima, but was discarded and in most of South America, except in Brazil. The Portuguese liberal Cortes had forced the King to return in 1822 and as they attempted to redress the balance of power between Portugal and the American possessions, his son declared Brazil to be an independent empire.[lxxxi] By then, Colombia had emerged under the stewardship of Simón Bolívar, replacing the Viceroyalty of New Granada with the territories what we know today as Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador and Panama.[lxxxii]

The return of the Cadiz Constitution between 1820 and 1823 brought popular sovereignty and representation back. And while most of the American possessions succeeded in gaining independence, a bulk of southern Peru and present-day Bolivia remained staunchly loyalist. During the triennium, a group of experienced royalist officers kept control of the south central Andes and reintroduced the Cadiz Constitution.[lxxxiii] The liberal revival was short-lived, as an invading army sent by the Holy Alliance, the "hundred thousand sons of Saint Louis," came into Spain from France and restored Ferdinand VII as absolute monarch. The division of the crown supporters in the Andes allowed Bolívar and his armies to defeat with their enemy at Ayacucho after which they signed a Capitulation in 1824. This formal document recognized defeat and ended the more than three centuries of Spanish control over an entire continent. The only territories that remained under the crown were the islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Caribbean and the Philippines in the Pacific. Although the

Hispanic Monarchy was re-established in the peninsula, it was not really possible to return to the *status quo ante* and the scene was set for further confrontation in the peninsula. In the Americas, new republics had sprung up, but it took a long time for them to consolidate and the problems that they had to confront were extremely similar to those faced by Spain.

The Nineteenth Century: The Legacy of the *Longue Durée*

The half century that followed the Napoleonic invasion was one of instability and saw many parallel developments in Spain and Spanish America, as people on both sides of the Atlantic struggled to find the most appropriate structures for government and wrestled with the legacy of the liberalism of the 1812 Cadiz Constitution. The period between 1820 and 1840 was extremely convulsed. In the Americas, this was because the first attempts at creating states were unsuccessful. In Mexico, the Empire collapsed and confrontations between centralists and federalists ensued.[lxxxiv] Central America abandoned Mexico and attempted a short-lived union as the Provincias Unidas de Centro America [United Provinces of Central America], which gave way to a República Federal de Centro America [Federal Republic of Central America], and lasted until 1838.[lxxxv] Colombia also proved to be fragile, disintegrating into the states of Venezuela, Nueva Granada and Ecuador in 1830.[lxxxvi] Peru and Bolivia joined in a Confederation between 1836 and 1839, but were unable to flourish against internal opposition and endured attacks from Chile.[lxxxvii] The Provincias Unidas de Sud América [United Provinces of South America] established in Tucumán in 1816 lasted as an official denomination until 1826, even though in reality they were more a collection of provinces than an actual unitary state. The union of the provinces of the former Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata reached its nadir in 1820, and confrontations between those proposing a federation and those who sought centralization dominated politics for the next fifty

years.[lxxxviii] Paraguay remained staunchly independent from 1811, and Uruguay was formed as a buffer state between the Empire of Brazil and the Río de la Plata in 1828.[lxxxix]

In Spain, Ferdinand held on to power from 1823 and 1833, but his death brought dynastic strife as his brother Carlos refused to accept the changes to the law of succession that made it possible for his three-year-old niece to inherit the crown. This resulted in the first Carlist war between 1833 and 1840 that pitted him against his sister-in-law, Queen Regent Maria Cristina.[xc] Even though the succession was the trigger, other issues fuelled conflict. Carlos had the support of the most reactionary religious factions that wanted to see the reintroduction of the Inquisition, as well as the backing of the traditional Basque and Navarre regions that resented the loss of their traditional rights. Although there were pockets of support for the Carlists all around the Peninsula, their control was greatest in the north, moving from the Basque Provinces, Navarre into Aragon and Catalonia, where the possibility of regaining historic rights provided motivation.[xci]

The army sided in most part with the young Queen and her mother. General Baldomero Espartero, veteran of the Peruvian wars of independence, became ever more powerful due to his success in battle, and in his role in ending the first Carlist war.[xcii] So, when the Queen Regent ran foul of her liberal backers and was forced into exile in 1840, the Cortes elected Espartero regent. His heavy-handed tactics led the progressive-wing of the liberals to abandon him, and after the bombardment of Barcelona, the uprising of General Juan Prim led to his downfall in 1843. At thirteen years old, Queen Isabel II was declared old enough to take care of government and took charge, although her liberal ministers did most of the work. The next crisis exploded when she did not marry the son of her uncle Carlos, but chose a different cousin. This triggered the second Carlist war, which she fought against her cousin Carlos, and was characterized by guerrilla upheaval in Catalonia. It lasted from 1846 to 1849.[xciii]

The difficulties faced by the new republics in the former Spanish possessions in the Americas mirrored the ones found in Spain after the Napoleonic invasion. All the territories had experienced prolonged war, with guerrilla mobilization and irregular forces. Regions and local powers became stronger as they were forced to exercise power and survive with little support from the centre. It was therefore very difficult to control vast areas lacking communication infrastructure where local powers had gained power and had armed backers. This dynamic was present in every single case as the new states, including the one created in Spain, struggled to impose a legitimate monopoly of violence. Armies were created from militias and the military emerged as the most important institution in all these territories as they reaped the benefits of becoming indispensable in times of war.

The issue of legitimacy was at the centre of the problem of creating new states. After the Napoleonic invasion the basis upon which monarchs governed was shaken. In the peninsula, it was possible to return to the monarch, whereas in America republican solutions had to be found. In both cases it was nevertheless required to invoke a legitimate origin of power, which in most cases was a constitution. The Cadiz 1812 document was central in all the attempts at creating new polities, even in the places where it was never implemented because it served as a blueprint for imagining a new political organization.[xciv]

The efforts to come to terms with the relationship with the Catholic Church consumed all of the new independent republics that tried to renegotiate their relationship with the Vatican, as they considered they had inherited the rights of Kings to name their own ecclesiastical authorities. Each new state dealt with the Church in different ways, but the way in which this relationship was conceptualized by liberals and conservatives set the tone for many of the conflicts that characterized the nineteenth century in Spain and Spanish America. All of the states that emerged from the Hispanic Monarchy remain to this day staunchly Catholic, even though they have established different types of relationships with the Vatican.

Although some are less religious than others, and during the nineteenth century the battles for freedom of religion were fought and mostly won, Catholicism is still part of the cultural fabric of all these nations.[xcv]

The civil wars that plagued both the newly independent republics in Spanish America, as well as Spain had a common origin in the long history of the Hispanic Monarchy. The questions over legitimacy that emerged from the monarchical crisis of 1808 and pitted regions against each, were not just due to short-term junctures, but had brewed over an extensive period of time. These confrontations began with the way in which territories were organized and administered from the sixteenth century onwards. The territorial jurisdiction of the Audiencias, it has been noted, map onto those of most of the new nations in Spanish America,[xcvi] just as is the case with the modern Autonomous Communities (*comunidades autónomas*) in Spain. If we consider that these judicial-administrative spaces were the cornerstone of the Hispanic Monarchy's administrative structure, it is clear that this is no coincidence, as, in spite of great changes over time, the Audiencia was extremely important in the administration of regions that then developed a sense of identity. It is not that things have not changed in the past five hundred years - far from it. It is more that the efforts made to reduce the differences between these territories were not made until the eighteenth century, and even then they were not very successful. Local administration was very important in such a large polity and as such it became the centre for the new polities that formed with the fall of the Monarchy. Deeper cultural traits were, nevertheless, shared. This is why, when studied side by side the nineteenth-century histories of Spain and Spanish America show that political instability, the importance of the Church and the military were all at the centre of their difficulties consolidating as nation states in the nineteenth century. The long-term efforts to make a durable state had ultimately unraveled. The long-term problem of how to make a durable state remained.

i. All translations are mine or by the editors. One of the most interesting attempts is the one by Jen-Fréderic Schaub in his essay "Hacia una historiografía eurocolonial. América portuguesa y monarquía hispánica," in *El gobierno de un mundo. Virreintos y audiencias en la América Hispánica*, ed. Feliciano Barrios (Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2004), 1053-75.

ii. David Armitage & Jo Guildi, "The Return of the Longue Durée: An Anglo-American Perspective," *Annales. Histoire. Sciences Sociales* 69, no. 4 (2014): 4.

iii. Jeremy Adelman, "Latin American Longues Durées," *Latin American Research Review* 39, no. 1 (2004): 233-37.

iv. Richard M Morse wrote widely on Latin American culture, from his first essays in the 1950s, to one of his most complete works *New World Soundings: Culture and Ideology in the Americas* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989). Brian Loveman has many books that present this argument, but one of the ones to do so most forcefully is *The Constitution of Tyranny: Regimes of Exception in Spanish America* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1994). Claudio Veliz has also written widely on this, but *The Centralist Tradition in Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980) remains a classic.

v. Paul Pierson presents a very up to date discussion of path dependence and its role in contemporary social science in *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004). See especially chapter 1 "Positive Feedback and Path Dependence."

vi. John H. Elliot developed the concept of the composite monarchy in several of his works, but one of his first formulations was in *Imperial Spain 1469-1716* (London: Penguin, 1963).

vii. For more on this see A.A. Thompson, "Castile, Spain and the Monarchy: The Political Community from The *Patria Natural* to *Patria Nacional*," in *Spain, Europe and the Atlantic World, Essays in Honour of John H. Elliott*, ed. Richard Kagan & Geoffrey Parker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 125-59 (see especially page 136).

viii. On the creation of systems of governance in America see *El gobierno de un mundo*. See in particular the essay by Carlos Garriga, "Las audiencias: Justicia y gobierno de las Indias," 711-94.

ix. On the Catalan Aragonese experience see Elliot, *Imperial Spain*, 30-45.

x. Fernando Ciaramitaro, "Virrey, gobierno virreinal y absolutismo: El caso de la Nueva España y el Reino de Sicilia," *Studia Historica. Historia Moderna* 30 (2008): 235-71

xi. The position of viceroy was occupied between 1523 and 1538 by Germana de Foix, who had married Ferdinand after the death of Isabel in 1505 at the age of 18 and later had a daughter with her step-grandson Emperor Charles I. See Rosa Elena Ríos Lloret, "Doña Germana de Foix," in *Historia de las mujeres en España y América Latina*, ed. Isabel Morant, vol. 1, 2005: *De la Prehistoria a la Edad Media*, ed. Asunción Lavrin & María Angeles Querol Fernández, 615-34.

xii. For more details see John Elliot, *Spain and Its Worlds 1500-1700* (New Haven: Yale, 1989).

xiii. Navarre was a late addition to Ferdinand's territories, only acquired in 1512. This fact, and its closeness to France, might explain the strength of this constitutional agreement. See Elliot, *Imperial Spain*, 140-47.

xiv. Tomás Polanco Alcántara, *Las reales audiencias en las provincias americanas de España* (Madrid: MAPFRE, 1992).

xv. Xavier Gil argues that although Aragon did ultimately lose some of its rights it managed to maintain most of them because it worked within the composite monarchy. See

"Aragonese Constitutionalism and Habsburg Rule: The Varying Meanings of Liberty," in *Spain, Europe and the Atlantic World*, ed. Kagan & Parker, 160-87.

xvi. James Casey, "De reino a provincia: De la Valencia foral a la absolutista (1609-1707)," *Historia del pueblo valenciano*, ed. Manuel Cerdá (Valencia: Levante, 1988).

xvii. Elliot, *Imperial Spain*, 166-73.

xviii. Polanco Alcántara, *Las reales audiencias en las provincias americanas*.

xix. Antonio Planas Roselló, *La Real Audiencia de Mallorca en la época de los Austrias (1571-1715)* (Barcelona: Universidad Pompeu Fabra, 2010).

xx. Alejandra B. Osorio has written on these Baroque ceremonies and the performance of power. See, *Inventing Lima: Baroque's Modernity in Peru's South Sea Metropolis* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

xxi. Elliot, *Spain and Its Worlds*, 13-14.

xxii. For more on this see David A. Brading, "La monarquía católica," in Antonio Annino & François-Xavier Guerra, *Inventando la nación. Iberoamérica siglo XIX* (Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003), 15-46.

xxiii. Brading, "La monarquía católica."

xxiv. Elliot, *Imperial Spain*, 118-19.

xxv. For a classic study of this see Mark Burkholder, *From Impotence to Authority: The Spanish Crown and the American Audiencias, 1687-1808* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1977).

xxvi. Elliot, *Spain and Its Worlds*, 115.

xxvii. For more on this see Geoffrey Parker, *The Dutch Revolt* (London: Penguin, 1988).

xxviii. Christopher Storrs, *The Resilience of The Spanish Monarchy, 1665-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). See especially chapter 5 "Centre and Periphery in the Spanish Monarchy."

xxix. Kathryn Burns has developed the idea of the "spiritual economy" to describe the important role religious organisations played in colonial society. See *Colonial Habits: Convents and the Spiritual Economy of Cuzco, Peru* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999).

xxx. On this see Christopher Storrs, "The Role of Religion in Spanish Foreign Policy in the reign of Carlos II (1665-1700)," in *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713*, ed. David Onnekink (London: Ashgate, 2013), 25-46.

xxxi. For a classic study see Henry Kamen, *The War of Succession in Spain 1700-15* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969).

xxxii. Kamen, *The War of Succession in Spain*, 248.

xxxiii. For a detailed analysis of the European dimension of the conflict see José Manuel de Bernardo Ares, "Las dos Españas de 1706 según las cartas reales de los Reyes Borbónicos," and Pere Molas Ribalta, "¿Qué fue de Italia y Flandes?" in *La pérdida de Europa. La guerra de Sucesión por la Monarquía de España*, ed. Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio, Bernardo J. García y García & Virginia León (Madrid: Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 2007), 249-70, 693-716.

xxxiv. José Calvo Poyato, *Guerra de Sucesión en Andalucía* (Cordoba: Diputación Provincial, 1982).

xxxv. José Luis Ponde, *La Guerra de Sucesión en Menorca. Causas, hechos y consecuencias* (Mahon: Museo Militar de Menorca, 1984). See also the essays collected in *La Guerra de Sucesión en España y América. X Jornadas Nacionales de Historia Militar Sevilla* (Madrid: Deimos, 2000).

xxxvi. Kamen, *The War of Succession in Spain*, 17-20.

xxxvii. For more on this process see Joaquim Albareda, *Felipe V y el triunfo del absolutismo. Cataluña en un conflict europeo (1700-1714)* (Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, 2002).

xxxviii. Joaquim Albareda describes this process in great detail in *La Guerra de Sucesión de España (1700-1714)* (Barcelona: Crítica, 2010), 360-85.

xxxix. For a detailed analysis of the peace treaty see Albareda, *La Guerra de Sucesión de España*, 314-59.

xl. See Albareda, *Felipe V* for more details.

xli. Adam James Lyons, "The 1711 Expedition to Quebec: Politics and The Limitations of Global Strategy in The Reign of Queen Anne" (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2011).

xlii. For some novel work on the *asiento* see Lía de Luxán Hernández & Santiago de Luxán Meléndez, "Las dificultades de funcionamiento del Asiento de Negros británico en el imperio español, 1713-1739: La misión de Tomás Geraldino en Londres," *Colonial Latin American Historical Review* 1, no. 3 (2013): 273-307.

xliii. See Magnus Mörner, *The Expulsion of the Jesuits from Latin America* (New York: Knopf, 1969).

xliv. A well know example is that of "Carta a los españoles americanos" written by Peruvian Juan Pablo Viscardo y Guzman in 1791, first published in French in 1799 and then in Spanish in 1801. A digital version can be accessed here http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/29000/1/Viscardo-Gutierrez%20Escudero.pdf (accessed January 16, 2015).

xlv. I have written extensively on this issue. For an overview, see "Luchando por 'la patria' en los Andes 1808-1815," *Revista Andina* (2014).

xlvi. For the most recent and comprehensive book see Charles Walker, *The Tupac Amaru Rebellion* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 2014). Also crucial to understand the period are Sergio Serulnikov, *Subverting Colonial Authority: Challenges to Spanish Rule in Eighteenth-Century Southern Andes* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), and Sinclair Thompson, *We Alone Will Rule: Native Andean Politics in the Age of Insurgency* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003).

xlvii. Walker, *The Tupac Amaru Rebellion*.

xlviii. See the work of David Cahill, *From Rebellion to Independence in the Andes: Soundings from Southern Peru, 1750-1830* (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2002), and John Leddy Pheland, *The People and The King: The Comunero Revolution in Colombia 1781* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011).

xlix. For a detailed study of this and how it changed after independence see Natalia Sobrevilla Perea, "Coloured by the Past: The Birth of the Armed Forces in Republican Peru," *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de America Latina* 22, no. 1 (2011): 57-79.

l. For a classic study see C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and The San Domingo Revolution* (London: Allison and Busby, 1980).

li For Haiti see David Geggus, *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History* (Cambridge: Hackett, 2014).

lii. Support for the Hispanic Monarchy was overwhelming. See Klaus Gallo, *Las invasiones inglesas* (Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 2004).

liii. One of the most important analyses of this process and what it meant for the Hispanic Monarchy is François-Xavier Guerra, *Modernidad e independencias: Ensayos sobre las revoluciones hispánicas* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001).

liv. This episode has been covered by most of the literature. For one of the most authoritative readings of the event, see Jaime E. Rodríguez, *The Independence of Spanish America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

lv. Ferdinand, and his brothers Carlos and Francisco de Paula were all held in Fontainebleu until the defeat of Napoleon.

lvi. The National Library of Spain has collected the most important resources to study this conflict: http://www.bne.es/es/Micrositios/Guias/Guerra_independencia/index.html (accessed, January 16, 2015).

lvii. Manuel Moreno Alonso, *La Junta Suprema de Sevilla* (Seville: Alfar, 2001).

lviii. José Carlos Chiaramonte, *Nación y estado en Iberoamérica: El lenguaje político en tiempos de las independencias* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 2004).

lix. On the importance of ceremonies in this context see *El origen de las fiestas patrias. Hispanoamérica en la era de las independencias*, ed. Pablo Ortemberg (Rosario: Prohistoria, 2013).

lx. The first was set up in 1808 and the other three in 1809.

lxi. For more details of this see Sobrevilla Perea, "Luchando por 'la patria' en los Andes."

lxii. To understand the situation in the South Atlantic see Jeremy Adelman, *Sovereignty and Revolution in the Iberian Atlantic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

lxiii. A concise yet detailed text for this period is Brian Hammnet, "Process and Pattern: A Re-examination of the Ibero-American Independence Movements, 1808-1826," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 29 (1997), 279-328.

lxiv. Marcela Ternavasio, "De legitimistas a revolucionarios. Notas sobre los 'carlotistas' rioplatenses, 1808-1810," *Bicentenaire des indépendances Amérique Latine Caribes* (Paris: Institut Français, 2011), 240-60.

lxv. Roberto Breña has written extensively on this, noting the differences with the French experience, as there was an explicit defense of the King.

lxvi. François-Xavier Guerra has asserted that the elections themselves were "the revolution." See François-Xavier Guerra & Marie Danielle Demelas "Un processus révolutionnaire méconnu: l'adoption des formes représentatives modernes en Espagne et Amérique Latine (1808-1810)," *Caravelle* 60 (1993).

lxvii. Scott Eastman & Natalia Sobrevilla Perea, eds., *The Rise of Constitutional Government in the Iberian World: The Impact of the Cádiz Constitution of 1812* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama University Press, 2015).

lxviii. Eastman & Sobrevilla Perea, *The Rise of Constitutional Government in the Iberian World*.

lxix. For more on these debates see Eastman & Sobrevilla Perea, *The Rise of Constitutional Government in the Iberian World*.

lxx. José María Portillo Valdés, "De la monarquía católica a la nación de los católicos," *Historia y Política* 17 (2007): 17-35.

lxxi. For more on this enduring Catholicism see Gregorio Alonso, *La nación en capilla. Ciudadanía católica y cuestión religiosa en España, 1793-1874* (Madrid: Comares, 2014).

lxxii. Natalia Sobrevilla Perea, "Loyalism and Liberalism in Peru," in *The Rise of Constitutional Government in the Iberian World*, ed. Eastman & Sobrevilla Perea.

lxxiii. Daniel Gutiérrez Ardila presents a detailed analysis of this complex panorama in *Un Nuevo Reino. Geografía, política, pactismo y diplomacia durante el interregno en Nueva Granada* (Bogota: Universidad Externado de Colombia, 2010).

lxxiv. For an example of this see Juan Luis Ossa, "Revolución y constitucionalismo en Chile, 1808-1814," *Revista de Historia Iberoamericana* 1, no. 5 (2012): 111-39.

lxxv. For a recent study of his work in the region see Scarlett O'Phelan & Georges Lomné, *Abascal y contra-independencia de América del Sur* (Lima: IFEA/PUCP, 2013).

lxxvi. Matthew Brown looks at this phenomenon in detail in *Adventuring Through Spanish Colonies: Simon Bolivar, Foreign Mercenaries and the Birth of New Nations* (Liverpool: University of Liverpool, 2006).

lxxvii. Juan Luis Ossa "The Army of the Andes: Chilean and Rioplatense Politics in an Age of Military Organisation, 1814-1817," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 46, no. 1 (2014): 29-58.

lxxviii. Charlton Tebeau, *A History of Florida* (Miami: University of Miami Press: 1980).

lxxix. Rafael de Riego began his movement with a *Pronunciamiento.* For more on this see Will Fowler's project and the links between Mexico and Spain: http://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/ (accessed January 16, 2015).

lxxx. Brian Hamnnet, *Roots Of Insurgency: Mexican Regions, 1750-1824* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

lxxxi. Roderick Cavaliero, *The Independence of Brazil* (London: British Academic, 1993).

lxxxii. For the most recent and comprehensive reassessment of this period see Anthony McFarlane, *War and Independence in Spanish America* (London: Routledge, 2014).

lxxxiii. Natalia Sobrevilla Perea, "From Europe to the Americas and Back: Becoming *Los Ayacuchos*," *European Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2011): 472-88.

lxxxiv. Timothy E. Anna, *Forging Mexico, 1821-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001).

lxxxv. Jordana Dym, *From Sovereign Villages to National States: City, State, and Federation in Central America, 1759-1839* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006).

lxxxvi. David Bushnell, *The Making of Modern Colombia. A Nation in Spite of Itself* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

lxxxvii. Natalia Sobrevilla Perea, *The Caudillo of The Andes, Andrés de Santa Cruz* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univerisity Press, 2011).

lxxxviii. Noemí Goldman & Ricardo Salvatore,

lxxxix. Julio Sánchez Gómez, "La independencia de la República Oriental del Uruguay: los realistas en la Banda Oriental," in *Bastillas, cetros y blasones: La independencia en Iberoamérica*, ed. Ivana Frasquet (Madrid: MAPFRE, 2006), 57-92.

xc. Mark Lawrence, *Spain's First Carlist War, 1833-40* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

xci. Lawrence, *Spain's First Carlist War*.

xcii. Adrian Shubert, "Baldomero Espartero (1793-1879). Del ídolo al olvido," in *Liberales, agitadores y conspiradores. Biografías heterodoxas del siglo XIX*, ed. Isabel Burdiel & Manuel Pérez Ledesma (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2000).

xciii. Alfonso Bullón de Mendoza Gómez de Valugera, *Las guerras carlistas* (San Sebastian: ACTAS, 2006).

xciv. Eastman & Sobrevilla Perea, eds. *The Rise of Constitutional Government in the Iberian World*.

xcv. For the case of Spain, see Alonso, *La nación en capilla.*

xcvi. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1992).