

SPANISH AMERICAN ROYALISM IN THE AGE OF REVOLUTION

René J. Silva and Víctor M. Uribe

Florida International University

- Indios, negros y mestizos en la independencia.** Edited by Heraclio Bonilla. Bogotá: Planeta / Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, 2010. Pp. 308. 43,000.00 Colombian pesos, paper. ISBN: 9789584224859.
- Cartagena de Indias en la independencia.** Edited by Haroldo Calvo Stevenson and Adolfo Meisel Roca. Cartagena: Banco de la República, 2011. Pp. 598. 45,000.00 Colombian pesos, paper. ISBN: 9789586642385.
- Preaching Spanish Nationalism across the Hispanic Atlantic, 1759–1823.** By Scott Eastman. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012. Pp. 180. \$42.50 cloth. ISBN: 9780807139578.
- Cortes y Constitución de Cádiz, 200 años.** 3 volumes. Edited by José Antonio Escudero. Madrid: Espasa, 2011. Pp. 2160. €57.69 cloth. ISBN: 9788467036497.
- Dominicos insurgentes y realistas, de México al Río de la Plata.** Edited by Fray Eugenio Torres Torres. Mexico City: Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2011. Pp. 644. MXN\$430.00 paper. ISBN: 9786074013726.

Until recently, most historiography on the independence period in Spanish America has focused on the forces in favor of separation from Spain. Less attention has been devoted to the colonial populations who sided with the Bourbon monarchy. Two factors contributed to this omission. First, the victorious liberators needed to forge an intelligible historical mythology for the emerging nations born of those conflicts. Second, the royalists, or *realistas*, of Spanish America were the enemy and, more important, they lost. Early Latin American historians neglected royalist versions of events or framed royalist activities as incidental to independence, while Spanish counterparts did little to probe the various shades of what in effect had been a national disaster. Consequently, the king's advocates in America suffered the added indignity of passing into virtual oblivion for the better part of two centuries. In essence, those who favored the royalist cause lost twice: they were first historically defeated then historiographically vanquished in the selective and forgetful void of subsequent accounts. Historians typically depicted the triumphant independence struggles as a battle between patriotic nationals against oppressive foreigners, when campaigns were in fact often civil wars between autochthonous forces.¹ Fortunately,

1. Early examples of this genre include José Manuel Restrepo's multivolume *Historia de la revolución de la República de Colombia*, originally published in 1827, and Lucas Alamán's *Historia de Méjico desde los* *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 49, No. 1. © 2014 by the Latin American Studies Association.

scholars of Spanish America are now vigorously pursuing the nuances of *realismo*. The five recently published works reviewed here underscore the nature of fidelity to the crown during the Age of Revolution. In particular, they bring to light the volatility and regional variability of the independence process, the significance of loyalty, the participation of subalterns, and the present state of the historiography.

The collection of essays edited by Haroldo Calvo Stevenson and Adolfo Meisel Roca, *Cartagena de Indias en la independencia*, provides a useful starting point. The work is part of a series on Cartagena from its earliest days through the present, with a separate volume devoted to each century of the port's development. The much briefer independence period has been allocated a tome of its own because of the era's overriding significance for Colombia's Caribbean coast. This edition examines the struggle for self-rule and is divided into five sections encompassing the international and national contexts, local antecedents, relations with other provinces and *audiencias* (judicial districts), the consequences of independence, and cultural aspects such as literature, architecture, iconography, and the press. In total, the essays impart an acute sense of the stages of an exceedingly chaotic conflict. Thus, the Caribbean coastline is seen as engulfed in deep turmoil, rebel or royal in varying degrees, times, and places.

The essay by Adolfo Meisel Roca is perhaps the best barometer of the volatility of the period. Using the economy as a compass, Meisel examines fiscal patterns in Cartagena from the 1808 Napoleonic invasion of the Iberian Peninsula, which triggered instability in Spanish America, to the surrender of the city by royalist forces in 1821. His graphs detailing customs collections, taxation mechanisms, governmental expenses, import duties, and the influence of specific merchants form part of a broader analysis that includes factors such as the issuance of paper currency, private loans to government, international trade, the role of privateers, property confiscations, Indian tribute, and the dwindling *situado*—a grant whereby fiscal resources originating in other areas were allocated to Cartagena to fund defense in the colonial era. In the process of gauging economic ebbs and flows, Meisel ably maps out the political trajectory of the fortified city as control changed hands.

Four political periods are discernible. First was the response to the initial crisis from 1808 to 1811, when the municipality formed a Junta Suprema and declared its allegiance to the crown, limiting its push for greater autonomy to an extension of free trade rights. The second phase began in November 1811, when Cartagena declared its independence. Meisel shows how the port's finances changed radically as the *situado* that had represented 57.1 percent of treasury funds before the crisis virtually disappeared, replaced by customs duties from a boom in foreign trade made possible by self-determination (Calvo Stevenson and Meisel Roca, 392). Phase three can be defined as the years of royalist reconquest, from Spanish general Pablo Morillo's successful siege of late 1815 to 1821. The final stage commenced when the patriots regained control of Cartagena after yet another

primeros movimientos que prepararon su independencia en el año de 1808, which first saw the light of day in 1849.

devastating siege.² The back-and-forth character of political ascendancy is emblematic of the overall character of American sovereignty at this juncture. While this particular sequence was unfolding in Cartagena, both analogous and diametrically opposite events were taking place throughout Spain's vast and mercurial empire.

An example of the ongoing instability occurred right next door. Steinar Saether focuses on the complex relationship between Cartagena and rival Santa Marta in the early stages of the struggle. On one level, he traces the initially affable familial connections among elites in both seaports and how these came apart as events developed, with Cartagena opting for independence while Santa Marta chose loyalty. On another, he unearths the decisive role of the popular classes, as the military forces of Cartagena were dislodged from Santa Marta in March 1813 by local Indians under cacique Antonio Núñez. Saether explains this revolt as an effort by subaltern peoples to resist domination by the region's urban centers and aristocratic elites, as well as a defense of *indianidad* (Calvo Stevenson and Meisel Roca, 210), defined as the identity and integrity of native payers of tribute opposed to a new regime that disregarded their historical privileges.³

In another contribution, Anthony MacFarlane studies a little-known episode in late 1812 called the "revolution of the Sabanas." He depicts this event as the first royalist uprising in the province, a rural rebellion of *libres de todos los colores* and Indian communities who acted as corporate bodies against the hegemonic ambitions of the port city. According to overlooked sources, the revolt was led by royalist priests, lasted fifty-three days, was joined by regular Spanish military forces, and failed when the Spaniards abandoned the territory. Its importance lies in exposing a lack of support for the liberal Cartagena regime in the countryside, as well as in explaining the hard line later employed against royalists, and that province's decision to take the war to a number of population centers loyal to the monarchy along the Magdalena River and in Santa Marta.

Additional contributions to royalist scholarship in this volume include Rebecca Earle's study of iconography. Especially revealing is her juxtaposing of the uses of Indian imagery in the patriot and royalist contexts. For the former, republican criollos legitimized the cause of independence by establishing linkages to an allegedly common pre-Hispanic past that antedated indigenous enslavement by the Spaniards. For the latter, the *Indio Leal*, devoted to the Spanish monarch and uncontaminated by Enlightenment ideas, became the "supreme figure of the royalist cause" (Calvo Stevenson and Meisel Roca, 585).⁴ Earle calls attention to the paradox that peninsulars frequently viewed white Spanish creoles as ungrateful fomenters of rebellion while regarding the conquered natives as supporters of existing royal institutions. The volume contains other essays covering themes of

2. For an excellent account of this period, see Justo Cuño Bonito, *El retorno del rey: El restablecimiento del régimen colonial en Cartagena de Indias (1815–1821)* (Valencia: Universitat Jaume I, 2008).

3. In another work, this author rightly stressed the need to avoid monocausal explanations of popular royalism instead of paying close attention to the nuances of local politics. See Steinar A. Saether, *Identidades e independencia en Santa Marta y Riohacha, 1750–1850* (Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia, 2005), 124–125, 132–145.

4. All translations from Spanish to English in this analysis are by the coauthors.

indirect interest for royalism, including how New Granada confronted the sovereignty crisis; the plans, activities, composition, and eventual ruin of the king's Expeditionary Army of Tierra Firme; new details on the 1815 siege of Cartagena by General Morillo; and the War Council that executed Cartagena's patriots after the capture of the city shortly thereafter. Space limitations preclude us from discussing them here.

Above all, it is the volatility of the independence process that stands out in *Cartagena de Indias en la independencia*. For the scholar, this instability produces a lack of historical clarity that makes it difficult to classify the conflict's phases and construct satisfactory periodizations on a continental scale. Perhaps this helps explain why so much of independence historiography is bounded in nationalist terms. Given a more targeted lens, the national is inherently easier to demarcate than the broader sweep of the continental.

In another vein, the regional variations of independence are the most striking feature of Fray Eugenio Torres Torres's collection of essays entitled *Dominicos insurgentes y realistas, de México al Río de La Plata*, covering the viceroyalties of Río de La Plata, Peru, New Granada, and New Spain. Treatment of the Dominican Order in both the royalist and patriot factions shows the geographical variability of Spanish fortunes. Only Peru managed to preserve a consistent commitment to royalism on the continent until very late in the conflict, while Río de La Plata was the lone area to keep alive the independence banner from early on. The rest of Spain's mainland empire fell prey to a seesaw battle for supremacy in which territories changed hands repeatedly, with the corresponding devastation that each regime change invariably wrought. The edition, published by the Dominican Institute for Historical Research in Mexico, consists of twenty-five essays, seven from members of the Dominican Order. Like those of other groups, Dominican protagonists were found on either side of the independence divide. Correspondingly, about one-third of the studies here are concerned with Dominican royalists, while several others engage both royal and patriot adherents.

A refreshing element is the inclusion of counterintuitive studies of the Southern Cone, largely missing in a royalist historiography dominated by inquiries on New Granada and New Spain. Two of these essays cover Argentina and another, Chile. In the latter case, Cristián Guerrero Lira traces the political evolution of Dominican friar José María Torres through the phases of Chile's independence. Thus, from 1811—when a Junta de Gobierno was formed in his native Concepción—to 1814, Torres was an *adepto* of revolution. However, from 1814 to 1817, when monarchical rule was restored, he was no less than editor of the royalist newspaper, which during his tenure launched an array of virulent diatribes against the rebellion. Yet by 1826, Guerrero Lira situates the friar as a deputy for Santiago in the independence congress, his position made possible by a prior pro-republican *mea culpa*. Rather than hypocrisy or opportunism, Guerrero Lira sees consistency, asserting that Torres based his political outlook on hostility to radical change in all forms and believed in sustaining the established order, no matter its ideological bent.

The essays dealing with royalist Argentina include a study on Dominican nuns in the Córdoba region and another on the gradual dissolution of the lay

Dominican Third Order in Buenos Aires. In the former, Guillermo Nieva Ocampo portrays nuns from elite backgrounds, "anchored in an imaginary of the Old Regime, respectful of hierarchies, honor, and decency, concepts in turn dependent on social origin" (Torres Torres, 143), living in a city tied more to the traditionalist-minded southern Andes than to the republican capital. These Dominicans were accused of antipatriotism after establishing contact with royalist prisoners from former social circles. Their trial was bounced along among various secular and ecclesiastical authorities, none of whom wanted to handle such a delicate affair. The charges were finally dropped when the matter was referred to a clerical superior and the sisters contended that they had no political opinions or formal ties with any side but only prayed for an end to the sufferings of war.

If the Córdoba nuns were saved in part by the enduring corporate structures and social values of the Old Regime, Lucrecia Jijena chronicles a reverse process. Her study focuses on the transatlantic merchant elites of Buenos Aires who were members of the Venerable Third Order of Saint Dominic, using the Inchaurregui family as a model. In essence, Jijena posits that Catholic institutions with privileged ties to the monarchy and extended family networks entered a period of decline when the patriots took over Río de La Plata. As she states, "This was not institutional bankruptcy or a total break with the established order" but rather "new spaces of religiosity sustained by an elite enlightened by liberal thought" (Torres Torres, 191). The Old Regime's lay ideal based on religious devotion was gradually displaced by a lay apostolate oriented toward philanthropic works.

The Torres Torres compilation also contains four essays on New Spain's royalist Dominicans. Mauricio Beuchot discusses the social philosophy of Fray Ramón Casaus, a professor at the University of Mexico who authored the *Anti-Hidalgo* in 1810, aimed at discrediting the renowned priest who was heading the revolution in New Spain. Beuchot points out that Father Casaus was more appalled by what he viewed as the sacrilegious nature and antireligious intentions of Hidalgo, who used religion to secure popular support, than the liberal political ideas or anti-Spanish elements of the rebellion. José Daniel López Hernández traces the royal "belligerence" of the Bishop of Oaxaca, Antonio de Bergosa y Jordán, through the pastoral instructions he sent to the parishes in his diocese. These *cordilleras* depicted a faithless Manichean duality of evil insurgents spreading anarchy and disaster, contrasted with the peace and tranquility of a faithful bishopric devoted to God and king. María Guadalupe Martínez Flores portrays royalist efforts to use the Virgen de la Soledad in Oaxaca as a countersymbol to the Virgin of Guadalupe, around which patriots rallied. Finally, Sergio Francisco Rosas Salas provides an excellent essay on the sermons of Fray Luis Carrasco y Enciso, who endorsed a pan-Hispanic imperial nationalism based on king, religion, and *patria* grounded in Thomist principles of natural law. His early sermons from 1808 to 1810 promoted fidelity to the king as a defense of Spain and the Catholic faith against French infidels led by a new Luther: Napoleon. In this vision, *patria* was the union of church and state. His later homilies, professed shortly after the restitution of Fernando VII in 1814, saw the *patria* as a transatlantic "symbiosis between the

king and all Spaniards, integrated by territory, religion, and union" (Torres Torres, 375).

As its coordinator notes, the importance of *Dominicos insurgentes y realistas* lies in "not disassociating the history of each country with the history of the Church" both in religious and secular manifestations (Torres Torres, 16). The complexities that impacted the Catholic Church in the Americas during this period parallel the regional fluidity of the larger independence process. Thus, *Dominicos insurgentes y realistas* ultimately illustrates the effects of upheaval in areas where provincials often established royal control of their own accord. For many, defense of imperial royalty in the face of a French invasion of the Iberian Peninsula was preferable to autonomy or independence. More important, this regional flux exacerbated a lack of cohesiveness that no doubt later contributed to the discordant impossibility of the Latin American union dreamed of by Bolívar and his supporters.

From today's vantage point, the contending sides in the independence struggle seem obvious. For contemporaries, though, such clarity was not necessarily apparent. Particularly nebulous was the idea of loyalty itself. As the monumental three-volume collection of essays organized by José Antonio Escudero, *Cortes y Constitución de Cádiz, 200 años*, reveals, after the Napoleonic assault in 1808, the central question in Spanish America became: loyalty to what? Imperial subjects across the Atlantic were confronted with a wide variety of institutions and people that claimed their allegiance. Carlos Martínez Shaw does an outstanding job of explaining the options. On the one hand, they could declare loyalty to Napoleon's brother and new king, Joseph I. Or they could declare fealty to Fernando VII, the kidnapped and deposed Spanish monarch. But the captive king was absent. Thus in America it became a question of whether or not to support those in Spain who defied the French and claimed to rule in the legitimate sovereign's name.

The Junta Central in Spain took on this role in September 1808. The repeated defeats of their peninsular armies, however, led the remnants of the junta to seek refuge in the Isla de León in January 1810 under British naval protection. Seclusion in turn cast doubts on their capacity to govern. Believing that a new beginning could facilitate adherence to the royal cause, the junta dissolved that January in favor of a Consejo de Regencia or Regency Council. This entity was assigned the task of convening the Cortes, or Spanish parliament. A month afterward, the invitation to elect deputies to the Cortes was extended to the territories across the ocean. These General and Extraordinary Cortes opened in September 1810, composed of elected representatives from both the peninsula and the imperial dominions, a formula that further eroded the traditional constraints of Bourbon absolutism in America. This legislative body enacted the Constitution of Cádiz in March of 1812. Following that charter's guidelines, the Cortes closed on September 14, 1813, and reconvened eleven days later as the Cortes Ordinarias, with a duly elected new membership. In January of 1814, the Cortes moved to Madrid in the wake of Spanish-British victories over Napoleon. In May, Fernando VII was restored to the throne. Fatefully, his first major act was to break up the Cortes that had defended his legitimacy, rescind the Cádiz Constitution, and begin full reinstatement of absolutist rule. He reigned until a military mutiny in 1820 brought

back the constitution during the Trienio Liberal, a government that was overthrown again in 1823 when Fernando solicited a French royal invasion, this time in his favor, for the purpose of restoring absolutism.⁵

At each step of the way, as new governmental entities were created and torn down, jurisdictions in Spanish America had to decide whether or not to pledge allegiance to the new order.⁶ Many never did, suspecting ploys of the treacherous French and their Spanish minions, or claiming that in the absence of the king, sovereignty belonged to the people through their elected local *cabildos*.⁷ Others pledged loyalty at the onset but withdrew allegiance at succeeding points. As an alternative, Spain's American subjects looked inward to form autonomous governments and, at least initially, rule in the name of the absentee king. They also had the option of declaring fealty to established regional royal authorities like the viceroy or the captain general, who remained at their posts. Such a chaotic process led many to push the boundaries of what was permissible. Hence, it should come as no surprise that some American juntas decided to altogether ignore king and empire and declared their outright independence.⁸

This is the labyrinthine background for the three-volume collection under the stellar direction of José Antonio Escudero commemorating the two hundredth anniversary of the Cádiz Constitution of 1812. Comprising 115 essays and over 2,100 pages, the work is divided into two major parts: the first deals with the Cortes and the second focuses on the Constitution. Part 1 traces the political and institutional antecedents of the Cortes, including the crisis of the Bourbon regime sparked by the Napoleonic invasion, the institutional histories of the Cortes in the various kingdoms of Spain from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, the summoning of the 1810 Cortes and the composition and nature of its representatives, the ideological and social context, and the reforms the assembly strove to undertake.⁹

Part 2 first examines the 1812 Constitution as a political milestone, including how it dealt with larger issues such as liberty, human rights, and economics, coverage received in the press, its contemporary opponents, and French influences through the ideological impact of the revolutionary 1791 Constitution as well as the Bayonne charter imposed on occupied Spain. An in-depth analysis of the *discurso preliminar*, the constitutional preamble, and its ten *títulos* then follow.

5. For an excellent breakdown of this process, see Roberto Breña, *El primer liberalismo español y los procesos de emancipación de América, 1808–1824: Una revisión historiográfica del liberalismo hispano* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2006); and Breña's most recent work, *El imperio de las circunstancias: Las independencias hispanoamericanas y la revolución liberal española* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México; Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2013).

6. For a lucid account of this complex process, see Jaime E. Rodríguez O., *The Independence of Spanish America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

7. For this point, in addition to Rodríguez O., see especially François-Xavier Guerra, *Modernidad e independencias: Ensayos sobre las revoluciones hispánicas* (Madrid: Ediciones Encuentro, 2009).

8. Venezuela was the first to declare outright independence on July 5, 1811. See Rodríguez O., *The Independence of Spanish America*, 109–122.

9. The earlier Cortes discussed in Escudero, *Cortes y Constitución de Cádiz, 200 años*, include Castilla y León, Aragón, Valencia, Cataluña, and Navarra. See Feliciano Barrios, "Las Cortes de los reinos españoles en los siglos XVI y XVII," vol. 1, pp. 138–155, and Pere Molas, "Las Cortes nacionales en el siglo XVIII," vol. 1, pp. 156–172.

The main issues explored include sovereignty, nationhood, and citizenship; the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers into Cortes, Rey, and Tribunales; and the role of Spain's imperial dominions; along with matters of constitutional procedure, government, taxation, military defense, and public education. Part 2 ends with a series of essays discussing the multinational influence of the Cádiz Constitution on the constitutionalism that arose from Spanish American independence: specifically in Mexico, Venezuela, Río de La Plata, Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, the Central American Federation, New Granada, and Cuba, the only American territory discussed that remained loyal to Spain.

Although the work is no doubt more about Spain than it is about the imperial periphery, it is nonetheless crucial to a proper understanding of the question of loyalty in the Spanish Empire. Indeed, eighteen of the essays center on issues of direct relevance to America. Thus, its contribution to the underlying essence of American royalism is substantial. For example, Rogelio Pérez-Bustamante argues that the Cádiz Constitution granted the independence movements not only an ideological reference point for their own republican charters but also concrete political and constitutional experience for protagonists who later played decisive roles at national conventions. More important, he emphasizes that the peninsular restrictions imposed on American representation at the Cortes, and the inability of the liberal government to react in a timely manner because of the limitations imposed by the constitution itself, reduced royalist influence in America and precipitated independence.

Four other essays merit mention for their emphasis on royalism. José Luis Soberanes Fernández discusses how the absolutist mentality of peninsulars in New Spain paradoxically produced a reaction led by former royalist Agustín de Iturbide in favor of Mexican independence when Fernando VII was obligated to accept the reinstatement of the Cádiz Constitution in 1820 by the mutinous Spanish armed forces under Riego. Alí Enriquez López and Robinzon Meza note the distinctions between Maracaibo, Coro, and Guyana, which sustained loyalty to the monarchy, and those that declared independence in the remainder of Venezuela. Fidelity, however, had strings attached: it was accompanied by a call for administrative autonomy from Caracas and economic privileges. Eduardo Martiré analyzes the royalism in the Río de La Plata viceroyalty, which coalesced around Montevideo's pronouncement in favor of the Cádiz Constitution and the curious desire of some to declare loyalty to Carlota Joaquina, sister of the captive Fernando VII and wife of the Portuguese prince who had escaped Napoleon's clutches and sought refuge in nearby Rio de Janeiro. And finally, Reinaldo Suárez Suárez does an admirable job of examining the constitution's impact on loyalty in Cuba. He stresses that, with the specter of the Haitian slave revolt in the air, "the liberties and spaces for debate that the Constitution of Cádiz introduced were, in effect, dangerous in that they brought with them a sense of insecurity. Absolutism, a familiar evil, represented the security that they so longed for and defended" (Escudero, 760). In sum, *Cortes y Constitución de Cádiz, 200 años* is a masterwork slated to become the indispensable reference source for future discussions of this constitutional period.

In *Preaching Spanish Nationalism across the Hispanic Atlantic, 1759–1823*, Scott Eastman calls the novel synthesis of an inclusive liberalism and an exclusive Ca-

tholicism in the Spanish Empire “mixed modernity” (8). This ideological fusion arose during the first constitutional period at Cádiz from 1808 to 1814 and was resurrected during the Trienio Liberal. The ostensibly incongruous bond between liberalism and Catholicism was developed in an atmosphere of flux, uncertainty, and negotiation among defenders of Spanish nationhood when basic national and imperial survival was in doubt. In brief, Eastman argues convincingly that Enlightenment ideals of progress, reform, and popular sovereignty blended with time-honored Roman Catholic doctrine to form a rallying point around which subjects of the deposed monarch converged to defeat the armies of Napoleon. In the process, these political architects built a new nationalism. The movement was led as much by liberal clerics as by secular reformers and was nourished by a notable dose of religious imagery. Furthermore, it was driven by the creation of a Catholic public sphere, grounded in sermons from the pulpit, which placed religion at the center of a nationalist narrative against atheistic France. This elastic discourse guaranteed the exclusivity of the Catholic faith while concurrently adopting the political reforms of the Age of Revolution. That a liberal constitutional monarchy should be forged in the name of an established single religion was not a contradiction in terms for its advocates, but rather “appropriate and self-evident” (5).

Eastman goes on to explore the effects of these developments in New Spain. There, he identifies a similar discourse tying national identity to Roman Catholicism, but notes the infusion of an insurrectionary component that flipped allegiance to the Spanish Crown on its head. Built on regionalism, a desire for increasing self-rule, class grievances, the unreliability of information from a crumbling Spain, and the exigencies of Marian symbols and adoration, by the 1820s the *novohispano* version of mixed modernity had metamorphosed into the new national identity of independent Mexico. Eastman sees the Catholic faith as the glue that held together the emerging nationalist discourses on both sides of the oceanic gulf, as people sought to reconcile “tensions between Old Regime Catholic spirituality and the radical secularism of popular sovereignty that grew out of the Enlightenment” (179). Thus, liberal nationalism and Catholic identity were complementary, not mutually exclusive, phenomena.

The author asserts that this merger of the liberal and Catholic creeds was what made Spanish nationalism unique, a feature that has been largely ignored by historians who have fallen into the trap of seeing the triumphant liberalism of the era—embodied in revolutionary France and the United States—as antithetical to Catholicism. This oversight has encouraged a teleological approach to the period’s history, portraying independence as inevitable and expunging viable contemporary options proposed by royalists and autonomists who wished to remain within the empire.

Taken together, Escudero’s three-volume set and Eastman’s monograph illustrate the intricacies of loyalty. In short, the subjects of a Spanish Crown reeling from invasion and virtual invisibility had an extremely complex set of variables with which to contend when making on-the-ground choices concerning fidelity. Their options were numerous—probably too much so for the sake of unity—and

the wide range of potential identities only served to add uncertainty to the reigning chaos.

Indios, negros y mestizos en la independencia, under the direction of Heraclio Bonilla, is an excellent illustration of the recent focus on ethnic subalterns in the independence struggle, specifically Indians, mestizos, and those with African antecedents. It is also, perhaps unintentionally, an ideal exemplar of the present state of Spanish American royalist historiography. The emphasis is explicitly on the Andean region; there are anywhere from two to four articles for each of the respective sections on Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Peru. Of a total of fourteen contributions, two deal explicitly with royalist themes and four others incorporate royalist concerns in varying degrees. The remaining eight essays focus almost entirely on the republican side.

Of the chiefly royalist contributors, Jairo Gutiérrez Ramos expands his now-classic analysis in *Los indios de Pasto contra la república, 1809–1824* to other subaltern groups in New Granada.¹⁰ He discusses the royalist commitment of the Indians in Santa Marta on the Caribbean coast and contrasts their position and that of Pasto's Indians with the vacillating tendencies of the natives in the east-central Tunja and Santa Fe regions, who never took up arms to defend either the Spanish monarch or the defiant patriots. In addition, he accentuates the royalist resistance of the mixed-race Afro-indigenous and mulatto (*zambo-mulato*) guerrillas in the Patía region. Insightfully, he ends his analysis by calling for studies of a possible and unexplored Indian-patriot nexus.

Broadening the geographical spectrum, Elina Lovera Reyes examines the Caquetío Indians of Venezuela's Coro region in a study of monarchical continuity. She attributes Caquetío allegiance to the Spanish monarch all the way back to the "Pact of Mamparo" of 1527, whereby the cacique Manaure and Spanish governor Juan de Ampies agreed to the peaceful cosettlement of Coro in an arrangement sealed by diplomatic marriage and a royal decree guaranteeing the Caquetíos the condition of "libres." Stipulations included conversion to Christianity, exemption from tribute and servitude, and their official designation as people of the Real Corona. For three centuries, the Caquetíos were steadfast subjects of the Spanish king and dedicated to the legacy of the near mythical Manaure, to the extent that Coro remained solidly within royal lines as late as 1821.

Lovera also puts forth a perceptive analysis concerning the differences between fidelity and loyalty, proposing that the former is an innate affection and the latter more of a rational compliance with written laws and unwritten codes of honor. She posits that those among the Caquetío elite were loyal, while commoners were blindly devoted "in an observance of faith, conviction, and submission" (Bonilla, 174) that led to unquestioned personal and collective action on behalf of their native superiors and Spanish authority.¹¹

10. Jairo Gutiérrez Ramos, *Los indios de Pasto contra la república, 1809–1824* (Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia, 2007).

11. For the sake of simplicity in this review, we have chosen to use the terms *fidelity* and *loyalty* as synonyms, rather than employ the more intricate definitions proposed by Lovera Reyes.

The essays in *Indios, negros y mestizos en la independencia* that incorporate some royalist analysis within a patriot context include those of José Marcial Ramos Guédez, who discusses the freedom-seeking motives behind black, mulatto, *pardo*, and *zambo* slaves joining either the patriot or royalist forces in Venezuela (many fought with Boves's loyal *llaneros*). Ítala de Mamán briefly scrutinizes the caciques *amedallados* in the Peruvian *altiplano*, who mobilized their people against natives on the patriot side in order to preserve their own privileges under the crown. Heraclio Bonilla ends his essay on indigenous participation in the independence of Peru by examining the Indian peasants of Iquicha in 1824, who rebelled in favor of the return of Fernando VII against a republican *patria traidora* after the supposedly final battle of Ayacucho, a revolt not crushed until four years later. Finally, Christine Hünefeldt draws distinctions between those of African descent who supported Spain and those that backed the patriots. She identifies the "soldiers of the king" as more recent arrivals from Africa, while the adherents to the nationalist cause were generally free blacks and slaves who had enjoyed some experience as artisans or as members of guilds and religious associations and recognized the significance of concepts such as liberty and citizenship (Bonilla, 271). Hünefeldt stresses that the repressive bent of the Spanish reconquest circa 1816, combined with Bolívar's drive to incorporate slaves into his army in exchange for freedom, led to a loss of royalist prestige among this popular sector.

Beyond its manifest interest in subalterneity, Bonilla's tome reveals that Spanish American royalism is not yet an independent scholarly field of its own, as in the case of loyalism in the American Revolution. Of course, one must concede that this edition was never intended to be a compendium of royalist analysis, and it is no doubt unfair to cite this outstanding text as an example of a broader pattern.¹² But that is precisely the point. There are no similarly structured compilations of purely royalist scholarship. At present, the treatment of Spanish loyalty in the empire is anchored tenuously between the crisis of Bourbon rule in America and the birth of republican nationalism in the nineteenth century. This apparent flaw can be remedied. As Georges Lomné declares in the concluding chapter: "It seems absolutely necessary to study the elements of monarchical fidelity that survived or remained" (Bonilla, 308). The texts reviewed here show that there are abundant riches to excavate. Let us end, then, by briefly proposing some directions for investigating Spanish American royalism.

In short, royalism needs to be examined with a new focus on chronology, actors, and approach. In the first case, consideration should be given to exploring the essence of royalism prior to, during, and after the wars of independence. From a chronological standpoint, studies of the ideological, political, economic, social, and cultural antecedents that helped to justify the royalist cause once open conflict broke out are the first order of business.¹³ Second, there is a need for more studies of social identity, loyalty, ideology, and the dynamics of local politics in areas un-

12. The same could be said of *Cartagena de Indias en la independencia* and *Dominicos insurgentes* reviewed here.

13. A British American example is Janice Potter, *The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

der royal control during the independence struggle. Finally, scholars need to take a close look at both royalists who sought exile and those that opted to remain in the newly independent American nations upon the conflict's resolution.¹⁴

In terms of historical actors, it would probably be wise to revisit with new eyes the Spanish American royalist elites, both peninsular and creole. There is likely much to be reinterpreted here beyond the standard accounts of the historians that immediately followed independence and their successors. Moreover, research ought to be undertaken on nonelite criollos, peninsulars, and natives of the Canaries (*canarios*), groups that will add a novel dimension to the superb recent studies on indigenous and African participation.¹⁵

As we have seen, regional variation is important. From a methodological perspective, it would therefore seem appropriate to venture more regularly beyond the confines of New Granada or New Spain, where royalist historiographical energy has thankfully produced much of the current literature.¹⁶ Religion is also a relatively neglected element. There exists a need for further incursions into the royalist-patriot opposition within the Catholic Church, as Fray Eugenio Torres Torres and his able collaborators have shown. Meanwhile, the use of biographical prototypes for exploring specific aspects of loyalty in the persons of particular protagonists—as in the work of Robert Calhoon on American loyalists¹⁷—could likewise yield notable results. Despite what some historians may view as an outdated approach, this method has for the most part remained untapped in royalist historiography, albeit not on the patriot side. Last, the exploration of comparative loyalty would be salutary. There is, for instance, a mature historiography concerning the British American case that Latin American scholars could profitably engage for valuable insights on methodologies, themes, and strategic vantage points for comparison and contrast.¹⁸ All in all, there is no doubt that royalism holds great promise for new waves of scholars willing to harvest a beckoning imperial expanse.

14. To our knowledge there are no existing studies of royalists after they were defeated, with the possible exception of Harold Sims's work on the post-independence Spaniards in Mexico. See Harold Dana Sims, *The Expulsion of Mexico's Spaniards, 1821–1836* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990). For exiles from the American Revolution, see especially Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011).

15. For a comparable example, see Joseph S. Tiedemann, Eugene R. Fingerhut, and Robert W. Venables, eds., *The Other Loyalists: Ordinary People, Royalism, and the Revolution in the Middle Colonies, 1763–1787* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009).

16. In this regard, see also Marcela Echeverri, "Los derechos de indios y esclavos realistas y la transformación política en Popayán, Nueva Granada (1808–1820)," *Revista de Indias* 69, no. 246 (2009): 45–72; and "Popular Royalists, Empire, and Politics in Southwestern New Granada, 1809–1819," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 91, no. 2 (2011): 237–269.

17. See especially Robert M. Calhoon, *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760–1781* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973).

18. See René J. Silva, "Loyal and Royal: A Comparative Analysis of Adherents to the Crown during the American Revolution and the Spanish American Wars of Independence," unpublished manuscript, 2013.