

Sobre Héroes y Tumbas: National Symbols in Nineteenth-Century Spanish America

Rebecca Earle

The external signs adopted by governments are the only language appropriate for explaining to the multitude the principles that animate them.

—José de San Martín, 1821

A street whose name invokes a great man or a great moment, mused Argentine liberal Andrés Lamas in the penultimate decade of the nineteenth century, is “in truth nothing other than a commemorative monument to that deed or that man.” Such street names “have neither the authority nor the solemnity of statues and artistic monuments, but on the other hand [they] keep memory more alive, more specified, and more widely diffused through the population.” While few stop to study a statue or monument, “in contrast street names are tied more closely to the populace, and are of necessity remembered by the city’s inhabitants, who name them at every step and write them regularly. Thus the deed or the great man is tied more closely to the citizenry’s ways of being and thinking.”¹ These everyday monuments offered the population “a silent course in ethics” and converted daily excursions into individual acts of commemoration and homage.²

I would like to thank the Leverhulme Trust and the Arts and Humanities Research Board for the financial support that made this research possible. I am very grateful to Theodore Buttery for his guidance in interpreting Mexican coinage, Adrian Pearce for encouragement, Tonya Blowers for late-night discussions of postcolonial theory, Shirin Rai for the perspective of a political scientist, the two *HAHR* reviewers for their perceptive comments, and Christopher Clark for a beautiful turn of phrase.

1. Notes by Andrés Lamas, 1880s?, Archivo General de la Nación, Buenos Aires [henceforth AGN] Colección Andrés Lamas 2659.

2. In 1793, revolutionary Parisians suggested that the National Convention rename streets and plazas after “all the virtues necessary to the Republic” so as to provide the

Such ideas led to the creation, in the late nineteenth century, of Buenos Aires' grand Avenida de Mayo, whose name recalled the central event of Porteño independence: the May Revolution of 1810. Santiago's mayor, Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna, was inspired in the same years to rename the streets of Chile's capital after the heroes of the war of independence, discarding the old colonial names. The construction, in the 1870s, of Mexico City's Paseo de la Reforma—a broad boulevard honoring the liberal reform movement begun in the 1850s—is another example of this process.³ The commemorative urge that impelled late-nineteenth-century governments in Spanish America to build or rename roads in honor of national heroes and events is evident even in the writings of those skeptics who doubted that street nomenclature was the best place for such commemorations. At roughly the same time that Lamas praised patriotic street names, the Mexican liberal Ignacio Manuel Altamirano dismissed as insignificant their contribution to preserving the memory of their namesakes. Other more effective forms of remembrance ought to be deployed, he maintained, lest the great deeds of the heroes of independence be forgotten. He felt that statues in particular had an as-yet unrealized commemorative potential, which the Mexican government ought to exploit.⁴

Governments in nineteenth-century Spanish America honored the past in many ways, some more familiar to us than others. Scholars have long noted the attempts by nineteenth-century historical writings, so-called *historias patrias*, to foment a patriotic appreciation of the past.⁵ More recently, historians have

population with “a silent course in ethics”; Lynn Hunt, *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (London: Methuen, 1986), 20–21.

3. María del Carmen Magaz and María Beatriz Arévalo, *Historia de los monumentos y estatuas de Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires: Municipalidad de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1985), 21, 193, 212; José Emilio Burucua and Fabián Alejandro Campgane, “Los países del Cono Sur,” in *De los imperios a las naciones: Iberoamérica*, ed. Antonio Annino, Luis Castro Leiva, and François-Xavier Guerra (Zaragoza: IberCaja, 1994), 378; and Barbara Tennenbaum, “Streetwise History: The Paseo de la Reforma and the Porfirian State, 1876–1910,” in *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico*, ed. William Beezley, Cheryl English Martin, and William French (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1994).

4. Ignacio Manuel Altamirano, prologue to *El romancero nacional*, by Guillermo Prieto (Mexico City, 1885), xxvii. See also Lilia Ana Bertoni, *Patriotas, cosmopolitas y nacionalistas: Construcción de la nacionalidad argentina a fines del siglo XIX* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001), 103, 300.

5. For varied discussion of nineteenth-century *historia patria*, see Josefina Zoraida Vázquez de Knauth, *Nacionalismo y educación en México* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1970); E. Bradford Burns, *The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1980); Allen Woll, *A Functional Past: The Uses of History*

also begun to explore the importance of civic festivals in commemorating the nation and its heritage.⁶ Civic festivals, far more than historical writings, had the potential to reach a large audience, even though their orchestration remained largely in the hands of the elite. The 1883 celebrations held in Mexico City to mark September 16 (the anniversary of Miguel Hidalgo's 1810 Grito de Dolores) attracted crowds of 30,000, for example.⁷ The public nature of such festivals encourages us to explore their impact on the popular imagination and, more broadly, to ask how non-elite groups responded to elite constructions of the past. Alberto Flores Galindo's celebrated *Buscando un Inca* is but one of many works in recent decades that examine the interface between elite and popular

in Nineteenth-Century Chile (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1982); Germán Colmenares, *Las convenciones contra la cultura* (Bogotá: Tercer Mundo 1987); Nikita Harwich Vallenilla, "La génesis de un imaginario colectivo: La enseñanza de la historia de Venezuela en el siglo XIX," *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de la Historia* (Venezuela) 282 (1988); Steven Palmer, "A Liberal Discipline: Inventing Nations in Guatemala and Costa Rica, 1870–1900" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia Univ., 1990); David Brading, *The First America, the Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots, and the Liberal State, 1492–1867* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991); Nicholas Shumway, *The Invention of Argentina* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1991); Nelda Pilia de Assunção and Aurora Ravina, eds., *Mayo de 1810: Entre la historia y la ficción discursivas* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos, 1999); and Timothy Hawkins, "A War of Words: Manuel Montúfar, Alejandro Marure, and the Politics of History in Guatemala," *The Historian* 64, nos. 3–4 (2002).

6. See, for example, Javier Ocampo, *Las ideas de un día: El pueblo mexicano ante la consumación de su independencia* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1969); Annick Lempérière, "Los dos centenarios de la independencia mexicana (1910–1921): De la historia patria a la antropología cultural," *Historia Mexicana* 45, no. 2 (1990); Georges Lomné, "Révolution française et rites boliviariens: Examen d'une transposition de la symbolique républicaine," *Cahiers des Amériques Latines* (new series) 10 (1990); Pedro Enrique Calzadilla, "El IV centenario en Venezuela y el fin del 'matricidio,'" in *Los grandes períodos y temas de la historia de Venezuela (V Centenario)*, ed. Luis Cipriano Rodríguez (Caracas: Instituto de Estudios Hispanoamericanos, 1993); Robert Duncan, "Embracing a Suitable Past: Independence Celebrations under Mexico's Second Empire, 1864–6," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 30 (1998); Pedro Enrique Calzadilla, "El olor de la pólvora: Fiestas patrias, memoria y Nación en la Venezuela guzmancista, 1870–1877," *Caravelle* (1999); William Beezley and David Lorey, eds., *¡Viva Mexico! ¡Viva la Independencia! Celebrations of September 16* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2000); and Rebecca Earle, "Padres de la Patria and the Ancestral Past: Celebrations of Independence in Nineteenth-Century Spanish America," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34, no. 4 (2002).

7. William Beezley, "New Celebrations of Independence: Puebla (1869) and Mexico City (1883)," in Beezley and Lorey, *¡Viva Mexico!*, 136.

ideologies.⁸ These studies help us understand the contested nature of nation building in nineteenth-century Spanish America, for it is precisely the demands of nation building that underlie this concern with the past. Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm, and others have shown that nationalism generally involves the invention of a “national” past. Nations maintain themselves as imagined communities in part through the creation of what Nicolas Shumway has called “guiding fictions” that serve to justify the nation’s existence.⁹ A mid-nineteenth-century Venezuelan newspaper expressed this view with particular clarity when it proclaimed, in a crescendo of resonant words, that “it is incompatible with *civilization* and *patriotism* for a *citizen* to be ignorant of his *Patria*’s history.”¹⁰ Com-

8. See, for example, Tristan Platt, “Liberalism and Ethnocide in the Southern Andes,” *History Workshop Journal* 17 (1984); Alberto Flores Galindo, *Buscando un Inca: Identidad y utopía en los Andes* (Lima: Instituto de Apoyo Agrario, 1987); Steve Stern, ed., *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World, 18th to 20th Centuries* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1987); Florencia Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1995); Peter Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico’s National State: Guerrero, 1800–1857* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1996); Mark Thurner, *From Two Republics to One Divided: Contradictions of Postcolonial Nation-making in Andean Peru* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1997); Charles Walker, *Smoldering Ashes: Cuzco and the Creation of Republican Peru, 1780–1840* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1999); Guy Thomson, with David LaFrance, *Patriotism, Politics, and Popular Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Juan Francisco Lucas and the Puebla Sierra* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1999); Sonia Alda Mejías, *La participación indígena en la construcción de la República de Guatemala, s. XIX* (Madrid: Univ. Autónoma de Madrid, 2001); Marta Irurozqui, “The Sound of the Pututos: Politicisation and Indigenous Rebellion in Bolivia, 1825–1921,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 32, no. 1 (2000); and Greg Grandin, *Blood of Guatemala: A History of Race and Nation* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2000).

9. See Pierre Nora, ed., *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, 3 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–92); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991); Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991), 77; Shumway, *The Invention of Argentina*, 194; Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, ed., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992); Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1992), 86–87; and Jean Meyer, “History as National Identity,” *Voices of Mexico* (Oct.–Dec. 1995): 33.

10. Harwich Vallenilla, “La génesis de un imaginario colectivo,” 349 (my emphasis). For similar views from elsewhere in Spanish America, see Zabala and Gandía, *La enseñanza de la historia*, 13; Woll, *A Functional Past*, 150; Acto de la inauguración oficial del Instituto Histórico, 1906, Julio Tello and Toribio Mejía Zesspe, *Historia de los museos nacionales del Perú, 1822–1946* (Lima: Museo Nacional de Antropología y Arqueología, 1967), 62; “Alpha” (presumably Manuel Ancizar), introduction to *Gonzalo Pizarro*, by Felipe Pérez (Bogotá, 1857), xiv; Emiro Kastros [Juan de Dios Restrepo], “Memorias para la historia de la Nueva Granada por el Señor José Antonio de Plaza,” *Colección de artículos escogidos* (Bogotá, 1859), 38;

memorations of the past must be understood as part of the larger nineteenth-century process of nation building.

This article examines neither the impact of elite efforts at nation building on the popular classes nor the alternate models of nationalism articulated by sub-alterns. Rather, I focus on certain tensions inherent in the elite process of nation building itself. I explore the unstable visions of the national past expressed during the nineteenth century in such unobtrusive but ubiquitous sites of official memory as postage stamps, coins, statues, and place-names. These surprisingly eloquent venues reveal the changing conceptions of the nation maintained by the politicians and intellectuals who created them. They also reveal the difficulties posed to the nationalist project by the colonial experience. Postcolonial theorists have drawn our attention to the particular challenges history offers to nations formed out of former colonies, where interpretations of the past are often deeply embedded in the struggle for independence and where attempts at locating the “authentic” past so central to the enterprise of nationalism are particularly problematic. Seeking authenticity in the precolonial era, which appears to provide an alternative to colonial culture, may instead create “a calcified society whose developmental momentum has been checked by colonization,” as Abdul JanMohamed writes with reference to African nationalism. In other words, celebrating the precolonial era as the true national past raises the fear that national culture must be obsolete, trapped in bygone times, and therefore backward. On the other hand, any attempt to incorporate aspects of the colonial era raises the specter of what JanMohamed calls historical catalepsy, which condemns postcolonial society as a “vacant imitator” of colonial culture, devoid of any genuinely authentic past of its own.¹¹ Imitation appears scarcely more appealing than obsolescence, although Homi Bhabha has suggested that the colonial and, potentially postcolonial, experience is located precisely in that moment of imitation.¹² Imitation and mimicry, rather than authenticity, thus

Lorenzo Montúfar, *Discurso pronunciado . . . el 15 de setiembre de 1877* (Guatemala, 1877), 16; and Ramón Rosa, “Conciencia del pasado,” 1880, *Oro de Honduras* (Tegucigalpa: Univ. Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, 1993), 1:191.

11. Abdul JanMohamed, *Manichean Aesthetics: The Politics of Literature in Colonial Africa* (Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1983), 5 (for quotes), 40, 152, 182–84, 265, 279. Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (London: Zed Books, 1986), 65, discusses somewhat comparable dilemmas. See also Frantz Fanon’s analysis of the native intellectual and his relationship with national culture in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961; London: Penguin, 1990), 166–99.

12. For mimicry, see Homi Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse,” *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); and for the

mark the postcolonial, just as the search for history and origins signifies the national. An authentic past, in other words, is perhaps both a necessary component of nationalism and fundamentally unobtainable in postcolonial situations.

Whether or not Spanish America fits comfortably within concepts of “post-coloniality,” postcolonial theory’s observations about the conflictive nature of the past hold some relevance for the region, where elite efforts at imagining the nation were rent by internal anxieties about the weight of history. Nineteenth-century intellectuals and ideologues asked themselves: What is our history? In whose image has the nation been created? Which past should the state honor in its efforts to transform itself into a nation? Commemoration inevitably invokes certain histories and excluded others. Endowing a street with a new, commemorative name usually necessitates discarding its previous name. Commemoration thus involves not only remembering, but also forgetting, much as the nationalist project of which it forms a part involves both common remembrances and common forgetting, as Ernest Renan observed more than a century ago.¹³

I pay particular attention to the role of indigenous imagery within these elite remembering and forgettings, because (as we shall see) the indigenous past was central to the iconography of the earliest efforts at nation building during the wars of independence. In attending to elite use of indigenous (and more specifically, preconquest) imagery to represent the nation, I draw on the perceptive studies of scholars such as Blanca Muratorio and Marisol de la Cadena, who have stressed that representations of the preconquest era reflect broader concerns about the nature of the nation itself.¹⁴ Their studies, which focus on

challenges the search for origins poses in colonial contexts, see Bhabha, “Representation and the Colonial Text: A Critical Exploration of Some Forms of Mimeticism,” in *The Theory of Reading*, ed. Frank Gloversmith (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1984), 93–96. Thanks to Tonya Blowers for advice on Bhabha’s work.

13. Ernest Renan, *Que’est-ce qu’une nation?* 1882, *Discours et Conférences* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1887), 286.

14. For studies of the varying role of indigenous imagery in independent Spanish America, see Nuria Sala i Vila, “De Inca a indígena: Cambio en la simbología del Sol a principios del siglo XIX,” *Allpanchis* 35–36, no. 2 (1991); Blanca Muratorio, “Nación, identidad y etnicidad,” in *Imágenes e imagineros: Representaciones de los indígenas ecuatorianos, siglos XIX y XX*, ed. Blanca Muratorio (Quito: Flasco, 1994); Stacie Widdifield, *The Embodiment of the National in Late Nineteenth-Century Mexican Painting* (Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press, 1996); Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, *Mexico at the World’s Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1996); Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race, and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997); Walker, *Smoldering Ashes*; and Marisol de la Cadena, *Indigenous Mestizos: The Politics of Race and Culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919–1991* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2000). My understanding of this topic also owes a debt to the works of David Brading, in particular

individual states, have encouraged me to consider manifestations of nationalism throughout nineteenth-century Spanish America. Although the history of no republic wholly resembles that of its neighbors, the similarities of elite political culture allow for fruitful comparisons. This article thus offers a supranational perspective on the formation of elite nationalisms in Spanish America.

Anáhuac, Bogotá, Caupolicán: Naming the Nation in the Independence Era

The importance of the past in imagining the nation was understood early in the independence process that developed after 1810. To paraphrase Bhabha, “nations *find* their origins in the myths of time,” and for Spanish American insurgents the time of origin myths was the pre-Columbian era.¹⁵ Poetry, state spectacle, and prose lauded this happy idyll before the arrival of the conquistadors. Revolutionary writers celebrated the achievements of Aztecs, Incas, and other indigenous peoples, whose virtues they contrasted with the depravity of the Spanish colonizers. “Plato’s Republic, the utopia of Thomas More, seem actually to have existed on this continent,” boasted one Buenos Aires newspaper in 1816. “The government of our Peruvian Incas was so wise that it scarcely appears possible, but it is indubitable that it existed.”¹⁶ The conquest and colonial period, on the other hand, was a time of darkness, “three centuries of horror,” in the words of a patriotic Peruvian song.¹⁷ The motives behind this rhetoric are easy to discern: by celebrating the prequest era and condemning Spanish colonization, insurgents sought to delegitimize Spanish rule. If the conquest had dethroned legitimate, virtuous indigenous monarchies, then colonial rule was unjust and illegitimate. Moreover, by hinting that the Americas possessed a noble history

Prophecy and Myth in Mexican History (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984); and *The Origins of Mexican Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985).

15. Thanks to my colleague Chris Clark for this felicitous rephrasing! See Homi Bhabha, “Introduction: Narrating the Nation,” in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990), 1.

16. *El Censor* (Buenos Aires), 12 Dec. 1816.

17. José de la Torre Ugarte, “Canción Nacional del Perú,” 1821, *Colección documental de la independencia del Perú* [henceforth CDIP], vol. 24, *La poesía de la emancipación*, ed. Aurelio Mira Quesada Sosa (Lima: Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú, 1971), 293. Hans-Joachim König discusses the trope of “three centuries of slavery” in Hans-Joachim König, “Símbolos nacionales y retórica política en la independencia: El caso de la Nueva Granada,” in *Problemas de la formación del estado y de la nación en Hispanoamérica*, ed. Inge Buisson, Günter Kahle, Hans-Joachim König, and Horst Pietschmann (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1984).

predating Spanish colonization, insurgents endowed their projected nations with an impressive past that would, they hoped, reinforce their nationalist ambitions. The merits of the preconquest era thus justified independence in several complimentary ways.¹⁸

This largely newfound appreciation for the pre-Columbian past was reflected in the renaming of provinces, cities, and other locations in the wake of independence. Insurgent leaders used indigenous names to rechristen place-names that recalled Iberian geography, thereby discarding semantic links to Spain and establishing ties to the preconquest past. Thus, in New Spain the province of Nuevo Santander became Tamaulipas, Nueva Galicia became Xalisco, and New Spain itself became Méjico (or better, México, which was felt to reflect more authentically the indigenous Nahuatl pronunciation). Some enthusiasts even fought to call the country the Republic of Anáhuac, after a supposed Aztec term for central Mexico. The insurgent priest Servando Teresa de Mier, for example, preferred to speak of “Anahuacans” rather than “Mexicans.”¹⁹ By referring to their country as México, or indeed Anáhuac, national insurgents stressed the country’s ancient origins and historic autonomy, features that were important elements of nineteenth-century nationalist rhetoric in Europe as well.²⁰

While insurgent-era names in Mexico honored the Aztecs, in Chile they recalled the Araucanians. Lautaro, Caupolicán, Tucapel, Galvarino, and the other Araucanian heroes of Alonso de Ercilla’s sixteenth-century epic, the *Araucana*, had become central emblems of Chilean patriotic discourse during the independence period, for like the Aztecs, the indigenous Araucanians had resisted the Spanish Conquest, providing a model of heroism and suggesting a history of independence with which South American insurgents could seek continuity. “Who,” asked insurgent journalist Camilo Henríquez in 1812, “would not be moved by the heroic magnanimity with which the Chilean Indians fought for their freedom? . . . All America had bowed her neck under the yoke; in sad silence seeing her children condemned to murderous work in the

18. See Rebecca Earle, “Creole Patriotism and the Myth of the ‘Loyal Indian,’” *Past & Present* 172 (2001): 175–95.

19. Session of 3 July 1823, *Historia parlamentaria de los Congresos Mexicanos*, ed. Juan Mateos (Mexico City, 1878), 2:432; Edmundo O’Gorman, ed., *Fray Servando Teresa de Mier: Antología del pensamiento político americano* (Mexico City: Imprenta Universitaria, 1945), xxxvi, 113; Edmundo O’Gorman, *Historia de las divisiones territoriales de México* (Mexico City: Ed. Porrúa, 1973), 50–51, 61–62; and Brading, *The Origins of Mexican Nationalism*, 81.

20. For canonical discussion of the Mexican case, see Brading, *The Origins of Mexican Nationalism*; and Brading, *The First America*.

mines, robbed of their possessions, reduced to servitude; the palaces of the invaders were raised on the tombs of their Incas; only the hardy Araucanian refuses to accept his chains.”²¹ Poets thus invoked the shades of Caupolicán and his brothers to assist them in their fight with the Spanish: “Immortal ashes of the Araucanians, / Rise up from your tomb, Oh come, warriors, / Oh, Tucapel, valiant Caupolicán, / Whose fearsome weapons pursued / The Spanish despot with gallantry.”²² These heroes were honored in the names of the new republican territories; by 1826 Chile had acquired the departments of Caupolicán and Lautaro, which replaced the colonial province of Concepción. Two of the four vessels of Chile’s first “national” navy were likewise named the *Lautaro* and the *Araucano*, while other independence-era Chilean ships included the *Galvarino* (previously *HMS Hecate*), the *Tucapel*, and, for good measure, the *Montezuma*.²³ This official appreciation for the Araucanians contrasts sharply with colonial attitudes. In 1796 the city of Talca had requested that its coat of arms show the defeat of “the terrible Indian chief” Lautaro.²⁴

In Peru and Río de la Plata, patriotic renaming celebrated the Incas alongside the Araucanians. After his 1821 capture of Lima, José de San Martín rebaptized the city’s fortifications so that the “King’s Bastion” became the “Bastion of Manco-Capac.” Manco Capac, the first Inca, literally replaced the defeated Spanish monarch.²⁵ The name change implied that Peru’s independence revived the Inca Empire, as indeed poets and politicians proclaimed it had: “At last has

21. *Aurora de Chile* (Santiago), 16 July 1812, *Aurora de Chile, 1812–1813: Reimpresión paelográfica a plana y renglón*, ed. Julio Vicuña Cifuentes (Santiago: Imprenta Cervantes, 1903), 96.

22. “Unipersonal con intermedios de música: El triunfo,” *La lira argentina o colección de las piezas poéticas dadas a luz en Buenos-Ayres durante la guerra de su independencia* (Buenos Aires, 1824), 209. The classic text on the importance of the Araucanians to insurgent rhetoric in Chile is Simon Collier, *Ideas and Politics of Chilean Independence, 1808–1833* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), 194–213. See also Alonso de Ercilla, *La araucana* (1569; Mexico City: Ed. Porrúa, 1992).

23. Francisco Solano Asta-Buruaga, *Diccionario geográfico de la República de Chile* (Santiago, 1899), 137–38, 359–60; Miguel Luis Amunátegui, *Los precursores de la independencia de Chile* (1870–72; Santiago, 1910), 2:512; Manuel Torrente, *Historia de la Revolución de Chile: Colección de historiadores i de documentos relativos a la independencia de Chile* (Santiago, 1900), 3:369; and www.armada.cl, a Web site maintained by the Chilean Navy.

24. Néstor Meza Villalobos, *La conciencia política chilena durante la monarquía* (Santiago: Univ. de Chile, 1958), 258–59.

25. Decreto de San Martín, Lima, 21 Sept. 1821, *El álbum de Ayacucho: Colección de los principales documentos de la guerra de la independencia del Perú, y de las cantes de victoria y poesías relativas a ella*, ed. José Hipólito Herrera (Lima, 1862), 60–61.

arrived / the happy moment / in which the Incan Empire is / restored in the peoples of the Sun,” states a patriotic Peruvian ditty of the same year.²⁶ In the former viceroyalty of New Granada, new names recalled the indigenous Muiscas: the capital previously known as Santafé or Santa Fe de Bogotá became simply Bogotá, and the zone around the city became Cundinamarca—which, according to its 1811 constitution, was the “first and original name” used by its pre-conquest inhabitants.²⁷ These renamings illustrate what Daniel Milo has called the “nationalization of the right to name.”²⁸ Nation builders in the former Spanish colonies consciously selected place-names that evoked the pre-Columbian empires whose overthrow they claimed to avenge.²⁹ At the same time, they sought to erase traces of the colonial presence by eliminating semantic refer-

26. Canción al Primer Congreso del Perú, Mira Quesada Sosa, *La poesía de la emancipación*, 407. See also *Gazeta Ministerial de Chile*, 25 Aug. 1821; Julian Segundo de Agüero, “Oración patriótica,” 25 May 1817, Buenos Aires, *El clero argentino de 1810 a 1830* (Buenos Aires, 1907), 1:181–85; José Bernardo Monteagudo, “Diálogo entre Atahualpa y Fernando VII en los Campos Eliseos,” 1809, *CDIP*, vol. 25, *El teatro en la independencia*, ed. Guillermo Ugarte Chamorro (Lima: Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú, 1974), 1:253–61; *El Sol de Cuzco*, 1825, *Documentos para la historia de la vida pública del Libertador*, ed. José Félix Blanco y Ramón Azpurua (Caracas: Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República, 1978), 10:127; Insurgent documents, 1814, *CDIP*, vol. 3, *Conspiraciones y rebeliones en el siglo XIX*, no. 7, *La revolución del Cuzco de 1814*, ed. Horacio Villanueva Urteaga, 556, 565; and “Canción patriótica del ejército libertadora a los peruanos”; Felipe Lledías, “Lima libre, canción patriótica,” 1822; “Marcha patriótica del Perú independiente,” 1822; Felipe Lledías, “Canción patriótica,” 1822; “Proclama de Huáscar Inca en su prisión,” 1822; Y. V., “La sombra de Atahualpa a los hijos del sol,” 1822?; and “El pronóstico de Viracocha: Embajada de este príncipe al Inca su padre,” 1822; all in Mira Quesada Sosa, *Poesía de la emancipación*, 182–83, 299–302, 307–10, 322–23, 359–61, 354–55, 362–64.

27. Constitución de Cundinamarca, 1811, *Constituciones de Colombia*, ed. Manuel Antonio Pombo and José Joaquín Guerra (Bogotá: Ministerio de la Educación, 1951), 1:126; and the discussion of this text in König, “Símbolos nacionales,” 394. Cartagena was likewise referred to poetically as “Calamar,” after its pre-conquest name of Calamarí, apparently meaning “crab.” Crabs accordingly decorated Cartagena’s state flag in 1811. See König, *En el camino hacia la nación: Nacionalismo en el proceso de formación del estado y de la nación de la Nueva Granada, 1750 a 1856* (Bogotá: Banco de la República, 1994), 250; and José María Salazar, *La campaña de Bogotá* (Bogotá, 1820).

28. Daniel Milo, “Le nom des rues,” in *Les lieux de mémoire*, Nora, vol. 2, *La Nation*, part 3, 287.

29. For the insurgents as the avengers of the Incas and Aztecs, see *Gazeta Ministerial Extraordinaria de Chile*, 21 Aug. 1821; Manuel de la Barcena, *Oración gratulatoria a Dios, que por la independencia mejicana dijo en la catedral de Valladolid de Michoacán* (Mexico City?, 1821?); *Justicia de la independencia o apuntamientos sobre los derechos de los americanos* (Mexico City, 1821); *Extracto del noticioso general de México del lunes de julio de 1822* (Puebla, 1822); Horacio



Figure 1. 1812 copper coin minted by insurgents in Oaxaca, Mexico. The obverse shows a crude bow and arrow. (Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 1407.)

ences to Spain. For Eric Hobsbawm, the invented nature of postindependence Spanish American place-names provides good evidence that nationalism played little role in the independence process.³⁰ In my view, it illustrates instead precisely the sort of invented past that scholars such as Benedict Anderson, and indeed Hobsbawm himself, have taught us to expect nationalism to produce.

The insurgents thus imbedded their view of Spanish America's history in the very geography of the continent. The emblems of the state—the coats of arms, coinage, flags, and medals created to symbolize these new nations—made similar use of indigenous imagery. Unlike colonial currency with its busts of Spanish monarchs, coins minted during the wars of independence did not depict particular persons, but they often used indigenous motifs (see table 1). The first insurgent coins minted in Mexico showed a bow and arrow, while others sported the Aztec eagle perched on a cactus that would, by 1821, become the state seal (see figure 1).³¹ Insurgent Colombian coins of the 1810s were embossed with

Villanueva Urteaga, "La idea de los Incas como factor favorable a la independencia," *Revista Universitaria* (Cuzco) 115 (1958): 157; El observador americano a sus paisanos, 23 Dec. 1813, Augusto E. Mallié, ed., *La revolución de mayo a través de los impresos de la época, primera serie, 1809–1815* (Buenos Aires: Comisión Nacional Ejecutiva del Sesquicentenario de la Revolución de Mayo, 1965), 2:201; Andrés Bello, "La agricultura en la zona tórrida," *El repertorio americano, Londres, 1826–1827* (Caracas: Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República, 1973), vol. 1, tomo 1, 14, 8, 17; and "Glosa," 1820; José Joaquín de Olmedo, "Brindis a San Martín"; Y. V. and J. P. A., "Contestación de los hijos del sol a la sombra de Atahualpa," 1822; José Joaquín de Olmedo, "Marcha," 1825, and F. S. M., "Himno," 1825; all in Mira Quesada Sosa, *Poesía de la emancipación*, 195–96, 327, 356–58, 487–90.

30. Eric Hobsbawm, "Nationalism and Nationality in Latin America," in *Pour une histoire économique et sociale internationale: Mélanges offerts à Paul Bairoch*, ed. Bouda Etemad, Jean Baton, and Thomas David (Geneva: Éditions Passé Présent, 1995), 315.

31. Chester Krause and Clifford Mishler, 1994 *Standard Catalog of World Coins* (Iola: Krause Publications, 1993), 1396–1460.

Table 1: Spanish American Coins

	Argentina	Bolivia	Chile	Colombia	Ecuador	Guatemala	Mexico	Peru	Venezuela
First national coin	1813 Incaic solar face	1827 llamas under tree	1822 column crowned with stars	1811 Indian under tree	1833 Incaic solar face	1829 volcanoes	1811 bow and arrow	1822 Incaic solar face	1812 "19" ^a
First indigenous motif	1813 Incaic solar face	1831 Incaic solar face	1971 Lautaro	1811 Indian under tree	1833 Incaic solar face	1949 Maya stela at Quiriguá	1811 bow and arrow	1822 Incaic solar face	never
First person on coin	1836 Juan Manuel de Rosas	1827 Simón Bolívar	1942 Bernardo O'Higgins	1911 Simón Bolívar	1844 Simón Bolívar	1859 Rafael Carrera	1821 Agustín de Iturbide	1898 ^b Manco Capac	1863 José Antonio Páez
First <i>prócer</i> on coin	1950 José de San Martín	1827 Simón Bolívar	1942 Bernardo O'Higgins	1911 Simón Bolívar	1844 Simón Bolívar	never	1821 Agustín de Iturbide	never	1863 José Antonio Páez

Sources: Rosa, *Numismáticas*; Alberto Francisco Pradeau, *Historia numismática de México de 1823 a 1950* (Mexico City: Sociedad Numismática de México, 1957); Asbun-Karma, *Monedas*; Henry Grunthal, *The Coinage of Peru* (Frankfurt: Numismatischer Verlag P.N. Schulten, 1978); Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*; and Gumucio, *Las monedas de la independencia*.

Notes:

^a "19" refers to April 19, 1810, the date of Caracas' first move toward independence.

^b Trade coinage.



Figure 2. Eight-real silver coin of the Provincias Unidas de Nueva Granada. This 1821 design shows an Indian princess adorned with a feather crown on the obverse, and a pomegranate (*granada*) on the reverse. Courtesy of Michael Shaw.



Figure 3. 1994 Argentine Peso displaying the Incaic solar face that first appeared on currency in 1813.

crowned Indian maidens and indigenous warriors (see figure 2).³² Argentine and Peruvian coinage of the war years displayed the radiant solar face considered to be an Incaic symbol (see figure 3). Incaic symbolism is also apparent in the use of “sol” (sun) rather than “real” (royal) as a term for coins of small denomination in Río de la Plata and Bolivia.³³

State shields and flags adopted similar indigenous imagery—which is unsur-

32. For discussion of these coins, see König, *En el camino*, 255–63.

33. See Establishment of Orden del Sol, 8 Oct. 1821, Herrera, *Album de Ayacucho*, 74; Alejandro Rosa, *Numismática: Independencia de América* (Buenos Aires, 1904); CDIP, vol. 13, *Obra de gobierno y epistolario de San Martín*, ed. José A. de la Puente Candamo (Lima: Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú, 1974), 1:379–84; Davis Burnett, *Bolivian Proclamation Coinage* (Virginia, MN: Latin America Press, 1987); and Fernando Baptista Gumucio, *Las monedas de la independencia (1808–1827)* (La Paz: Ed. Cervecería la Taquiña, 1995).

Figure 4. A version of the first Peruvian state shield, designed in 1821, showing a radiant Incaic sun crowning an Andean peak. The motto reads “The Peruvian sun has been reborn.” (Pons Muzzo, ed., *Símbolos de la patria*, unnumbered plate.)



EL CONSEJO DE GOBIERNO

prising, as they were often designed simultaneously. The Incaic sun figured prominently on national iconography in both Río de la Plata and Peru. The Peruvian flag designed by San Martín in 1820 sported a rising sun, and in 1818 an Incaic sun was added to the Argentine flag, where it remains to the present day (see figure 4).³⁴ Other flags, state shields, and commemorative medals simply showed Indians or indigenous attributes such as bows and arrows. The 1815 coat of arms of the Provincias Unidas de la Nueva Granada depicted bows and arrows alongside the traditional pomegranate (*granada*), while that of Funza (New Granada) showed a bow and arrows, a lance, and “other distinctive Indian weapons.” These emblems were intended, according to their designers, to “remind us that in this place the ancient Indian sovereigns held court.” After its break from Gran Colombia, Venezuela’s state emblem featured an Indian woman, and the 1812 shield of the Chilean Patria Vieja included two Indians armed with bows and spears. Commemorative medals, too, used the figure of Indian princesses to represent an independent America. For example, an 1821 medal honoring Agustín de Iturbide depicted Mexico as a *huipil*-clad Indian princess adorned with a feather crown. The Aztec war ax, or *macana*, was also incorporated into designs for Mexican

34. For the development of the national flag and state shield in Río de la Plata, see AGN, sala X, 44-8-29, “escarapela nacional/bandera nacional/banda presidencial (1812-18)”; Asamblea General Constituyente de 1813, Mallié, *La Revolución de Mayo*, 2:223; and Vicente Fidel López, *Historia de la República Argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1883-93), 4:118-19. For Peru, see José de San Martín, Bando, Pisco, 21 Oct. 1820, *CDIP*, vol. 10, *Símbolos de la patria*, ed. Gustavo Pons Muzzo (Lima, Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú 1974), 3.



Figure 5. José María Morelos's flag, circa 1814, showing a crowned, Aztec-style eagle perched on a cactus. (Romero Flores, *Banderas históricas mexicanas*, plate facing 44.)

coins and medals, alongside the Aztec eagle and cactus, which in turn featured on many of Mexico's independence-era banners (see figure 5).³⁵

This indigenously emphasized America's former, rightful independence by suggesting a history of autonomy predating the conquest. This autonomous history, insurgents insisted, had been unjustly uprooted by the conquest-

35. Miguel Luis Amunátegui, "Apuntes sobre lo que han sido las bellas artes en Chile," *Revista de Santiago* 3 (1849): 41; Pedro Julio Dousebés, "Las insignias de Colombia," *Boletín de Historia y de Antigüedades* 24, no. 274 (1937): 460; König, "Símbolos nacionales," 395; Eduardo Posada, "Heráldica colombiana," *Boletín de Historia y de Antigüedades* 26, nos. 291–302 (1939); Eduardo Poirier, ed., *Chile en 1910: Edición del centenario de la independencia* (Santiago, 1910), plate facing 104; Frank Grove, *Medals of Mexico*, vol. 2, *Medals of Mexico, 1821–1971* (San José: Prune Tree Graphics, 1970–74), nos. 7, 75; Rosa, *Numismática*, 21; Declaración del Cura Hidalgo, 7 June 1811, *Colección de documentos para la historia de la Guerra de Independencia de Mexico*, ed. J. E. Hernández y Dávalos (1880; Mexico City, 1968), 1:13; Jesus Romero Flores, *Banderas históricas mexicanas* (Mexico City, 1973); and Session of 12 Apr. 1823, Mateos, *Historia parlamentaria*, 2:253–54.

tadors, and it was therefore proper to eliminate traces of Spanish rule. Nation building, as we know, involves forgetting. For this reason the emblems of these new states not only displayed indigenous emblems but also discarded the icons of Spanish rule, just as Spanish place-names had been replaced with more indigenous-sounding ones. San Martín designed the new Incaic flag for an independent Peru because he felt that “the conservation of symbols that recall its long period of oppression is incompatible with . . . independence.”³⁶ Chile’s Bernardo O’Higgins likewise justified the minting of new coinage to replace ones depicting Ferdinand VII by explaining that “in an epoch in which the august emblems of liberty are everywhere substituted for the execrable image of the former despots, it would be extraordinarily absurd for our coins to conserve that infamous bust of usurpation personified.” (Ferdinand VII was seen not merely as a tyrant, but a usurper, because colonial rule was a usurpation of the ancient rights of the Aztecs, Incas, and Araucanians.³⁷) O’Higgins’s call to eliminate the iconography of usurpation was echoed by Mexican writers. “Neither in the cathedral nor on the pillory, nor even less on our coins, nothing that reeks of Spain’s old tyrannical domination over America” should be retained, proclaimed “Anita

36. José de San Martín, Pisco, 21 Oct. 1820, Pons Muzzo, *Símbolos de la patria*, 3 (for quote); and decree by Torre Tagle, 9 Feb. 1822, *Colección de leyes, decretos y ordenes publicadas en el Perú desde el año de 1821 hasta 31 de diciembre de 1859*, ed. Juan Oviedo (Lima, 1861), 6:182–83. The Buenos Aires Assembly similarly ordered in 1813 that the king’s arms be replaced on all public buildings with the assembly’s new shield; see José Ingenieros, *La evolución de las ideas argentinas* (1918; Buenos Aires: Talleres Gráficos Argentinos, 1937), 2:34; and also Manuel Belgrano to Gobierno Superior, Jujuy, 29 May 1812, AGN, Sala X, 44-8-29.

37. Quoted in Francisco A. Encina, *Historia de Chile desde la prehistoria hasta 1891* (Santiago: Editorial Nascimento, 1969), 7:392. For comparable comments from Peru, see “Mariano Felipe Paz Soldán da razón de los cinco proyectos que se presentaron . . . para variar la bandera nacional,” Feb. 1825, Pons Muzzo, *Símbolos de la patria*, 33–34. For “usurpation,” see Manuel Ferreyros, “Lima independiente,” 1822?; Y. V. and J. P. A., “Contestación de los hijos del sol a la sombra de Atahualpa,” 1822; and “Bosquejos de la tiranía y el Perú libre”; all in Mira Quesada Sosa, *La poesía de la emancipación*, 247–49, 356–57, 401–4; Un americano, *A los ciudadanos militares que componen la división del Sr. D. Vicente Guerrero* (Mexico City, 1821); Francisco Lagranda, *Consejo produente sobre una de las garantías* (Mexico City, 1821); *Gazeta Ministerial del Gobierno de Buenos Aires*, 17 Mar. 1813; Proclama de los insurgentes del Cusco, 1814?; Manuel Jesus Aparicio Vega, *El clero patriota en la revolución de 1814* (Cuzco: Cervetur, 1974), 126; El ciudadano Juan Ramon Balcarce to señores xefes y oficiales of 6 regimientos of milicias de caballeria de Buenos Aires, 31 Dec. 1815, Mallié, *La Revolución de Mayo*, 2:563–64; Explicación de la Función al cumple años del gobierno de la América del Sud, Buenos Aires, 1812; and Anonymous letter to Pedro Vicente Cañete, both in AGI, Seville, Diversos 2; and Heraclio Bonilla, “Clases populares y estado en el contexto de la crisis colonial,” in *La independencia en el Perú*, ed. Heraclio Bonilla et al. (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1972), 29.

la Respondona” in an 1821 Mexican pamphlet. She appealed for “little eagles, *floripundios*, cactuses, coyotes, arrows, macanas, feathers, and, if possible, parrots, *galloretas*, cherimoyas, and *chocomites*, in place of fleurs-de-lis, lions, castles, fleeces.”³⁸ The request to replace Spanish lions and castles (the emblems of Castile and León) with autochthonous imagery was heeded by Colombia’s newly formed Republic of Cartagena, whose 1812 national shield replaced the lion, cross, and crown of the city’s colonial coat of arms with an Indian woman seated under a palm tree.³⁹ The Argentine city of Salta made similar use of the new allegorical Indian when it modified its coat of arms. The city’s arms had previously shown a Spaniard resisting attack by a hostile Indian, but in 1813 the cabildo altered the design “so that the Spaniard appears to surrender to the Indian.”⁴⁰ The political message encoded in this change is quite clear: Spanish colonialism would inevitably fall to American arms, as symbolized by the victorious Indian warrior. The indigenous, pre-conquest past, in other words, represented freedom, heroism, and liberty for the framers of Spanish American independence. For these reasons, Indian princesses and Araucanian heroes were worthy to represent the newly independent state.

Symbolizing the Postindependence State:

The Triumph of the *Próceres*

This appreciation of the pre-Columbian past should not be misconstrued as an indigenista-style concern with the well-being of contemporary indigenous people. Rather, it reflected the “Indianesque” nature of independence-era elite rhetoric, which emphasized the illegitimacy of Spanish colonialism through an exaltation of the Aztecs, Incas, and Araucanians. This rhetoric, and the consequent use of indigenous imagery, was part of the nation-building process begun with independence, which sought to endow Spanish America with its own usable past. After independence, these states (and their successors) would continue to represent themselves with official iconography, but they were under no particular ideological compulsion to continue using the same emblems and symbols to do so. Indeed, even during the independence era itself, elite revolutionaries had oscillated between wholehearted endorsement of the pre-conquest past as the wellspring of nationality and insistence that their own status and importance derived precisely from their Spanish heritage.⁴¹ The tensions inherent in “Indi-

38. Anita la Respondona, *Allá van esas frioleras al Pensador Mexicano* (Mexico City, 1821).

39. König, “Símbolos nacionales,” 395; and Posada, “Heráldica colombiana.”

40. Governor of Salta (Feliciano Antonio Chiclana), report on the celebrations of 25 de Mayo in Salta, 1813, AGN, sala X, 44-8-29.

41. See Earle, “Creole Patriotism.”

anesque” representations of the state mitigated against their survival as articulations of elite nationalism in the decades after independence. The fierce repudiation of their colonial heritage never sat comfortably with the region’s creoles. Precisely these concerns underpinned the rejection of Indianesque nationalism in the decades after independence. Commentators of all political persuasions dismissed as ludicrous the view that the new republics were continuations of pre-Columbian empires. Conservative Peruvian priest Bartolomé Herrera, writing in the 1840s, described the independence-era belief that “Peruvian independence and the reconquest of the Inca empire . . . [were] one and the same thing” as “one of the truly crazy ideas of which there was no shortage during the period of emancipation.”⁴² Liberal Argentine writers of the Generation of 1837 commented on the peculiar taste of Porteño insurgents, whose bizarre fascination with the preconquest era had led to such excesses. The historian Vicente Fidel López, for instance, critiqued the creole insurgents’ “peculiar patriotism,” which, “wishing to ennoble itself with grandiose and poetic traditions, in imitation of European nations . . . turned its back on the heroic traditions of their race . . . and showed itself enamored of, enthusiastic for, the opulent legends and memories left in American lands by the majestic and opulent Inca Empire.” Indeed, “All the rancor that the indigenous race might have invoked against the sixteenth-century conquest (if they had revived and recovered their lands) had by some curious process transferred itself to the hearts and patriotism of the sons of those very conquistadors, who had made their own the complaints that would have been just in the mouths of the original Indians, but which in the mouths of the heirs of the conquest were simply absurd.”⁴³

The surviving leaders of the independence movement reevaluated their own earlier utterances, rejecting the view that their actions had avenged the pre-Columbian empires of the Aztecs and the Incas. In 1822 San Martín had referred to conquistador Fernando Pizarro’s flag as the “standard that Pizarro carried to enslave the Inca Empire,” but in 1844 he described the same flag as “the standard that the brave Spaniard Don Francisco Pizarro brandished during

42. Bartolomé Herrera, *Sermón pronunciado . . . el día 28 de julio de 1846 aniversario de la independencia del Perú* (Lima, 1846), 15. The Mexican conservative Lucas Alamán similarly dismissed Carlos María de Bustamante’s Indianesque language as part of the independence era’s “general delirium”; Alamán, “Noticios biográficos de . . . Carlos María Bustamante y juicio crítico de sus obras,” 1849, *Documentos diversos (inéditos y muy raros)* (Mexico City: Ed. Jus, 1946), 3:327.

43. López, *Historia de la República Argentina*, 5:462, 466, 542, 543–45 (for quote), 548; and for a Chilean example, Miguel Luis Amunátegui, “18 de septiembre,” *Revista de Santiago* 3 (1849): 288.

the conquest of Peru.”⁴⁴ The conquest, San Martín implied, was no longer to be considered the start of three hundred years of slavery but rather a heroic moment in Spanish American history. To use JanMohamed’s terminology, national elites opted for the comforts of catalepsy rather than calcification.

Political elites, in other words, became less sympathetic to the view that the new republics were vindications of the Aztec and Inca empires. Several factors beyond the inherent instability of Indianesque nationalism worked to facilitate this change. The 1840s saw the evolution in many parts of Spanish America of a liberal ideology that stressed the nation’s forward-looking nature and embraced heroic pantheons of more contemporary figures, whose commitment to liberalism was certified through their participation in the war of independence (itself increasingly labeled a modern, progressive movement) and subsequent struggles against backward, conservative obscurantism.⁴⁵ “Progress,” that byword of nineteenth-century liberalism, not only prescribed a particular path toward the future but also shaped the features to be sought in a national past. Nationalism founded on the preconquest past indeed suited neither of the emergent political trends of midcentury Spanish America. While liberals readjusted their vision of the past to highlight the independence period, conservatives—themselves never happy with the rejection of Catholicism implicit in any celebration of the preconquest era—urged the state to develop a patriotic history that embraced not the pre-Columbian past but rather the colonial period and its protagonists. Those who based nationalism on preconquest history, wrote Mexican scholar and statesman Lucas Alamán, “deprive the current . . . nation of its noble and glorious origin,” which, this spokesman of nineteenth-century conservatism made clear, lay in the colonial era.⁴⁶ The Indianesque nationalism of the independence era reflected the insurgents’ pressing need for a past, rather than a serious commitment to the incorporation of indigenous culture into the nation. Once independence was achieved, elite politicians and intellectuals—who considered the state a reflection of themselves—grew increasingly dissatisfied with a state iconography revolving, even in part, around indigenous emblems. During the heady days of independence, it was appealing to consider oneself the son

44. Ultima proclama de San Martín, 20 Sept. 1822, and accompanying footnote, Herrera, *Album de Ayacucho*, 97.

45. The features of nineteenth-century liberalism are discussed in Charles Hale, *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821–1853* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1968); Charles Hale, *The Transformation of Liberalism in Late Nineteenth-Century Mexico* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1989); Vincent Peloso and Barbara Tennenbaum, eds., *Liberals, Politics, and Power: State Formation in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (London: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1996).

46. Lucas Alamán, *Disertaciones* (1844–45; Mexico City: Ed. Jus, 1969), 1:109.



Figure 6. A version of the Peruvian state shield, circa 1873. The Incaic sun (see figure 4) has been replaced by a llama, a quinine tree, and a cornucopia. The motto now reads simply “República Peruana.” (Pons Muzzo, ed., *Símbolos de la patria*, unnumbered plate.)

of Lautaro or the avenger of Atahualpa, but in later decades such indigenous self-identifications proved supremely unappealing. Only in Mexico, with its long history of creole nationalism, did liberals persist in describing themselves as the sons of the Aztecs, and even there, as we shall see, other heroes largely replaced Cuauhtémoc and his fellow Aztec lords in state iconography, even if the latter continued to be extolled in patriotic poetry and prose.⁴⁷

Indigenous iconography thus began to disappear from Spanish American coinage and other state emblems in the decades after independence (see figure 6). In Colombia, the Indian princess who had symbolized liberty and the republican state was replaced, after 1821, with a feminine bust garbed in a toga. This figure was described in later decades as a “bust of the Republic,” whereas the Indian princess was said to have been simply an “Indian woman crowned with feathers”; an indigenous woman, it seems, could now represent only herself, and never the republic.⁴⁸ In 1836 the Venezuelan government replaced the bow and

47. For the insurgents as the sons of Lautaro et al. and later generations of Mexicans as sons of the Aztecs, see Earle, “Creole Patriotism”; and Earle, “Padres de la Patria.” For celebration of Cuauhtémoc, see Josefina García Quintana, *Cuauhtémoc en el siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Univ. Nacional Autónoma de México, 1977); on creole nationalism, see Brading, *The First America*.

48. Act of 4 Oct. 1821, *Actas del Congreso de Cúcuta, 1821*, ed. Carlos Restrepo Piedrahita (Bogotá: Biblioteca de la Presidencia de la República, 1989), 3:207; and Ernesto

arrow on its state shield, “which today are exclusively the weapons of savage peoples,” with a European sword and lance intended to denote “the triumph of civilized and cultured peoples.”⁴⁹ Indigenous imagery now represented the barbarous Indian present rather than an autonomous past. Place-names likewise ceased honoring the Araucanians and the Aztecs.⁵⁰ What indigenous imagery did remain was reinterpreted. The radiant sun on Argentine flags and coins, which had been linked specifically to the Incas, was now associated more generally with freedom and the May Revolution. While during the independence era San Martín had explained that the radiant sun recalled “the second deity adored by the Peruvians, after their invisible Pachacama,” in the 1840s the liberal poet Miguel Cané referred to it merely as “the symbol of the regeneration of this beautiful and unfortunate hemisphere.”⁵¹ The retention of the Aztec eagle and cactus on the Mexican state shield is a rare exception. The “Mexican Eagle” continued to be identified as an indigenous emblem throughout the nineteenth century. Of course, the eagle and cactus had been a symbol of Mexico City during the colonial period as well; the image thus had a particularly long and consistent association with the Mexican capital, which perhaps explains its unquestioned acceptance as an emblem of the Mexican state.

Replacing the discarded indigenous emblems were the heroes of independence. With the consolidation of most national states by the mid-nineteenth century, patriotic mythologizing no longer necessitated trawling the distant past, for an entirely new pantheon of heroes lay at hand in the form of the leaders of independence. The decades between 1840 and 1880 saw the emergence of the state cult of these *próceres*, whose importance was proclaimed not only in history texts and patriotic speeches but also via statues, postage stamps, coinage, and the geography of Spanish America itself. These new heroes largely

Restrepo Tirado, *Catálogo general del Museo de Bogotá* (Bogotá, 1912), 105–6. See also Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 476–77; König, “Símbolos nacionales,” 398; and König, *En el camino*, 264.

49. Georges Lomné, “El ‘espejo roto’ de Colombia: El advenimiento del imaginario nacional, 1825–1850,” in Annino, Castro Leiva, and Guerra, *De los imperios a las naciones*, 386.

50. One exception: after a series of victorious campaigns against the Mapuche in southern Chile in the 1880s, the Chilean military named several defensive forts along the new frontier after the heroes in *La araucana*. By naming these forts after Araucanian warriors, the Chilean state demonstrated its sovereignty over not only the territory of the Mapuche but also over their past; Osvaldo Silva, *Atlas de historia de Chile* (Santiago: Ed. Universitaria, 1984), 96–97; and Solano Asta-Buruaga, *Diccionario geográfico*, 281.

51. Establishment of Orden del Sol, 8 Oct. 1821, Herrera, *Album de Ayacucho*, 74; and Miguel Cané, “Fiestas mayas,” 1844, AGN, Colección Andrés Lamas 2649 (leg. 46).

displaced the indigenous figures previously enthroned as the tutelary guardians of independent Spanish America.

Some of these men had, of course, been honored by the new states during and immediately after the war of independence itself. In Peru, various revolutionaries, including Vicente Angulo, were named national heroes in 1823. In the same year, Miguel Hidalgo's remains were ceremonially interred in the Mexico City cathedral, and some patriots recommended renaming the town of Dolores (where he had begun the insurgency in 1810) "Villa de Hidalgo."⁵² These early initiatives, however, were complicated by factionalism between the followers of different insurgent leaders. In early independent Mexico, conservatives celebrated Agustín de Iturbide and deplored the "bloodthirsty" Hidalgo, while liberals lionized Hidalgo and condemned Iturbide as a crypto royalist. In Colombia, historians contrasted the merits of Simón Bolívar with those of Antonio Nariño and Francisco de Paula Santander.⁵³ Thus, attempts in 1825 by the Peruvian constituent congress to rename Trujillo "Ciudad de Bolívar" failed when Trujilleños protested that the new name would make the city more obscure without in any way increasing its prestige.⁵⁴ By the 1840s, however, as states began to sponsor patriotic historiographic texts that emphasized the coherent nature of the independence movements, it became easier to commemorate independence heroes without the disputes that earlier attempts had provoked. These works stressed the fundamental importance of the independence era to the status and legitimacy of the nation. At the same time, states began to "nationalize" the heroes of independence, whose achievements might be admired by the entire world but who belonged to the individual countries that claimed them as their own. "The glories of the Great Bolívar are Venezuela's," insisted Caracas officials in the 1840s.⁵⁵ By the 1880s, so thoroughly were these men enthroned as national icons that the writer Soledad Acosta de Samper

52. Decree of Riva Agüero, 6 June 1823, Herrera, *Album de Ayacucho*, 246; Session of 11 Feb. 1824, Mateos, *Historia parlamentaria*, 2:678; and Lucas Alamán, *Historia de Méjico* (1852; Mexico City: Ed. Jus, 1942), 5:484.

53. For Mexico, see Edmundo O'Gorman, "Discurso de ingreso: Hidalgo en la historia," *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de Historia* 23, no. 3 (1964). For Colombia, see, for example, José Manuel Restrepo, *Historia de la revolución de Colombia*, 6 vols. (1827; Medellín: Bolislibros Bedout, 1974).

54. Decree by Congreso Constituyente, 9 March 1825; and decree by Congreso General, 13 July 1827, both in Oviedo, *Colección de leyes*, 4:150–51.

55. Juan Carlos Palenzuela, *Primeros monumentos en Venezuela a Simón Bolívar* (Caracas: Academia Nacional de Historia, 1983), 148; and Christopher Conway, *The Cult of Bolívar in Latin American Literature* (Gainesville: Univ. Press of Florida, 2003), 18–45.

could announce definitively, “We have no popular heroes other than those of the war of independence.”⁵⁶

The establishment of this pantheon can be traced through nineteenth-century maps, which from the 1840s record an increasing accumulation of place-names recalling the leaders of the wars of independence. Mexico’s Vicente Guerrero became, in 1849, the first insurgent to have a region named in his honor. This was followed by the creation of the states of Hidalgo and Morelos; under Maximilian, Iturbide became a territory. The colonial city of Valladolid was also rebaptized Morelia in honor of José María Morelos.⁵⁷ Chile created the province of O’Higgins in 1883.⁵⁸ By 1891 there were 78 places in Argentina named “San Martín” and some 20 named “Veinticinco de Mayo,” after the date on which Buenos Aires made its first moves toward independence. Bolívar was geographically commemorated in Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela. For example, the Venezuelan city of Santo Tomás de Angostura became “Ciudad Bolívar” in 1846, and by 1874 Venezuela had created an entire province bearing the Liberator’s name.⁵⁹ Colombia established departments honoring Bolívar, Santander, Nariño, and Sucre.⁶⁰

As ever, renaming also involved forgetting. Colonial and precolonial names were discarded in favor of the new nomenclature; in Guatemala, for example, the *municipio* of Tocay Tzimá in 1887 shed its Quiché name in favor of Morazán,

56. Acosta de Samper refers specifically to Colombia in *Biografías de hombres ilustres o notables, relativas a la época de descubrimiento, conquista y colonización de la parte de América denominada actualmente EE. UU. de Colombia* (Bogotá, 1883), 3. For varied discussion of the cult of the *próceres*, see O’Gorman, “Discurso de ingreso”; Germán Carrera Damas, *El culto a Bolívar* (Caracas: Univ. Central de Venezuela, 1977); and *Caravelle: Héros et nation en Amérique Latine* 72 (1999).

57. Decrees of 27 Oct. 1849, 7 June 1862, 15 Jan. 1869, and 16 April 1869, *La presencia del indígena en la prensa capitalina del siglo XIX*, ed. Antonio Escobar Ohmstede and Teresa Rojas Rabiela (Tlalpan: Instituto Nacional Indigenista, 1992), 1:36, 39; and O’Gorman, *Historia de las divisiones territoriales*, 106, 130, 164.

58. Solano Asta-Buruaga, *Diccionario geográfico*, 487.

59. Constitución de 1864, tít. I, art. 1; and Constitución de 1874, tít. I, art. 1, *Las constituciones de Venezuela*, ed. Luis Mariñas Otero (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1965), 303, 325; Francisco Latzina, *Diccionario geográfico argentino* (Buenos Aires, 1891), 435–37, 506–7; and Saul Cohen, *The Columbia Gazetteer of the World*, 3 vols. (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1998).

60. These names honoured Bolívar, Francisco de Paula Santander, Antonio Nariño, and Antonio José de Sucre. The first place in Colombia to be named after a *prócer* of independence was the municipio of Nariño, Cundinamarca, founded in 1833; the first municipio was named after Bolívar in 1844; Eugenio Gómez, *Diccionario geográfico de Colombia* (Bogotá: Banco de la República, 1953), 42, 44–45, 187, 263, 323, 328–29.

to honor the liberal hero.⁶¹ The Venezuelan constitution of 1901 illustrates the scope of these substitutions, listing the nation's provinces as "Apure, Aragua, Bolívar (formerly Guayana), Barcelona, Carabobo, Cojedes, Falcón (formerly Coro), Guárico, Lara (formerly Barquisimeto), Mérida, Miranda (formerly Caracas), Maturín, Sucre (formerly Cumaná), Nueva Esparta (formerly Margarita), Portuguesa, Táchira, Trujillo, Yaracury, Zamora (formerly Barinas), and Zulia (formerly Maracaibo)."⁶² "One does not invent geography," insisted a Colombian scholar in 1884, but geographic names were another matter entirely.⁶³

Likewise, once national coinage began to portray individuals rather than allegorical figures, the leaders of the wars of independence were usually the first persons to be depicted (see table 1). "Democracy has no monuments; it strikes no medals; it bears the head of no man upon a coin," John Quincy Adams had proclaimed in 1831, but by the 1850s this sentiment described democracy in neither the United States nor Spanish America.⁶⁴ Bolívar, for example, was the first individual appearing on coinage in Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador, and he quickly came to dominate coins in Venezuela as well (see figure 7). Peru, Paraguay, and the Central American states are the only exceptions to this rule. (Although Argentina did not put a prócer on its coinage until 114 years after its coins began portraying individuals, it placed independence heroes on bank notes from 1869.)

61. Dirección General de Cartografía, *Diccionario geográfico de Guatemala* (Guatemala: Tipográfica Nacional, 1961), 1:470. Raymond Craib presents an apparent exception in "A Nationalist Metaphysics: State Fixations, National Maps and the Geo-Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Mexico," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 82, no. 1 (2002): 57–65, which discusses efforts in mid-nineteenth-century Mexico to preserve indigenous place-names. These attempts seem, however, to have been motivated in part by the desire to map accurately the route taken by Hernán Cortés during the conquest. Craib's argument thus suggests that the pre-Columbian past was commemorable insofar as it helped preserve the foundational events of the *colonial* period.

62. Constitución de los Estados Unidos de Venezuela, 1901, tít. I, art. 2, Mariñas Otero, *Las constituciones de Venezuela*, 423.

63. Jorge Isaacs, *Estudios sobre las tribus indígenas del Magdalena* (1884; Bogotá: Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 1951), 110.

64. Charles Francis Adams, ed., *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott, 19??), 8:433. For nineteenth-century state commemoration in the United States, see Michael Kaman, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1991), parts 1–2; John Gillis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1994); and Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War and Monuments in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997).



Figure 7. An 1845 eight-escudo coin from Ecuador, showing a bust of Simón Bolívar, along with the Ecuadorean state shield. (Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 591.)

Coins not only began to depict these men but were also renamed in their honor: in 1879 Venezuela's coinage was rechristened the bolívar, and in 1884 the sucre replaced the Ecuadorean peso.⁶⁵ Only occasionally was coinage renamed to commemorate individuals not associated with the wars of independence, as occurred in Bolivia in 1865, when President Mariano Melgarejo renamed the national coinage after himself.⁶⁶

The heroes of independence were also among the first persons to adorn postage stamps, "that most universal form of public imagery other than money," as table 2 indicates.⁶⁷ Hidalgo graced the first Mexican stamps (see figure 8), and in Argentina, the próceres of independence were not only the first individuals depicted on stamps but also, starting in 1888, the subject of an entire stamp series. The importance of stamps as a venue for displaying the nation is evident also in their frequent representation of state shields, which were indeed often the first images to appear thereon. Placing the national shield on stamps converted them very explicitly into little emblems of nationality. Coins too almost invariably displayed the state shield once one had been designed.

65. Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 589–95, 2049–56.

66. Luis Alberto Asbun-Karma, *Monedas, medallas, billetes, acciones y documentos bancarios* (La Paz: Banco de Crédito Oruro, 1977), 232–48.

67. Eric Hobsbawm, "Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870–1914," in Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, 281.

Figure 8. The one-real version of the first postage stamp issued in Mexico (in 1856), depicting the independence hero Miguel of Hidalgo.



Commemorative statuary tells the same story. “Statueification” (we cannot quite speak of *statuomanie*) began at midcentury, overwhelmingly honoring male heroes of the wars of independence.⁶⁸ The patriotic possibilities of statues are illustrated by the playwright Emilio Segura’s proposed monument to the Venezuelan insurgent Antonio Ricaurte, a martyr of independence who in 1814 blew himself up rather than permit the ammunition stores he guarded to fall into royalist hands. Segura called for a “pyramid of smoking ruins crowned by the dismembered statue of the *Hero*,” from whose center “should spring forth the majestic image of young *Colombia*, holding with one hand a great shining cross decorated with the name of *Ricaurte*, and with the other caressing the broken forehead of the *Martyr*, who expires fixing his loving gaze on the afflicted inhabitants of the *Patria*!”⁶⁹ This was perhaps the sort of thing Altamirano had in mind when he lamented that the Mexican government was not erecting more statues

68. There were unsuccessful efforts in various parts of Spanish America during the 1820s to create monuments to Bolívar and other leaders of the movement for independence. See, for example, Raul Molina, *La primera polémica sobre la Revolución de Mayo* (Buenos Aires: Apartado de la Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía, 1961); Decree of 1825, *La Batalla de Ayacucho, 9 de diciembre de 1824*, ed. Juan Friede (Bogotá: Banco de la República, 1974), 143–45; Pons Muzzo, *Símbolos de la patria*, 128–30; Session of 8 Aug. 1825, *Libro mayor de sesiones de la Asamblea de Representantes del Alto Perú* (La Paz: Litografías e Imprentas Unidas, 1926), 44–46; and Alamán, *Historia de Méjico*, 5:484. The Pirámide de Mayo in Buenos Aires, an apparent exception, commemorates the May Revolution itself, rather than its leaders.

69. Emilio Segura, “Advertencia,” *Ricaurte, o el Parque de San Mateo* (Bogotá, 1858), emphasis in original.

Table 2. Spanish American Stamps.

	Argentina	Bolivia	Chile	Colombia	Ecuador	Guatemala	Mexico	Peru	Venezuela
First stamp	1856 ^a Ceres	1867 condor	1853 Columbus	1859 state shield	1865 state shield	1871 state shield	1856 Miguel Hidalgo	1858 ^b state shield	1859 state shield
First person on stamp	1864 Bernardino Rivadavia	1897 Tomás Frias	1853 Columbus	1875 ^c Pedro Justo Berrio	1892 Juan José Flores	1886 Justo Rufino Barrios	1856 Miguel Hidalgo	1885 Francisco Bolognesi	1871 Simón Bolívar
First <i>prócer</i> on stamp	1864 Bernardino Rivadavia	1899 Antonio José de Sucre	1910 Thomas Cochrane	1879 ^d Simón Bolívar	1892 Juan José Flores	1907 <i>próceres</i> discussing independence	1856 Miguel Hidalgo	1896 José de la Mar	1871 Simón Bolívar
First indigenous motif	1948 Araucanian warrior	1916 statue from Tiahuanaco	1965 monolith from Easter Island	1938 Muisca god Bochica	1954 <i>chasqui</i> runner	1878 Indian princess	1895 statue to Cuauhtemoc	1874 Incaic solar face	1987 pre-Hispanic musical instrument

Sources: C. W. Wickersham, *The Early Stamps of Venezuela* (New York: Collector's Club, 1949); Santiago Hernández Ron, *Estampillas clásicas de Venezuela* (Caracas: Banco Industrial de Venezuela, 1967); Roland Goodman, ed., *Guatemala: The Postal History and Philately*, vol. 1 (London: Robson Lowe, 1969), vol. 2 (Troy, NY: Robson Lowe, 1985); *Stanley Gibbons Stamp Catalogue*, parts 15 and 20; Walter Bose and Julio Sáenz, *Correo argentino: Una historia con futuro* (Buenos Aires: Manrique Zajo Ediciones, 1994); Mario Arango, Augusto Peinado, and Juan Santa María, *Comunicaciones y correos en la historia de Colombia y Antioquia* (Santafé de Bogotá: Ediciones Gente Nueva, 1996); *Michel Südamerika 1996 Übersee-Katalog*, vol. 3 (Munich: Schwaneb Verlag, 1996); and *Michel Nord- und Mittelamerika 2000 Übersee-Katalog*, vol. 1 (Munich: Schwaneb Verlag, 1999).

Notes: ^a This stamp, depicting the Roman goddess Ceres, was issued by the state of Corrientes. The first stamp issued by the Argentine republic (in 1858) showed the state shield.

^b A provisional stamp showing a boat, designed by the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, was marketed in 1858 alongside the government-issue stamp.

^c This stamp, issued by the state of Antioquia, depicts the state governor.

^d Issued by the state of Bolívar.



Figure 9. Postcard showing the statue to Simón Bolívar in Caracas' Plaza Bolívar. The postcard has been decorated with two five-cent Venezuelan stamps, themselves depicting Bolívar. (Palenzuela, *Primeros monumentos*, plate 8.)

to the heroes of Mexican independence. Such grand monuments would be fitting visual companions to the verbal eulogies delivered to the leaders of independence in countless works of mid-nineteenth-century poetry and prose. Statues to Bolívar were dedicated in Bogotá in 1846, in Lima in 1858, in Ciudad Bolívar in 1869 (26 years after the city was renamed in his honor), in Caracas in 1874 (where it stood in the Plaza Bolívar, as the Plaza de la Catedral had been known since 1842), and in Carabobo and Guayaquil in 1889 (see figures 9 and 10).⁷⁰ The first statue to Hidalgo was installed in Toluca in 1851, followed by others to Morelos, Guerrero, and the insurgent writer José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi. By 1852, monuments had also been installed on the sites where various Mexican insurgents had been executed.⁷¹ San Martín and Manuel Belgrano received their

70. *El Duende* (Bogotá), 25 July 1846, Archivo General de la Nación, Bogotá, Colección Restrepo, Fondo XI, vol. 23, rollo 86; Andrés Bello, "Estadua de Bolívar," 1847, *Obras completas*, vol. 19, *Temas de historia y geografía* (Caracas: Ministerio de Educación, 1957), 195–57; *El Comercio* (Lima), 9 Dec. 1858; Juan León Mera, "A la estatua de Bolívar," *Poesías* (Barcelona, 1892); and Palenzuela, *Primeros monumentos*. See also Natalia Majluf, *Escultura y espacio público, Lima, 1850–1870* (Lima: IEP Ediciones, 1994).

71. Alamán, *Historia de Méjico*, 5:484n8; *El 16 de setiembre de 1851 en la capital del Estado de México* (Toluca, 1851); Ignacio Manuel Altamirano, prologue to Prieto, *El romancero*



Figure 10. Statue to Simón Bolívar unveiled in Lima on December 8, 1858, the 34th anniversary of the Battle of Ayacucho. (Manuel A. Fuentes, *Lima: Sketches of the Capital of Peru, Historical, Statistical, Administrative, Commercial and Moral* [London, 1866], plate facing 72.)

nacional, xxx; *Diario del Hogar* (Mexico City), 26 June 1886; and Ida Rodríguez Prampolini, ed., *La crítica de arte en México en el siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Imprenta Universitaria, 1964), 2:167–69.

first statues in 1862 and 1873 (in Buenos Aires), a few years before San Martín's ashes were repatriated from France.⁷² Santiago erected statues first to Diego Portales (1860) and San Martín (1863), and then in the 1870s to O'Higgins and Ramón Freire.⁷³ In Colombia, as elsewhere, the centenary of independence led to an outpouring of statues. In 1910, Bogotá erected monuments to Nariño, Bolívar, and a number of other próceres.⁷⁴ Statues dedicated to later heroes, who were often described as following in the footsteps of the leaders of independence, kept these venerable insurgents company. Mexico raised the first statue to Benito Juárez in 1875 (three years after his death), while Argentina honored unitarian general Juan Galo Lavalle with a statue in 1887.⁷⁵ Commemorative statues, erected to keep "alive for the nation the memory of great men and great deeds," thus proclaimed that the independence period (and perhaps a few subsequent moments) was the time par excellence of great men and great deeds.⁷⁶

This memorable epoch, however, no longer marked the return of the preconquest past, as independence-era iconography had asserted. Moreover, despite the independence era's undeniably heroic qualities, it was not necessarily Spanish America's point of cultural origin, which by the late nineteenth century many intellectual and political elites believed lay in the colonial period, after the arrival of Columbus. As one liberal Mexican paper put it in 1891, Columbus was the "initiator and father of American culture."⁷⁷ Thus, although during the wars of independence themselves attempts had been made to eliminate the colonial

72. Burucua and Campgane, "Países del Cono Sur," 376–79; Magaz and Arévalo, *Historia de los monumentos*, 211–12; and Bartolomé Mitre, *Arengas* (Buenos Aires, 1889), 238–43, 635–38, 868–73.

73. Burucua and Campgane, "Países del Cono Sur," 376–78; Magaz and Arévalo, *Historia de los monumentos*, 211–12; and Al Almanzar and Dale Seppa, *The Medals of Ecuador* (San Antonio: Almanzar's Coins of the World, 1972). See also Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna, "Homenaje a don Bernardo O'Higgins," 18 June 1864, *Obras completas de Vicuña Mackenna*, vol. 12, *Discursos parlamentarios* (Santiago: Univ. de Chile, 1939), 464.

74. Emiliano Isaza and Lorenzo Marroquín, eds., *Primer centenario de la independencia de Colombia, 1810–1910* (Bogotá: Escuela Tipográfica Salesiana, 1911), particularly 14–7. For Buenos Aires, see Adrián Gorelik, *La grilla y el parque: Espacio público y cultura urbana en Buenos Aires, 1887–1936* (Buenos Aires: Univ. Nacional de Quilmes, 1998), 208–10.

75. Rodríguez Prampolini, *La crítica de arte*; and Lilia Ana Bertoni, "Construir la nacionalidad: Héroes, estatuas y fiestas patrias, 1887–1891," *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana "Dr. E. Ravignani"* 5 (1992), 100.

76. For statues as memorials to great men and great deeds, see Altamirano, prologue to Prieto, *El romancero nacional*, xxix (for quote); *El Siglo XIX* (Mexico City), 18 Sept. 1877, and Ricardo Rojas, *La restauración nacionalista: Crítica de la educación argentina y bases para una reforma en el estado de las humanidades modernas* (1909; Buenos Aires: A. Peña Lillo, 1971), 221.

77. *El Partido Liberal* (Mexico City) 9 Apr. 1891, cited in José María Muría, "El cuarto centenario del descubrimiento de América," in *El descubrimiento de América y su sentido actual*,

period from the national map, this was no longer an attractive enterprise by the 1880s, as virtually all Spanish American states had reconciled themselves with the Hispanic past, if not to Spain itself. States from Mexico to Argentina therefore began to memorialize the colonial period alongside the independence era. This commemoration focused on emblematic figures such as the conquistadors, whose deeds had been regarded with such loathing during the independence period. Colombia, for example, established the municipio of Belalcázar in 1887, presumably in honor of the colorful conquistador, and Panama's first currency was named the balboa, after Vasco Núñez de Balboa, who stood silent upon a peak at Darien.⁷⁸ Chile erected a statue to Pedro de Valdivia, that scourge of the Araucanians.⁷⁹ Columbus, in particular, received considerable state homage. Patriotic orators reminded "all civilized men" to voice his name "with gratitude and veneration," and states employed the mechanisms of commemoration to assist in this process.⁸⁰ Mexico, Venezuela, and Honduras erected statutes honoring Columbus in the last decades of the nineteenth century, while Costa Rica renamed its currency the colón. Argentina and Venezuela named entire regions after the Admiral, and he appeared on Chilean postage stamps a full half-century before the first prócer. Columbus was thus the first individual ever depicted on a Spanish American stamp (see figure 11).⁸¹ José Enrique Rodó could therefore observe in 1917 that such homages to Columbus "infinitely reproduce his image from one extreme to the other of the world conceded to his faith."⁸²

ed. Leopoldo Zea (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1989), 125. For the return of the colonial era, see Earle, "Padres de la Patria."

78. Gómez, *Diccionario geográfico de Colombia*, 36; and Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 1560–69. In 1916 the Colombian town of Riosucio similarly petitioned to be renamed "Hispania." See Nancy Applebaum, *Muddied Waters: Race, Region, and Local History in Colombia, 1846–1948* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2003), 159.

79. Burucua and Campgane, "Los países del Cono Sur," 376–78.

80. Enrique Martínez Sobral, *Discurso Oficial* (Guatemala), 15 Sept. 1897.

81. Buenos Aires had streets named after Columbus as well, while the liberal Colombian writer José María Samper called in 1861 for "Colombia" to be used in preference to "América" as the term for the Spanish-speaking part of the continent, so as to honor its true discoverer. See José María Samper, *Ensayo sobre las revoluciones políticas y la condición social de las repúblicas colombianas (hispanoamericanas)* (Paris, 1861), xiv–xv; Latzina, *Diccionario geográfico argentino*, 108; Rodríguez Prampolini, *Crítica de arte*, 2:268–69, 302, 318; Juan Ortega y Medina, *La idea colombina del descubrimiento desde México (1836–1986)* (Mexico City: Univ. Nacional Autónoma de México, 1987), 10; Gerhard Blank, *Chile: First Issues of Postage Stamps, 1853–1867* (London: Royal Philatelic Society of London, 1989); Bertoni, "Construir la nacionalidad," 99; Calzadilla, "El IV centenario en Venezuela," 270; Calzadilla, "El olor de la pólvora," 116; and Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 507–18.

82. José Enrique Rodó, *El camino de Paros, José Enrique Rodó, estudio y antología*, ed. Emilio Gasco Contell (Madrid: Compañía Bibliográfica Española, 1970), 178.

Figure 11. Dies used to print the first adhesive postage stamps issued in Spanish America. The 1853 one- and five-centavo Chilean stamps showed Christopher Columbus. (Blank, *Chile: First Issues of Postage Stamps*, plate 1.)



The pre-Columbian period, on the other hand, was rarely depicted on late nineteenth-century coins, stamps, and other state paraphernalia. Although nineteenth-century stamps and coins increasingly portrayed autochthonous flora and fauna, as well as gauchos or other local types, indigenous figures, whether contemporary or historic, were rarely employed after the 1830s. Indeed, the independence-era indigenous imagery removed from the emblems of the state was not replaced with similar motifs until well into the twentieth century—sometimes, but not always, under the influence of official indigenismo.⁸³ While

83. For an illuminating discussion of the 1926 renaming of Honduras's currency the "lempira" see Darío Euraque, "La creación de la moneda nacional y el enclave bananero en

in the first decades after independence indigenous motifs were retained on some national coins, by the second half of the nineteenth century such figures had been nearly universally eradicated. The only exceptions are the occasional use of Incaic imagery in Peruvian coinage (such as the brief appearance, under Nicolás de Piérola, of a temporary currency called the *inca*) and the retention of the Indianesque state shields, designed during the independence era, on Argentine and Mexican coins. The Aztec prince Cuauhtémoc did not appear on a Mexican coin until 1947.⁸⁴ The designs on stamps reveal a similar absence. In Argentina, indigenous imagery did not appear on stamps until 1948, with the exception of the Incaic sun used as a watermark by the Argentine postal service in the 1890s. Only Guatemala, Mexico, and Peru employed indigenous motifs on any nineteenth-century stamps: Guatemala placed an “Indian princess” on an 1878 stamp, although it was not until the 1930s that indigenous designs began to figure regularly (see figure 12). Peru issued a stamp showing an Inca solar face in 1874, and Atahualpa appeared, together with Francisco Pizarro, in an 1896 stamp series. An 1895 Mexican stamp showed the recently inaugurated statue to Cuauhtémoc. It is no coincidence that the three states that continued to make sporadic use of preconquest imagery were those whose pre-Columbian cultures were the object of particular scientific and scholarly interest in the same period.⁸⁵ In other Spanish American countries, indigenous motifs were not employed on stamps until well into the twentieth century (see table 2).⁸⁶

Likewise, a mere handful of nineteenth-century statues commemorated the preconquest era. The monopolization of commemorative statuary by colonial and independence-era figures is indicated clearly in the (unsuccessful) petition by a member of the former Inca nobility to erect a statue in honor of the Inca

la costa caribeña de Honduras: ¿En busca de una identidad étnico-racial?” *Yaxkin: Revista del Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia* 14, nos. 1–2 (1996).

84. Henry Grunthal, *The Coinage of Peru* (Frankfurt: Numismatischer Verlag P. N. Schulten, 1978); Francisco Yábar Acuña, *El Inca de Oro: Acuñación del inca en las cecas de Lima y Ayacucho durante la Guerra del Pacífico* (Lima: F. Yábar Acuña, 1996); and Krause and Mishler, *Standard Catalog*, 1442.

85. See Rebecca Earle, “Monumentos y museos: La nacionalización del pasado precolonial en la Hispanoamérica decimonónica,” *Galerías del progreso: Exposiciones, ferias y cultura material en América Latina, 1860–1922*, ed. Jens Andermann and Beatriz González Stephan (Buenos Aires: Beatriz Viterbo Editora, forthcoming).

86. Stanley Gibbons *Stamp Catalogue*, vol. 15, *Central America* (London: Stanley Gibbons, 1984) and vol. 20, *South America* (London: Stanley Gibbons, 1989). Mary Crain, “The Social Construction of National Identity in Highland Ecuador,” *Anthropological Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (1990), analyses the problematic stamp series honouring the “Ecuadorian Indian” issued in 1980. I am grateful to a *HAHR* reviewer for recommending this article.

Figure 12. Pencil drawing for the 1878 Guatemalan “Indian Woman” stamp. The figure, probably designed by a French artist, shows a fanciful Indian princess with a feather tiara framed by two quetzals. (Sale Catalogue for the 30 Oct. 2001 auction of the collection of F. W. Lange, Afinsa Auctions [Barcelona, 2001]; and Goodman, ed., *Guatemala*, 1:78–82.)



Huayna Capac in Lima. In his 1868 petition, Ignacio Manco y Ayllón observed pointedly that “Huayna Capac, Sirs, is no less deserving [of a statue] than *Christopher Columbus* and *Bolívar*.”⁸⁷ The only nineteenth-century state monuments erected in honor of preconquest figures (of which I am aware) are a statue of the Inca Pachacutec erected in Cuzco in the late nineteenth century and the statues to Netzahualcoyotl (the fifteenth-century ruler of Texcoco) and the Aztec rulers Cuauhtémoc, Izcóatl, and Ahuízotl, unveiled in 1869, 1887, and 1889 in Mexico City (see figure 13).⁸⁸ The Porfiriato’s erection of these monumental statues, and the considerable public ceremony that accompanied the dedication

87. Ignacio Manco y Ayllón to Cámara de Representantes, Lima, 4 Nov. 1868, Biblioteca Nacional del Perú, Colección Manuscrita, D2632 (my italics).

88. R. Zárate, *El Cuzco y sus monumentos: Guía del viajero* (Lima: Sanmarti y Ca., 1921), 64–66; Teresa Gisbert, *Iconografía y mitos indígenas en el arte* (La Paz: Gisbert, 1980), 180; *El Siglo XIX*, 18 Sept. 1877; García Quintana, *Cuauhtémoc*, 22–26; Daniel Schávelzon, “Notas sobre Manuel Vilar y sus esculturas de Moctezuma y Tlahuicole,” and Daniel Schávelzon, “El primer monumento a Cuauhtémoc (1869),” both in *La polémica del arte nacional en México, 1850–1910*, ed. Daniel Schávelzon (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1988), 81–87, 109–11; Helen Escobedo, ed., *Monumentos mexicanos: De las estatuas de sal y de piedra* (Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1992), 65, 118; and Barbara Tennenbaum, *Mexico and the Royal Indian: The Porfiriato and the National Past* (College Park: Univ. of Maryland, 1994), 10–11.



Figure 13. The monument to the Aztec prince Cuauhtémoc unveiled in Mexico City in 1887. The impressive pedestal contains further scenes from the hero's life. (Schávelzon, ed., *La polémica del arte nacional*, 127.)

of the statue to Cuauhtémoc in the Paseo de la Reforma, might seem to imply that Mexico was an exception to the general lack of interest in indigenous iconography observed elsewhere in the late nineteenth century. I do not wish to argue that the use of state iconography followed identical trajectories in all parts of Spanish America, but I would like to suggest that even Mexico fits within the broad patterns I have sketched here. While indigenous imagery was never wholly rejected by the nineteenth-century Mexican state—perhaps a reflection of the deep roots creole patriotism had already sunk in Mexico during the colonial period—the intense use of Aztec iconography typical of the independence era was replaced by an equally intense celebration of the próceres and, later, the heroes of the Reforma. Hidalgo, the “sublime hero,” was elevated to virtually the same level as Christ himself in post-Reform patriotic oratory.⁸⁹

Elsewhere, the mere presence of allegorical indigenous figures in commemorative statuary had become problematic, notwithstanding their previous ubiquity in independence-era iconography. The statue to the insurgent hero Antonio José de Sucre unveiled in Quito in 1892 provoked outrage because it depicted the prócer “in the attitude of liberating and protecting a young Indian woman [intended to symbolize] the motherland.” Commentators objected that Sucre, far from liberating an allegorical motherland, appeared to be embracing a “bashful and intimidated Indian woman.” Instead of representing the patria, the indigenous figure merely provoked embarrassing suspicions of an improper relationship between the independence hero and an *india*.⁹⁰ In her analysis of this incident, Muratorio stresses the concerns about mestizaje that underlay objections to the statue. I, however, would like to highlight what they reveal about the transformation in the iconographic potential of indigenous imagery over the nineteenth century. The response to the 1892 statue contrasts sharply with independence-era attitudes. During the independence era, as we have seen, indigenous imagery had been used in state iconography across Spanish America. Indeed, in 1825 a commemorative plaque designed for the chambers of the Bolivian constitutional assembly honored Sucre in a manner almost identical to

89. For explicit comparisons between Jesus and Hidalgo, see Juan Payan León, *Discurso pronunciado en el Teatro de Guerrero la noche de setiembre de 1875* (Puebla, 1875), 6; and Melchor Ocampo Manzo, *Composiciones recitadas por sus autores en el concierto celebrado en el Teatro Ocampo de Morelia* (Morelia, 1888), 8–9.

90. Blanca Muratorio, “Images of Indians in the Construction of Ecuadorian Identity at the End of the Nineteenth Century,” in *Latin American Popular Culture: An Introduction*, ed. William Beezley and Linda Curcio-Nagy (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2000), 116; Muratorio, “Nación, identidad y etnicidad,” 172; and *Inauguración de la estatua del Mariscal don Antonio José de Sucre en Quito, el 10 de agosto de 1892* (Quito, 1892).

that employed in the 1892 statue. The plaque was to show “a beautiful Indian girl, symbolizing America, . . . embracing the liberator [Bolívar] with her right arm and the Grand Marshal of Ayacucho [Sucre] with her left.”⁹¹ This intimate mingling of próceres and indias incited no protest whatsoever, in part because the use of indigenous figures to represent the state served a necessary nationalist function. By the end of the century, however, indigenous figures had wholly lost the ability to represent the state. A figure of an indigenous woman was merely an india, not an emblem of liberty or a symbol of Ecuador. She could represent only herself. Gone were the days in which allegorical references to America’s indigenous heritage served to elevate its claims to sovereignty.

The rejection of indigenous imagery was not confined to stamps, coins, and statues. Many national anthems composed during the independence period were revised to eradicate Indianesque references. For example, the second verse of the Argentine national anthem, composed in 1813, ran:

Se conmueven del Inca las tumbas
 Y en sus huesos revive el ardor,
 Lo que ve renovando a sus hijos
 De la patria el antiguo esplendor.⁹²

[The Inca is roused in his tomb
 And in his bones fire is rekindled
 On seeing his sons renewing
 His patria’s former splendor.]

This typical independence-era composition not only invoked the Inca but also described an independent Buenos Aires as a recreation of the Inca Empire. In 1900, however, the Argentine state no longer saw itself as a reborn Inca Empire and accordingly decreed that, out of a “desire to forget the struggles with Spain,” only the first and last quartets of the national anthem be sung, thereby eliminating the verse about the Inca.⁹³ “Forgetting the struggle with Spain” thus entailed deleting references to the indigenous (or Indianesque) past.

Peru’s national anthem, like Argentina’s, had been composed during the war

91. Tristan Platt, “Simón Bolívar, the Sun of Justice, and the Amerindian Virgin: Andean Conceptions of the Patria in Nineteenth-Century Potosí,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25, no. 1 (1993): 169; and Session of 8 Aug. 1825, *Libro mayor de sesiones*, 44–46.

92. Vicente López y Planes, “Marcha patriótica” (1813), *La lira argentina*.

93. Hector Miri, ed., *Antología poética de Mayo* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Antonio Zamora, 1960), 23; and Bertoni, *Patriotas, cosmopolitas y nacionalistas*, 180–84, 294–95.

of independence. Its lyrics lamented three centuries of subjugation at the hands of the Spanish and presented independence as a vindication of Peru's "Inca and Lord."⁹⁴ In the early republican period, an additional stanza describing Spain's cruel oppression of the colony (derived from a popular independence-era song) was incorporated as the first verse.

Largo tiempo el peruano oprimido
 La ominosa cadena arrastró:
 Condenado a una cruel servidumbre
 Largo tiempo en silencio gimió.⁹⁵

[Long years the oppressed Peruvian
 Dragged the ominous chain:
 Condemned to a cruel servitude
 Long years he groaned in silence.]

Independence-era Peruvians would have recognized this common metaphor, which presented all Americans as the heirs to the defeated Incas, subjected to three hundred years of slavery at the hands of the usurping Spanish. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the suggestion that Peru was a (metaphorical) reincarnation of the Inca Empire served little rhetorical purpose for the state, equipped as it was with heroes of more recent vintage. The references to Peru's oppression at the hands of the Spanish were deemed insufficiently glorious for a national anthem, and in 1901 the government ordered the lyrics to be changed. Determined to replace these "humiliating" and "antiquated" verses with something more elevating, the government of Eduardo López de Romaña commissioned four new stanzas from the modernist poet José Santos Chocano. The new verses contained no references to subjugation, slavery, chains, or Incas, but instead celebrated the achievements of San Martín and the importance of industry.⁹⁶ In a wholly emblematic fashion, a heroic San Martín thus replaced the historic Inca.

94. José de la Torre Ugarte, "Canción Nacional del Perú," 1821, *La poesía de la emancipación*, Mira Quesada Sosa, 293.

95. "Primera Canción Patriótica," *ibid.*, 295–97.

96. Resolución Suprema, Lima, 8 May 1901; and José Santos Chocano, "Himno Nacional," 1901, both in Pons Muzzo, *Símbolos de la patria*, 233, 262–63.

Which Heroes? Whose Tombs?

The independence-era use of pre-Columbian imagery to represent the Spanish American nations was thus almost universally rejected in the second half of the nineteenth century. In its place emerged a heroic iconography drawn from the independence era itself, augmented by a smaller number of colonial and postindependence heroes. By the early twentieth century, little trace remained of the insurgent Indians who had peopled independence-era sites of official memory. Although indigenous artifacts were increasingly housed in national museums, and although growing scholarly attention was devoted to understanding America's preconquest cultures (of which so few traces were declared to remain), the emblems of the state no longer elevated the indigenous universe to the level of national iconography.⁹⁷ On the contrary, as we have seen, references to the indigenous past were deemed "antiquated" and out of fashion. Once the preconquest past lost its contemporary relevance to the representation of the nation and its metaphorical link to an independent Spanish America had been severed, nothing justified the retention of indigenous imagery on state emblems. Unable to symbolize the independent state, the indigenous past was instead relocated into the "vast and varied collection of memories and things" that constituted the national heritage.⁹⁸ Through such processes, as a number of scholars have noted, acceptable indigenism was firmly situated in a distant pre-Columbian era that had preceded the arrival of European civilization.⁹⁹ The Aztec and Inca empires could remain the heritage of the creole states, displayed in museums, discussed in scholarly texts, and even, on occasion, celebrated in poetry and paintings. State emblems, however—coins, stamps, national anthems—paid homage to heroes of more recent vintage and more European "race."

We began with a consideration of street nomenclature, and it is with that topic we conclude. Andrés Lamas and Ignacio Manuel Altamirano were not alone in meditating on the importance of street names in national iconography. The Peruvian writer Ricardo Palma agreed with Altamirano that renam-

97. For archaeology, museums and the preconquest past, see Earle, "Monumentos y museos."

98. Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna, *Catálogo del Museo Histórico de Santa Lucía* (Santiago, 1876), 3.

99. See, for example, Luis Villoro, *Los grandes momentos del indigenismo en México* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1950), 234–35; Enrique Florescano, *Memory, Myth and Time in Mexico from the Aztecs to Independence* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1994), 192; Cecilia Méndez, "Incas Sí, Indios No: Notes on Peruvian Creole Nationalism and Its Contemporary Crisis," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 28, no. 1 (1996): 210, 222; Muratorio, "Images of Indians," 111–12; and de la Cadena, *Indigenous Mestizos*, 72–78.

ing streets was unsatisfactory, but for different reasons. Recalling an earlier effort at baptizing Lima's streets with names drawn from Peruvian geography, Palma commented in 1901 that "venerable street names, each of which had its own *raison d'être* because it commemorated an event or the surname of some personage, all names that had been conserved for two or three centuries, were changed for those of departments and provinces. Who in Lima, not excluding city officials, knows by heart without consulting a map which is Quispicanchis Street, for example, or Chumbivilcas Street? We all stick to the old names."¹⁰⁰ Palma disapproved of the renaming of streets—not because he felt that street names were meaningless, but because he did not want Peru's *colonial* history to be discarded in favor of the patriotic commemoration of postindependence geography. Similarly, when the Argentine nationalist Ricardo Rojas called for the preservation of "traditional geographical names," he had in mind colonial place-names—which, he complained, had been replaced with a "new nomenclature, more similar to a military register" than an atlas. Names such as "General Pinto" (a participant in the 1879 *Conquista del Desierto*) had been substituted for older creole place-names. This, Rojas felt, was part of an insidious process eliminating vestiges of Argentina's colonial, creole heritage.¹⁰¹ Like Palma, Rojas did not want the creole culture born in the colonial period replaced by a national culture springing from other roots. In Rojas's view, Argentina's growing immigrant population undermined its creole heritage, and a misplaced zeal for commemorating recent heroes exacerbated this process. Rojas thus believed it vital to preserve the colonial place names that provided daily lessons in the country's true, creole nature. Place-names, these men concurred, were indeed "mute witnesses of history"—in this case, of colonial history.¹⁰²

While Lamas, Altamirano, Palma, and Rojas agreed that the state should commemorate significant events of national history, they disagreed on which aspects most deserved commemoration. Lamas and Altamirano, liberals both, accepted the independence era as the most heroic episode in national history. For them, the wars of independence were their nations' "classical antiquity," the glorious period to which later writers might hark back with admiration and

100. Ricardo Palma to Ignacio Gamio, Lima, 21 Nov. 1901, cited in Daniel Estrada Pérez, *Proyecto de Ley no. 4181* (Lima: n.p., 1998), 7. This legislation is available on the internet at <http://www.congreso.gob.pe/ccd/proyectos/pr9811/00418195.htm>, a site maintained by the Peruvian congress.

101. Rojas, *La restauración nacionalista*, 230–34.

102. José Guadalupe Romero referred to geographical names in this way in *Dictamen sobre los inconvenientes de mudar los nombres geográficos de las poblaciones de la república aprobada por la Sociedad* (1860), cited in Craib, "A Nationalist Metaphysic," 59.

awe. Discussing republican Buenos Aires' 1811 campaign against royalist forces in Montevideo, Lamas's colleague Vicente Fidel López compared it to the most thrilling moments of ancient history: "With the exception of the Peloponnesian War, when Athens, amid glories and disasters, lost its fatal dominance over the other Greek hegemonies, the history of the world presents no event as worthy of study and as interesting as that offered by the peoples of Río de la Plata in this emergency."¹⁰³ In contrast, Palma and Rojas, like many other conservative nationalists, wished to give greater prominence to the colonial period.¹⁰⁴

These differences, however, obscure more fundamental agreements. Despite their varying political convictions, all four men concurred that citizens should know their country's history and that the state should assist in this process through appropriate efforts at commemoration. Similarly, none showed much interest in encouraging the state to preserve indigenous place-names, and all implied that the pre-Columbian period offered little that the state could legitimately commemorate. Whatever the merits of the civilizations that had inhabited the region before the Spanish Conquest, their achievements belonged in museums, not in street names. Such opinions mirror the nationalist iconographies discernible in the postindependence state emblems studied here. These rarely evoked either the preconquest past or the contemporary indigenous population, and when they did, it occasioned complaint. It is not a coincidence that Palma directed his objections to proposed street names that recalled Peru's indigenous, Andean heritage: Chumbivilcas and Quispicanhis streets. When Palma condemned the inappropriateness of this renaming exercise, he was affirming that the state should not commemorate the wrong aspects of the national experience, such as that evoked by Peru's indigenous nomenclature.

These late nineteenth-century discussions of the state's role in commemoration reveal the distance traveled by elite nationalism in the decades after independence. During the independence era, the indigenous past played a fundamental role in constructing the new Spanish American nations, whose history was displayed on the state emblems considered to be essential elements of the nationalist venture. As San Martín asserted in 1821, "The external signs adopted by governments are the only language appropriate for explaining to the multitude the principles that animate them."¹⁰⁵ State iconography remained central to the national project in postindependence Spanish America, but its

103. López, *Historia de la República Argentina*, 3:401–2.

104. Rojas, *La restauración nacionalista*, 84, 147, 159–60, 195, 199, 212.

105. Decreto de José de San Martín, 27 Dec. 1821, Pons Muzzo, *Símbolos de la patria*,

10–13.

messages altered dramatically over the course of the century. No longer represented by crowned Indian princesses and indigenous warriors, the nation was instead embodied in the creole heroes of independence who decorated stamps, coins, and city plazas from Mexico to Argentina. Coins, street names, and postage stamps are as much sites of nation building as are the newspapers considered by Benedict Anderson. They reveal, with particular clarity, the complete identification elite nation builders made between themselves and the nations they strove to create. During the wars of independence, creole revolutionaries proclaimed themselves to be the sons of Montezuma and the avengers of Atahualpa, and they designed a corresponding national iconography replete with preconquest imagery. In later generations, elites saw themselves instead as the sons of Hidalgo, Bolívar, and perhaps Columbus, and they reformed state emblems in line with this new identity. These symbols do not signal a more inclusive independence-era vision of the nation, from which subsequent generations retreated. Rather, during the nineteenth century, the elite conception of the nation was at all times the *patria criolla*: the state created in their own image, for their own purposes. This, to paraphrase San Martín, is one of the principles animating nineteenth-century elite nationalism, which we can discern through its external signs and symbols.