

This article was downloaded by: 10.2.97.136

On: 26 Sep 2023

Access details: *subscription number*

Publisher: *Routledge*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG, UK



Edited by Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale and Manuel Delgado

The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies

Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale, Manuel Delgado

Carlists Against Liberalism

Publication details

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch23>

Jordi Canal

Published online on: 28 Mar 2017

How to cite :- Jordi Canal. 28 Mar 2017, *Carlists Against Liberalism from: The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies* Routledge

Accessed on: 26 Sep 2023

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch23>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/legal-notices/terms>

This Document PDF may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproductions, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The publisher shall not be liable for an loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

23

CARLISTS AGAINST
LIBERALISMCounter-revolution in the Iberian Peninsula
during the nineteenth century*Jordi Canal*

Carlism belongs to a wider category of what have been termed “counter-revolutionary” movements visible in most Western European states over the course of the nineteenth century, including Miguelism in Portugal or the Legitimist movement in France. It was primarily opposed to liberalism and revolution. It was not the only expression of counter-revolutionary sentiment to be seen in Spain (consider, e.g., the popularity of royalism during the Liberal Triennium), but it was undoubtedly the most important, in every sense. This has often led “Carlism” to be understood as a synonym for “counter-revolution,” especially in accounts of nineteenth-century Spain (see Canal 2000a, 2006; Rújula 1998). That century saw Carlists take a leading role in two major civil wars – the First Carlist War (1833–1840) and the Second Carlist War (1872–1876) – as well as various insurrections, cavalry raids, coups, and minor skirmishes. These conflicts involved thousands of people, and were an essential part of the process by which the contemporary nation-state took shape. As such, the Carlist movement is of fundamental importance for the contemporary history of Spain.

God, King, and Country

Carlism may be defined as a socio-political movement which is anti-liberal and anti-revolutionary in nature, formed soon before the fall of the *Ancien Régime* and still surviving to the present day, albeit in a clearly diminished form. The terms “Carlism” and “Carlist” were coined during the second absolutist restoration of Fernando VII, between 1823 and 1833; they were derived from the name of the prince, Carlos María Isidro de Borbón, who would later become the legitimists’ King Carlos V; and they represented the culmination of several pre-existing trends, whose principal outlet had previously been royalism. The situation was similar in neighbouring Portugal: the terms “Miguelism” and “Miguelist” referred to a counter-revolutionary movement led by Dom Miguel, King Miguel I of Portugal from 1828 to 1834, who remained a pretender to the throne after being deposed at the end of a fratricidal war (see Lousada and Ferreira 2006). Although Carlism really took root in Spain and rose to prominence from 1833 onwards, its rise must be set alongside those of other royalist movements which have their origins in the conflicts of the early nineteenth century, and which begin to play a significant role in events during the 1820s (see Aróstegui 1975; Canal 2000a).

The widespread acceptance of the terms “Carlism” and “Carlist” resulted in other similar – but not completely equivalent – expressions falling into disuse, although they did not disappear entirely; these included “royalism” and “absolutism,” or terms such as “ultra,” “apostólico,” “servil,” or “royalist.” In certain cases, words such as “absolutist” or “servil” acquired distinctly pejorative connotations over time, even within the counter-revolutionary movement itself. Others, such as “faccioso,” “latrofaccioso,” or “carca,” were applied to Carlists by their enemies, the product of an intensely confrontational atmosphere. Likewise, referring to the Carlist rebels as a “facción” was common. In Catalan, as well as “facció” and “facciós,” “fàccia” was also used as a synonym for the former. The origins of the term “carca” lay in Portugal, where liberals referred to counter-revolutionaries or Miguelists as “corcovas,” “corcundas,” or “carcundas.” The Portuguese and Galician “corcunda” or “carcunda,” which were variant forms of “corcova” (a hump, a hunchback, an egoist), were the root from which the Spanish “carcunda” and the abbreviated, jargonistic form “carca” ultimately derived, aided by phonetic similarity to the term “Carlist” (“carlista”).

The term “traditionalism” is also worthy of note; in the nineteenth century it was often associated, and sometimes even synonymous, with “Carlism.” In Jaime Lluís y Navas’s words, Carlism “con el tiempo sería llamado tradicionalismo” (1967, 309). In reality, the situation is more complex. It is true that following the Democratic Sexennium, in the era of the *Comunión Católica-Monárquica*, and especially during the Restoration and subsequently during the Second Republic (Carlism’s loss of vigour after the Carlist uprisings was not irrelevant to this process), the term “traditionalism” came to be used as a synonym for “Carlism.” However, although all forms of Carlism were traditionalist (at least during the nineteenth century, since the late twentieth-century battle between traditionalist and socialist manifestations of Carlism is another question entirely), not all forms of traditionalism were Carlist. The case of Juan Donoso Cortés, Marquis of Valdegamas, may be instructive. “Traditionalism” essentially referred to a system of thought, to a doctrine and an attitude, as Francisco Canals has recognized (1977, 193–198). Carlism’s identification as traditionalist thus reaffirmed a distinctive and essential part of its nature (as did its identification as Catholic), while also facilitating its underlying tendency to unite various related movements under a single banner.

Although this question has been of little interest to historians, it is worth adding here that colours were used as terms of reference for both Carlists and, of course, liberals. Thus, “blanco” was common currency in nineteenth-century Spain to designate the followers of Carlism, while “negro” – or “beltza” in Basque – indicated an adherent to liberalism. While the former had its roots in the association of that colour with the Bourbon dynasty (counter-revolutionaries were also known as “blancs” in France), the latter – which is openly contemptuous – appeared in Spain during the 1820s, and must be related to the processes of political purging or purification, and to the supposed purity or otherwise of the soul (see Canal 2008).

The dynastic question, which confronted advocates of Isabel II and those of her uncle Carlos María Isidro regarding the succession to Fernando VII, is not itself sufficient to explain the birth of Carlism and its prolonged existence. However, the influence of this controversy has often been overplayed. Queen Amalia, Fernando VII’s third wife, died in May 1829, whereupon the King, now a widower without an heir, decided quickly to contract a new marriage. His bride was one of his nieces, the young María Cristina of Naples who was sister to Luisa Carlota, the wife of Prince Francisco de Paula. The marriage took place in December of that year, and a few months later it was announced that the Queen was expecting. In late March 1830, Fernando had the Pragmatic Sanction, passed in 1789 but never promulgated, formally enacted. The Pragmatic Sanction constituted the annulment of the Salic law which had been in force since the reign of Felipe V; it introduced substantial changes in the matter

of succession, removing the masculine preference and the resulting near-exclusion of women. The child of Fernando and María Cristina would therefore inherit the throne, regardless of gender.

Much critical ink has been spilled over the promulgation of the Pragmatic Sanction, since it formed the legal basis for the conflict between Carlists and liberals. The points of contention were several: could Fernando VII take this decision? And if so, could he do so without the approval of the Cortes? Did enacting the Pragmatic Sanction affect Prince Carlos, who was born before 1789? Were the acts of 1713 and 1789 in fact valid? Many questions thus required clarification, and each side answered them according to its own interests, providing further evidence that the matter of succession was really secondary, and essentially designed to provide a legal justification for dispute and civil war. The Carlist uprisings were truly socio-political conflicts. The decree passed in 1713, which barred women from succession in the event of there being a direct or collateral male heir, was updated under Carlos IV. In 1789, the Cortes voted to restore the old customs of succession set down in the *Partidas*, according to which there should be no distinction on the basis of gender. However, this modification was not published, and was therefore not incorporated into the *Novísima Recopilación* of 1805. In March 1830, King Fernando VII simply took the next step following the approval of the Cortes, which was to promulgate the law. When Princess Isabel was born in October of that year, her uncle, Carlos María Isidro, and groups of “ultras” in particular began to see the accession to the throne which they had so longed for now in serious danger (see Burdiel 2010; Canal 2000a; Moral Roncal 1999). The suggestion advanced by Gloria Martínez Dorado and Juan Pan-Montojo (2000), that in studying the origins of Carlism the dynastic question should be interpreted as a form of political opportunism, is worthy of consideration.

The dynastic question was not an essential issue for Carlism, nor was the movement ever solely a defence of the rights of Carlist Bourbons to the throne. The elements of continuity with previous counter-revolutionary movements, as well as the scale of the Spanish civil wars, give the lie to any exclusively dynastic interpretation of Carlism. In any case, the Carlists were driven by an idea or a set of principles not only personified in the Carlist king, but also for which he became an emblem, as well as being a permanent point of reference for the movement’s followers. They thus fought on the battlefield and in the political arena not for a king’s own person, but for what the figure of that king represented: namely, a particular worldview and the possible projects that might bring it to fruition. The legitimist publicist Juan María Roma wrote in the *Album histórico del carlismo* that the Carlists “lucharon por una idea más que por un Trono y una Dinastía” (1935, 25). The dynasty and the various claimants to the throne were to become essential parts of the movement, in a symbolic and emblematic sense. Despite the attempts of some Spanish Marxist historians, however, it is not possible to explain Carlism without the real and symbolic figure of the king-pretender: Carlos V, Carlos VI, Juan III, or Carlos VII, in the twentieth century. Although not exclusively so, Carlism was a legitimist movement, as Miguelism and Chambordism were. The figure of the king-pretender always had a role to play in bringing together various different counter-revolutionary interests into a single body (see Canal 2011a; Torras 1976).

The Carlist cause supported the maintaining of tradition, and fought against liberalism and everything that it represented or implied, both in reality and on an abstract level. God, King, and Country were the essential pillars of an ideology that was in fact remarkably ill-defined (see Canal 2001, 297–299; Ugarte 1998, 420). The *Fueros* did not always come in under the Carlist banner, and often did not do so until the end of the nineteenth century; when they did it was always strictly in support of traditional liberties, and not an expression of nationalism or the desire for regional autonomy. The First Carlist War was not a war fought over regional

charters, but these were a part of what was at stake in some areas. The so-called “abolición feral” (“Abolition of Municipal Charters”) of 1876, together with the emergence of regionalisms and nationalisms subsidiary to the wider construct of the state, which had some overlap with Carlism, often led to a fourth element being added to that fundamental trilogy of God, King, and Country (see Mina 2011). In any case, the indistinct nature of their ideology made it easier for differing opinions and heterogeneous sectors of society to coexist within the Carlist movement, united in the face of other options to which they considered themselves opposed, and which they therefore saw as threatening.

Carlism’s foundations were strongest in the north of Spain, especially in the Basque Country, Navarre, and Catalunya, with important centres elsewhere in Valencia and Aragon. The movement’s geographical reach was apparently unaltered with the passing of the decades, varying only in the scale of its support. The Carlist territory par excellence was the Peninsular north, which was particularly strongly affected by several widespread and intensive transformative processes from the early years of the twentieth century; these included everything from industrialization and agricultural specialization to the arrival of new ideas and attempts at reform, along with changes to forms of ownership or the perceived socio-cultural value of certain activities or institutions. Any analysis of the roots of the Carlist movement should be wary of overlooking either the inheritance of previous counter-revolutionary mobilizations, from the War of Independence (1808–1814) to the so-called Ominous Decade (1823–1833); or the impoverishment of several areas, as has been demonstrated in the case of Catalunya; or the attitude of traditional élites, particularly in the north (see Agirreazkuenaga and Ortiz de Orruño 1990).

As time passed, the wellspring of Carlist support was to grow concentrated in specific areas – above all, in Navarre – which became self-perpetuating enclaves of deeply rooted Carlist political culture (see Caspistegui 2005, 2008; Millán 1998). These places provided an ideal environment for Carlism to build its own microcosm and to think of itself as a true counter-society, without the inaccessible possession of the State ever destroying what was really a victimizing myth. However, other areas were always able to join these heartlands, on a more or less provisional basis, always as a result of an intense proselytizing process. This was the case, for example, in several Andalusian provinces during the Second Republic (see Blinkhorn 1975). Nonetheless, there is a clear continuity to be observed which extends throughout Carlism’s prolonged existence, taking into account both its ideology and its affiliations, structures, and legacy. This movement has been sustained by one single political culture, constantly in the process of being remade (see Pérez Ledesma 1996; Rújula 2014).

Social heterogeneity is one of the touchstones of Carlist identity. Peasants and craftsmen were the most common adherents to the movement and formed the heart of its popular base, along with landowners and the clergy, and not forgetting soldiers, administrative professionals, and merchants. Some studies of the first wave of Carlism in the centre of Navarre, for example, yield the following approximate results: 66.4% agricultural labourers – mostly peasants (54.5%), along with some day labourers (10.2%); 10.2% clergy; 7.7% craftsmen; 7.2% rentiers; 4.7% working in administration; and 3% soldiers. In Pamplona, however, the proportions vary somewhat: craftsmen are most common (34.3%), along with the clergy (22.6%), followed by those in administrative jobs (17.3%), agricultural trades (11%), those working in education (4.6%), rentiers (2.3%), and merchants (1.9%); the final 3.5% of the sample comprises those working in minor trades, or who are unemployed (see Pan-Montojo 1990).

According to the Carlists, liberalism and the revolution, in any of their varied manifestations, were the cause of the transformations – some of which had already taken place, with others still to come – which were calling into question, weakening, or shattering completely their

political or social positions, their economic foundations, or their cultural universe (which was not limited to religion, although that was a fundamental component of it). Carlists were united by mutual support in their battle for a common goal, despite differences between them which were many and significant. Although the movement's overall direction was controlled by the most well-to-do sectors of society and the old élites, there is no substance to the Marxist interpretation of Carlism, namely, that the movement should be understood in terms of a manipulation or exploitation of a popular revolt by more powerful members of society, who would become, on this interpretation, the true counter-revolutionaries. Neither is the opposite view tenable, advanced by neo-Carlist historiography, which argues for the existence of a popular Carlism that was the movement's true form, and which was then manipulated by the powerful (see Canal 2007b). The truth is that Carlism was really a temporary and circumstantial confluence of people from different parts of society – which nonetheless endured on occasion – based on interests, aspirations, wrongs, dangers, enemies, languages, and ideologies which were partially or entirely held in common, even if they were not identical.

The Carlist wars

Carlism was at its height in Spain between 1833 and 1876, in terms of both its reach and its importance. This was the era of the Carlist uprisings (see Aróstegui et al. 2003; Moral Roncal 2006; Rújula 2014). Both the First Carlist War (or the “Seven-Year War”) and the Second Carlist War took place at a critical juncture, and could be seen as potentially or actually revolutionary. The first, which took place during the regency of Maria Cristina of Naples (1833–1840), the wife of Fernando VII, occurred when the *Ancien Régime* was in the throes of crisis and the liberal revolution was unfolding. In this context, the links between the first Carlist uprising and the struggles of the royalists during the Liberal Triennium (1820–1823), or those of the “*agraviados*” in 1827, are clear. The second uprising occurred during the Democratic Sexennium (1868–1874), a turbulent period which began with Isabel II being deposed from the throne, and includes the reign of Amadeo I – who was fought fiercely by the Carlists as an enemy of the Pope, on account of the actions of the House of Savoy during the unification of Italy – and the brief period of the First Republic. Both conflicts essentially centred on northern Spain, and at some stages resulted in the formation of true Carlist states in the Basque Country and in Navarre (see Molina 2005; Montero 1992). Between the two wars of the 1830s and 1870s, as well as a wide variety of attempted insurrections – in 1855 and 1860, during the reign of Isabel II, and in 1869 and 1870, in the early stages of the Democratic Sexennium, to mention only the most significant – those years also included the “*Guerra de los Matiners*” (1846–1849), which only affected Catalunya (see Vallverdú 2002).

The First Carlist War was without doubt the most important, and broke out following the death of Fernando VII. The uprisings in favour of the pretender Carlos V, which seemed to be under control and close to being quashed in almost every part of Spain in early December 1833, then entered a new phase in which the incipient Carlist movement took on a markedly different form. Firstly, it showed a clear tendency to focus exclusively on certain areas, particularly the Basque Country and Navarre, but also Catalunya, Valencia, and Aragon. City revolts also gave way to an insurrectionism with a fundamentally rural basis. Finally, a combination of political, social, and cultural factors replaced the decidedly political motivation behind the uprisings of October and November 1833. The Carlist movement grew in followers and became more consistent as the months passed, through a dialectical process where revolution and counter-revolution each gave fuel to the other. Acts including the killing of monks and clergy in 1834 and 1835, the “*desamortizaciones*” (i.e., the ecclesiastical confiscations of Juan

Álvarez Mendizábal), or the progressive changes in government all spurred certain sectors of society to align themselves to the cause which Carlos represented. The battle would last seven long years.

Navarre and the Basque Country were the primary theatre of war during the period from December 1833 to mid 1835. Aside from the capitals, some coastal areas and part of Álava, in June 1835 the north of Spain was in Carlist hands. In those circumstances, the decision was taken to attack Bilbao. Tomás de Zumalacárregui was wounded during the failed siege of the city, and he died a few days later. Until mid 1837, the war in the north saw the armies of the Carlists and the government relatively evenly matched, the latter having been strenuously reinforced by the liberals in power. In the rest of Spain, after the weak Carlist mobilization of 1834 and 1835, a clear development in Catalan and Valencian-Aragonese lands is particularly noteworthy.

In May 1837, what was termed the “Royal Expedition” left Navarre, comprised of 12,000 cavalrmen and infantrymen, with Carlos himself at their head. The causes of this expedition were more political than military, and differed substantially from other expeditions, both previous and subsequent. The months leading up to the expedition saw ties begin to be established at the Neapolitan court between the pretender Carlos and the regent María Cristina, who was disquieted by the advance of the revolution, aggrieved by the liberals and the Calatrava government’s treatment of her, and unhappy with the other powers who made up the “Quadruple Alliance.” The Baron of Milanges played a prominent role in negotiations, in which he proposed that marriage be contracted between the young Isabel and the prince Carlos Luis, as a means of securing peace. The ruling queen even showed herself willing to cede power to the Carlist pretender in exchange for certain concessions for her and her family.

The presence of Carlos near the capital was considered an advantage. As a result, the Royal Expedition reached the outskirts of Madrid in mid September, having passed through Aragon, Catalunya, and Valencia. However, the Carlists made no attempt to enter the city, which was well defended with General Baldomero Espartero also making his approach at the time; nor did they have any news of María Cristina, who was closely watched by ministers and by her family, and who had won some support from the military. The Carlist troops began a long and difficult retreat towards Basque-Navarrese territory. The enterprise had turned out badly and the discontent among the Carlists was palpable. Although the effects of this military excursion were not to prove too serious, it may nonetheless be seen as a political fiasco. The balance which had so far been maintained between moderate and extremist forms of Carlism was to tip in favour of the latter.

The 31st of August 1839 saw the well-known meeting of the Carlist and liberal armies, along with the famous Embrace of Vergara. That pact contained the basis of an accord that was accepted by a significant portion of the Carlist combatants. It was not the first attempt to establish a dialogue, nor the first peace project to be essayed during the conflict. Early intentions to establish concord between the two parties were already in evidence before the outbreak of war in 1833, via the marriage of the young Isabel to a son of Carlos María Isidro, a proposal which was never completely discarded and which always remained available to be brought to the negotiating table. The first successful attempt led to Vergara and the subsequent breaking up of the Carlist army, which was sharply divided between those in favour of the treaty and those against it.

The war may be said to have ended in the Basque Country and Navarre by September 1839, but that was not true of the rest of Spain. In mid 1838, the Valencian-Aragonese region saw one of the crowning moments of the Carlist movement, driven on by Ramón Cabrera (see Sauch 2004). It had been a spectacular progression. Neither the Catalan Carlists, nor the

followers of the Count of Morella, nor the majority of the few scattered rebels from other lands accepted the Vergara pact, and they therefore continued to fight. In any case, the conflict between liberals and Carlists had taken a dramatic turn that was soon to prove decisive. Only the arrival from France in late 1839 and early 1840 of Castilians, Basques, and Navarrese who had not accepted the treaty managed to prolong, for a few months more, a war which almost everybody was to some extent weary of, after six years of fighting. The First Carlist War ended in mid 1840.

It was not until the 1870s that Carlism again found itself capable of provoking another civil war on a large scale, on the basis of a new set of counter-revolutionary factors. Around 1868, as before 1833, the prevailing conditions were again favourable for the building of Carlist sentiment – even if the situation was not identical, as Spanish society had undergone significant changes in the intervening years. Carlism became the focal point of a protest with various interests and multiple causes, but which above all based its unity on the fight against a common enemy, even if that enemy was an abstract one: the revolution of 1868. This new counter-revolutionary amalgamation which was formed during the Democratic Sexennium was also to build on the experiences of the middle years of the century, the idealization of earlier battles, identification with certain particular emblems, and the political and ideological dimensions which the conflict took on. The revolutionary events of 1868 and the first measures enacted by the new rulers paved the way for united action from both Carlists and neo-Catholics – a group led by Cándido Nocedal who were more right wing than the moderates (see Romeo 2011; Urigüen 1986) – who were to merge from 1870 to form the *Comunión Católico-Monárquica*. After initial attempts to precipitate conflict by various means in 1869–1871 – including via politics, parliament (winning 23 seats in the Cortes in the 1869 legislative elections), propaganda, and journalism – in 1872 Carlism took up arms. There had already been rebellions in 1869 and 1870, but the order to go to war was given definitively in April 1872. It was to last four years, until February 1876 (see Garmendia 1976, 1985; Sesmero 1998).

Each of the various Carlist uprisings ended with a significant political exodus. The Carlists found themselves forced to leave Spain with each defeat that they suffered in their constant battle with the ruling liberals (see Canal 2014). Two significant emigrations, after each of the two major civil wars – the First and Second Carlist Wars – as well as others on a more reduced scale, provide the roll call of Carlist exiles during the nineteenth century. Pedro Rújula has correctly seen exile as “una presencia constante en el horizonte carlista” (2007, 167), and it was to become a central tenet of Carlist mythology and culture.

The archetypal model of Carlist mobilization between 1833 and 1876 involved different bands of soldiers being brought together to form a Royal Army. The exception was the “Ortegada” of 1860, a failed attempt to land on the Catalan coast which took the form of a coup led by Jaime Ortega, Captain General of the Balearic Islands, and which entailed, among other things, the capture of the pretender Carlos VI, Count of Montemolín, and his brother Fernando (see Ceamanos Llorens 2003). The step from forming smaller bands of fighters to building a Carlist army or state did, however, require certain specific conditions to be fulfilled. This was achieved during the wars of 1833–1840 and 1872–1876, especially in the north, and was attempted on several other occasions with varying degrees of success. These squads of soldiers, guerrilla warfare, and full-scale insurrections were thus the most typical forms of Carlist violence.

Taking to the hills, with its explicit reference to the rural nature of the struggle during that period, was a tactic employed over and over again. The independence and mobility of the Carlist squads were key to their success, but these strengths came at a cost, as they also meant that the soldiers were difficult to organize and control. For that reason, when the leadership of the

Carlist movement was weak, as was the case after each of the two great Carlist uprisings, these squads could descend into little more than fringe groups engaged in acts of banditry. In sum, violence was a constant presence during the long civil war between Carlism and liberalism, with varying levels of organization, brutality, and regulation – as Lord Eliot was to discover in 1835, a refusal to recognize the opponent's status as a war combatant was hardly conducive to a struggle which respected even basic norms of conduct, whether in relation to prisoners or to the population at large.

In any case, defeat in the Second Carlist War marked the end of the bellicose facet of Carlism, leaving aside, of course, the isolated incident of October 1900 – the so-called “Octubrada” – and the significant Carlist participation on the rebel side in July 1936 (see Canal 2000b). 1876 was the year when the last great amalgamation of counter-revolutionary forces brought together around Carlism was broken apart (see Canal 2000a). The new rulers of the Restoration (1875–1923) made a significant investment of both human and material resources in ending the succession of Carlist-dominated conflicts, which had been present throughout the process of building the liberal state in Spain. In the end, the fruits of that enterprise were positive. The Restoration offered an extraordinary period of stability in modern Spain. This was the end of an era in the history of Carlism, one defined by Carlist uprisings and the head-to-head struggle against liberalism.

Conclusion: counter-revolution and civil war

Whether it was open hostility or latent tension, civil war formed the backbone of the nineteenth century in Spain. The country spent the larger part of that century suffering the effects of a long civil war – conflict was not continuous but it did endure, as phases of open combat alternated with attempted insurrections, exiles, and periods of what was really only an illusory sense of tranquillity. Confrontation between revolution and counter-revolution was constant, as can easily be shown for the years 1808 to 1876. Further conflicts of varying intensity would follow thereafter. The War of Independence was really the lead-up to the feuds that would dominate the Peninsula during the nineteenth century (see Mariás 1985; Rújula 2008, 2012). Nevertheless, it was during the Liberal Triennium that those feuds re-emerged in a more serious guise. Carlism was the primary outlet for contemporary Spanish counter-revolutionary movements, and the Carlist-liberal dialectic was to dominate the middle decades of the century. However, there has been a certain tendency to overlook or conceal the fratricidal nature of many of the armed confrontations which took place during those years. These conflicts have undoubtedly not received the attention they deserve, as the term “civil war” is reserved almost exclusively for the Spanish Civil War of 1936–1939. Something very similar could be said of the widespread political emigration during the nineteenth century and the great exile of 1939. In any case, civil war must be acknowledged as a defining feature of nineteenth-century Spanish history (see Canal 2004, 2007a; Ranzato 1994).

However, this is not an exclusively Spanish phenomenon. Civil war has played a role in the genesis or formation of various modern nations and states, both in Europe and elsewhere. The history of the nineteenth century simply cannot be understood without reference to the concept of civil war. This is clearly the case both in western and southern Europe, in France and in Spain, in Portugal and in Italy. These countries lived and suffered through a long and important civil war which lasted for most of the century. Of course, each nation-state's civil war inevitably took on its own distinctive hue, in terms of chronology and intensity as well as in their various implications, characteristics, and repercussions. There is no doubt that these considerations may equally be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to other neighbouring countries and to some lands farther afield (see Guerra 1999; Pérez Vejo 2010).

The case of Portugal may be the most similar to Spain. There too the Triennium of 1820–1823 was marked by tensions between revolution and counter-revolution which ultimately led to a civil war several years later, pitching Miguelists and liberals against each other between 1828 and 1834 – and especially from 1832 to 1834. The triumph of the liberals over proponents of Miguelist absolutism, many of whom were exiled, did not mark the end of this counter-revolutionary movement which had “Deus, Patria, Rei” as its motto (see Cardoso 2007; Lousada 1987; Lousada and Ferreira 2006; Silva 1993). In Portugal, as in Spain, conflicts of lesser intensity then followed after the war – a mixture of guerrilla warfare and banditry – until the revolts of Maria da Fonte and Patuleia broke out in the second half of the 1840s (see Ferreira 2002; Mónica 1997). To this should be added the political instability which affected the liberal side, which has led the historian Maria de Fátima Bonifacio to define the period 1834–1851 as a “guerra de todos contra todos” (1999, 160–181). The *Regeneração* of 1851 brought an end to this long era of confrontation, rebellion, and civil strife in Portugal (see Sardica 2001).

The links between various counter-revolutionary movements in European countries were permanent, providing at least an informal basis for a real “White International” during the middle decades of the nineteenth century (see Canal 2011b, 2011c). Men and women, money and arms, political practice and ideas were in permanent circulation in western Europe and America (see Albónico 1979; Cancio 2015; Dupont 2014, 2015; Sarlin 2009, 2013; Tronco 2010). The Carlists received ample financial support during the two civil wars of the nineteenth century, and many foreign legitimists fought on their side. Likewise, many counter-revolutionaries from France, Spain, Belgium, Germany, Portugal, and elsewhere gave their support to the King of Naples and the cause he represented, whether that was in person or through donations and propaganda. It is thus worth asking seriously whether the different civil wars between revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries in various incipient nation-states throughout nineteenth-century western Europe might really be considered as parts of an overarching European civil war (see Canal 2011c).

Works cited

- Agirreazkuenaga, Joseba and José María Ortiz de Orruño. 1990. “Algunes puntualitzacions sobre la insurrecció carlina al País Basc: l’actitud dels notables rurals.” In *Carlisme i moviments absolutistes*, edited by Josep M. Fradera, Ramon Garrabou, and Jesús Millán, 169–186. Vic: Eumo Editorial.
- Albónico, Aldo. 1979. *La mobilitazione legittimista contro il regno d’Italia: la Spagna e il brigantaggio meridionale postunitario*. Milan: Giuffrè.
- Aróstegui, Julio. 1975. “El carlismo en la dinámica de los movimientos liberales españoles. Formulación de un modelo.” In *Actas de las I Jornadas de metodología aplicada a las ciencias históricas. IV. Historia contemporánea*, 225–239. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago/Fundación Juan March.
- Aróstegui, Julio, Jordi Canal, and Eduardo González Calleja. 2003. *El carlismo y las guerras carlistas. Hechos, hombres e ideas*. Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros.
- Blinkhorn, Martin. 1975. *Carlism and Crisis in Spain 1931–1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonifacio, Maria de Fátima. 1999. *Apologia da história política. Estudos sobre o século XIX português*. Lisbon: Quetzal Editores.
- Burdiel, Isabel. 2010. *Isabel II. Una biografía (1830–1904)*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Canal, Jordi. 2000a. *El carlismo. Dos siglos de contrarrevolución en España*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- . 2000b. “La violencia carlista tras el tiempo de las carlistadas: nuevas formas para un viejo movimiento.” In *Violencia política en la España del siglo XX*, edited by Santos Juliá, 25–66. Madrid: Taurus.

- . 2001. “La longue survivance du Carlisme en Espagne: proposition pour une interprétation.” In *La Contre-Révolution en Europe, XVIIIe–XIXe siècles. Réalités politiques et sociales, résonances culturelles et idéologiques*, edited by Juan-Clément Martin, 291–301. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- . 2004. “Guerra civil y contrarrevolución en la Europa del sur en el siglo XIX: reflexiones a partir del caso español.” *Ayer* 55: 37–60.
- . 2006. *Banderas blancas, boinas rojas. Una historia política del carlismo*. Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- . 2007a. “Los exilios en la historia de España.” In *Exilios. Los éxodos políticos en España, siglos XV–XX*, edited by Jordi Canal, 11–35. Madrid: Sílex.
- . 2007b. “El carlismo en España: interpretaciones, problemas, propuestas.” *Trienio* 49: 193–215.
- . 2008. “Matar negros, hacer blancos: los colores y los nombres del enemigo en las guerras civiles de la España contemporánea.” *Espacio, tiempo, forma. V. Historia contemporánea* 20: 19–36.
- . 2011a. “El Rey de los carlistas. Reflexiones sobre las palabras, las personas y las cosas.” In *IV Jornadas de estudio del carlismo. Actas. “Por Dios, por la Patria y el Rey”: las ideas del carlismo*, 227–249. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- . 2011b. “Internationale blanche.” In *Dictionnaire de la Contre-révolution*, edited by Jean-Clément Martin, 307–311. Paris: Perrin.
- . 2011c. “Guerres civiles en Europe au XIXe siècle, guerre civile européenne et Internationale blanche.” In *Pratiques du transnational. Terrains, preuves, limites*, edited by Jean-Paul Zuñiga, 57–77. Paris: Centre de Recherches Historiques (EHESS).
- . 2014. “Gli esili nella Spagna dell’Ottocento.” In *Il Risorgimento. Mito e storiografia tra Italia e San Marino*, edited by Maurizio Ridolfi, 63–78. San Marino: Centro Sammarinese di Studi Storici.
- Canals, Francisco. 1977. *Política española: pasado y futuro*. Barcelona: Acervo.
- Cancio, Raúl C. 2015. *España y la Guerra Civil americana o la globalización del contrarrevolucionarismo*. Alcalá de Henares: Instituto Franklin/Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.
- Cardoso, António Manuel Monteiro. 2007. *A Revolução Liberal em Trás-os-Montes (1820–1834). O Povo e as Elites*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- Caspistegui, Francisco Javier. 2005. “‘Spain’s Vendée’: Carlist identity in Navarre as a mobilizing model.” In *The Splintering of Spain. Cultural History and the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939*, edited by Chris Ealham and Michael Richards, 177–195. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2008. “¿Carlismo en Navarra o Navarra carlista?: paradojas de una identidad conflictiva entre los siglos XIX y XX.” In *El carlismo en su tiempo: geografías de la contrarrevolución (I Jornadas de estudio del carlismo)*, 205–243. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- Ceamanos Llorens, Roberto. 2003. *Del liberalismo al carlismo. Sociedad y política en la España del siglo XIX: General Jaime Ortega y Olleta*. Zaragoza: Ayuntamiento de Gallur/Diputación de Zaragoza.
- Dupont, Alexandre. 2014. “¿Hacia una Internacional neocatólica? Trayectorias cruzadas de Louis Veuil-lot y Antonio Aparisi y Guijarro.” *Ayer* 95 (3): 211–236.
- . 2015. “Une internationale blanche. Les légitimistes français au secours des carlistes (1868–1883).” PhD diss., Université de Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne.
- Ferreira, Maria de Fátima Sá e Melo. 2002. *Rebeldes e Insubmissos. Resistências Populares ao Liberalismo (1834–1844)*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- Garmendia, Vicente. 1976. *La Segunda Guerra Carlista (1872–1876)*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- . 1985. *La ideología carlista (1868–1876). En los orígenes del nacionalismo vasco*. Zarautz: Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa.
- Guerra, François-Xavier. 1999. “Editorial.” *Bulletin Institut Pierre Renouvin* 7. Accessed May 20, 2015. <http://ipr.univ-paris1.fr/spip>.
- Lluís y Navas, Jaime. 1967. “Las divisiones internas del carlismo a través de la historia. Ensayo sobre su razón de ser (1814–1936).” In *Homenaje a Jaime Vicens Vives*, edited by J. Maluquer de Motes, vol. 2, 307–345. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.
- Lousada, Maria Alexandre. 1987. “O Miguelismo (1828–1834). O discurso político e o apoio da nobreza titulada.” PhD diss., Universidade de Lisboa.

- Lousada, Maria Alexandre and Maria de Fátima Sá e Melo Ferreira. 2006. *D. Miguel*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores / Centro de Estudos dos Povos e Culturas da Expressão Portuguesa.
- Marías, Julián. 1985. *España inteligible. Razón histórica de las Españas*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Martínez Dorado, Gloria and Juan Pan-Montojo. 2000. "El primer carlismo, 1833–1840." *Ayer* 38: 35–63.
- Millán, Jesús. 1998. "Una reconsideración del carlismo." *Ayer* 29: 91–107.
- Mina, María Cruz. 2011. "El carlismo y los fueros." In "Por Dios, por la Patria y el Rey." *Las ideas del carlismo. Actas de las IV jornadas del carlismo*, 251–292. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- Molina, Fernando. 2005. *La tierra del martirio español. El País Vasco y España en el siglo del nacionalismo*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Mónica, Maria Teresa. 1997. *Errâncias miguelistas (1834–1843)*. Lisbon: Cosmos.
- Montero, Julio. 1992. *El Estado Carlista. Principios teóricos y práctica política (1872–1876)*. Madrid: Aportes XIX.
- Moral Roncal, Antonio. 1999. *Carlos V de Borbón (1788–1855)*. Madrid: Actas.
- . 2006. *Las guerras carlistas*. Madrid: Sílex.
- Pan-Montojo, Juan. 1990. *Carlistas y liberales en Navarra (1833–1839)*. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- Pérez Ledesma, Manuel. 1996. "Una lealtad de otros siglos (En torno a las interpretaciones del carlismo)." *Historia Social* 24: 133–149.
- Pérez Vejo, Tomás. 2010. *Elegía criolla. Una reinterpretación de las guerras de independencia hispanoamericanas*. Mexico: Tusquets.
- Ranzato, Gabriele, ed. 1994. *Guerre fratricide. Le guerre civili in età contemporanea*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Roma, Juan María. 1935. "Por una idea, no por un trono. Vindicando a los mártires de la tradición." In *Centenario del tradicionalismo español. Album histórico del carlismo 1833–1933–35*. Barcelona: Gráficas Ribera.
- Romeo, María Cruz. 2011. "‘¿Qué es ser neocatólico?’ La crítica antiliberal de Antonio Aparisi y Guijarro." In "Por Dios, por la Patria y el Rey." *Las ideas del carlismo. Actas de las IV Jornadas del carlismo*, 129–164. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- Rújula, Pedro. 1998. *Contrarrevolución. Realismo y carlismo en Aragón y el Maestrazgo, 1820–1840*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias.
- . 2007. "Carlistas." In *Exilios. Los éxodos políticos en España, siglos XV–XX*, edited by Jordi Canal, 167–190. Madrid: Sílex.
- . 2008. "La guerra como aprendizaje político. De la Guerra de la Independencia a las guerras carlistas." In *El carlismo en su tiempo: geografías de la contrarrevolución (I Jornadas de estudio del carlismo)*, 41–63. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- . 2012. "La guerra civil en la España del siglo XIX: usos políticos de una idea." In *Guerras civiles. Una clave para entender la Europa de los siglos XIX y XX*, edited by Jordi Canal and Eduardo González Calleja, 39–58. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez.
- . 2014. "El antiliberalismo reaccionario." In *Historia de las culturas políticas en España y América Latina. 2. La España liberal, 1833–1874*, edited by María Cruz Romeo and María Sierra, 377–409. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias/Marcial Pons.
- Sardica, José Miguel. 2001. *A Regeneração sob o signo do Consenso: a política e os partidos entre 1851 e 1861*. Lisbon: Imprensa da Ciências Sociais.
- Sarlin, Simon. 2009. "Los carlistas en Italia en el siglo XIX." In *Violencias fratricidas: carlistas y liberales en el siglo XIX (II Jornadas de estudio del carlismo)*, 223–238. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.
- . 2013. *Le légitimisme en armes. Histoire d'une mobilisation internationale contre l'unité italienne*. Rome: École Française de Rome.Sauch, Núria. 2004. *Guerrillers i bàndols civils entre l'Ebre i el Maestrat: la formació d'un país carlista (1808–1844)*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- Sesmero, Enriqueta. 1998. "¿En armas a su pesar? Ensayo sobre la inevitabilidad de la Segunda Guerra Carlista en Bizkaia." *Vasconia* 26: 179–190.

- Silva, Armando Barreiros Malheiro da. 1993. *Miguelismo. Ideologia e mito*. Coimbra: Livraria Minerva.
- Torras, Jaume. 1976. *Liberalismo y rebeldía campesina, 1820–1823*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Tronco, Emmanuel. 2010. *Les Carlistes espagnols dans l'Ouest de la France (1833–1883)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Ugarte, Javier. 1998. *La nueva Covadonga insurgente. Orígenes sociales y culturales de la sublevación de 1936 en Navarra y el País Vasco*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Urigüen, Begoña. 1986. *Orígenes y evolución de la derecha española: el neocatolicismo*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Vallverdú, Robert. 2002. *La guerra dels Matiners a Catalunya (1846–1849). Una crisi econòmica i una revolta popular*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.