

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

HONOR THY FATHER, AND THY MOTHER:
LOYALIST PRIESTS AND THE SUPPORT OF SPAIN DURING THE MEXICAN
WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of Master of Arts
in History

Isaí Garcia

May 2013

The Thesis of Isaí Garcia is approved:

Dr. Patricia Juarez-Dappe

Date

Dr. Javier Villa-Flores

Date

Dr. Susan Fitzpatrick-Behrens, Chair

Date

California State University, Northridge

Acknowledgements

As my journey at CSUN comes to an end, I must thank all those that made this possible. There are several outstanding Historians at CSUN that have taught me, trained me, and supported me, even when life circumstances got in the way of academics.

I am forever grateful to Dr. Patricia Juarez-Dappe, she was the first Professor I met here, the one that informed me about the Pre-Doctoral Scholarship program, for which she readily agreed to be my advisor. The funding I received from that program ultimately made the research of this thesis possible. She has been my teacher and my mentor. Her constant encouragement, and one or two scolding's are greatly appreciated. My gratitude to Dr. Susan Fitzpatrick-Behrens goes beyond what I can write here. Professor Fitzpatrick-Behrens chaired my thesis and provided invaluable insights and revisions to this project. She was always willing to help and listen to anything I had to say. Her understanding, patience, guidance and encouragement will not be forgotten. For all you have done, gracias. It was she who put me in contact with Professor Javier Villa-Flores at the University of Illinois-Chicago. He immediately agreed to have me over for the summer and guided me through the research of the primary sources. He was of great help and inspiration while in Chicago and continued to provide invaluable expertise throughout the project. For your time and dedication, I am truly grateful. Muchas gracias Profesor.

My classmates at CSUN have made it for an enjoyable journey. The various points of view and the numerous discussions have been a great part of the learning process.

A mi familia, por darme la oportunidad de estudiar. A mis abuelos, padres, y tíos que salieron en busca de un mejor futuro. Su dedicación y sacrificio son una inspiración. Sepan que todo lo que han echo no fue en vano, y se les agradece. Mi abuelita, que fue una guerrera y me sigue inspirando. Mis papas que nunca dejaron de apoyarme. Sin su apoyo no lo hubiera logrado, por todo lo que han hecho y siguen haciendo, gracias. A mis hermanos por el apoyo, thank you.

Monica, you have been my greatest supporter. You have encouraged me and always believed in me. From my years of frustration attempting to navigate the community college system, to where I am now. You have always given me your unwavering support. For everything you have done to make this possible, thank you.

Table of Contents

Signature Page	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Sermons as a Persuasive tool	5
All is God's Will	12
Chapter 2: Rebel Priests	16
With God or Patria	19
Chapter 3: Where is the Patria?	23
Criollo Patriotism	30
Chapter 4: The Word of God	34
Hidalgo the Troublemaker	38
Catholic Soldier, Patriot Soldier	42
Honor Your Father and Your Mother	44
In Defense of American Independence	64
Conclusion	67
Bibliography	69

Abstract

HONOR THY FATHER, AND THY MOTHER:
LOYALIST PRIESTS AND THE SUPPORT OF SPAIN DURING THE MEXICAN
WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

By

Isaí Garcia

Master of Arts in History

The Mexican war of Independence was fought at many levels, the military, the social and economic as well as the religious. The position of the Catholic Church, one of the most important and influential arms of the Spanish Kingdom in Mexico, played a substantial role during the war. Catholic clerics were on many levels the frontline representatives of the Crown. The manner and the message they preached, attempted to guide the political stance of Mexican society. The large Criollo population, by the time of the war had established themselves as Mexicans and no longer considered themselves exclusively Spanish. They were citizens of two patrias, the European, which ruled them and the American in which they were born, raised and for many the only one they knew. Defining where their patria was, and who belonged to it, was an important step in the direction of independence.

The Catholic Church was at a crossroads during the war of independence. Many of the curates, like the rest of the population viewed themselves as Mexican, with loyalty to Spain. The priests were caught between the difficult position of defending and advocating for a King who was no longer in power and a nation that many had never seen. Others chose to fight and defend the American patria they knew. This was a difficult issue, since as members of the clergy, their loyalty was with the Church and by default with Spain.

To be Catholic was to be Spaniard and vice-versa. Analyzing some of the sermons that were read and then printed for circulation in the early stages and during the war, gives a small sample of the political ideology of some of the priests who chose to remain loyal to Spain. Through religious discourse, they advocated loyalty to King, God and Country.

Here it is shown that at least in the metropolitan cities of Mexico, there existed some debate during the war as to where loyalty should be. The Church and their sermons are an example of the perspectives and arguments presented by those who chose to remain loyal to Spain. The priests were clearly in a difficult position, but found some ease in their religion and in the Bible, which they used to express their political ideology.

Introduction

From 1808 and up to 1820, the Catholic Church hierarchy in Mexico generally rejected independence from Spain. Viewing Spanish-American independence exclusively as an anti-colonial movement or an anti-Spanish revolution does not provide a full picture of the events. Several important members of the clerical orders vocally opposed independence and rejected efforts to separate Mexico from Spain. They sought recognition of the patria Americana as a component of the Spanish patria.

The residents of the New World developed a sense of their unique identity within the realms the Spanish Monarchy. Like their counterparts in Europe, the Spanish Americans, started to identify with their locality and their local history. A criollo identity developed in the New World, along with a consciousness that separated them from their brothers in Spain. This study is in agreement with Jaime Rodriguez's claim that the independence of Spanish America was part of both the revolution within the Spanish world and the dissolution of the Spanish Monarchy.¹ Furthermore I am in agreement with David A. Brading, that the development of a Mexican national identity aided in strengthening the cohesion among Americans during the rebellion.

This study takes the position that the view of the rebel priest that leads the congregation in revolt against Spain and the King is only a small portion of the role the church played in society during the war of independence. By examining printed sermons that were read at the metropolitan churches of Mexico in the years immediately preceding, and during the initial stages of the war, we can see that an important number of clerics condemned the actions of Miguel Hidalgo and his followers. Through the use

¹ Jaime E. Rodriguez O, *The Independence of Spanish America*, (Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press, 1996).

of sermons, church leaders, attempted to persuade the Mexican population away from the rebellion and advocated loyalty to Spain and King. Treason against King and Spain was treason against the mandate of God, was the message delivered by the church fathers.

While based on Biblical teachings, we will see that sermons of the time were much more than doctrinal documents, they were documents in political rhetoric that took an active position in the social events of the time and validated their stance, based on their religious teachings.

The sermons here presented are only a small representation of the number that were printed. The majority of sermons never made it to print. Only those deemed of the highest quality and approved by the authorities were eventually printed. Most printed sermons circulated in the metropolitan cities, Mexico City in particular. Because of the limitations of the surviving printed sermons, it is difficult to judge the point of view of the rural priest by the same scope. The metropolitan regions are overrepresented in the available sources.

Political resentment was only one ingredient necessary to trigger a war for independence. Mexico, much like Spain had a deep religious history that often influenced the course of the nation. The Catholic Church sought to guide the population as to where their loyalty should be. After all, to be Mexican was to be part of Spain and to be part of Spain was to be Catholic. The Mexican clergy found itself having to make the difficult decision of either remaining loyal to the Church, to Spain or to its new patria. They sought to reconcile their loyalty to all three, and through the use of sermons, guided the Criollo and Gachupin population to do the same. They had to choose to defend the King and his power as was believed to be the mandate of God, or side with the brewing

insurrection. It was not a simple matter of politics. To some Clerics, it was a war of religion in which their faith and the position of the Church as a civic institution of Spain was under attack.

The romanticized view of the fearless rebel priest that waves the flag while calling for a free Mexico and calls for death to the Spanish system falls short to explain the difficult position in which the Clerics found themselves. The sermons give an indication that the Church, the most powerful institution and the one with the greatest influences on the population was itself in turmoil. Hundreds of priests sympathized with the rebellion, after all most were Mexican born and educated. The majority had never set foot in Spain.² To them Mexico was their patria and like others wanted the best for it. Despite their difficult position, the clergymen were urged by their ecclesiastical superiors and by the dictates of their own faith and consciousness to remain loyal to their religious vocation. In reading the sermons we gain some understanding of the role clerics played in their attempt to deter the independence movement.

This study aims to show the position of some of clerics within the metropolitan churches of Mexico and the message they were delivering within the margins of the pulpit in the time of war. The sermons here analyzed were read at the various churches during Mass, in honor of a holiday or other important events within the Catholic Community. Once read, the sermons were printed and made available for general circulation. Sermons from Guadalajara, Queretaro and Durango are also included in the

² John Tutino, has made the argument that Miguel Hidalgo and his associates, which included other priests, supported the rebellion as an “agrarian insurrection, despite the more political goals of its leader.” In Tutino’s view, many of the Clerics, including Hidalgo, belonged to a marginalized elite class that could not advance beyond their current positions. Despite their education, most could not aspire to advance beyond a minor post in the Church. As such, they identified with the rural poor who were the foot soldiers of the war. See, John Tutino’s, *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940*.

study. The authors of the various sermons here studied were predominantly of the Franciscan and Dominican orders with the inclusion of some Secular priests.

Many chose to remain loyal to their faith and their religious duty and expressed such loyalty in their sermons. They rejected the insurgency and condemned the actions of fellow cleric Hidalgo. Parish priests played a prominent role in the insurgency at all levels including leadership. The majority of the churchmen remained at least passively loyal to Spain and the colonial order and did not fit the rebel priest category.³ It is clear that the Church had great external influence on the greater society and as such deserves a closer revision of its position in time of chaos. In understanding the sermons of the Church, we can gain a different perspective into the difficult position the Church and the population were in. Where should loyalty lie? With God, the Patria or both? Those are questions that some clerics of the period attempted to answer and sought guidance in their faith and biblical teachings. The sermons of the clerics are only one part of the loyalist discourse, which was never one side of without disagreement. Some of the sermons at points appear to contradict themselves, which serves as an indication of the evolving mentality of the society and the transition within the Church during the period.

³ Eric Van Young, *The Other Rebellion: Popular Violence, Ideology and the Mexican Struggle for Independence, 1810-1821*. (Stanford, CA; Stanford University Press, 2001), 202.

Chapter 1

Sermons as a Persuasive Tool

Sermons, fliers, and printed catechisms were valuable methods of disseminating, pressing and defending political positions in the early stages of the independence movements.⁴ The analyses of Civic Sermons, those included within the religious discourse political and social elements, pronounced and then printed for circulation, provide insight into the ideological and religious discourse of the period immediately before and during the war of independence. Of special interest are the socio-political dimensions of such documents. They were an important element of colonial society that aided in guiding the civic and religious lives of colonial society.⁵ Sermons pronounced immediately before and during the war of independence in México were designed to reinforce the social arrangements between religion and politics that had existed in the colony for three hundred years. No longer was the sermon a simple document of church doctrine, they evolved to include political interests and messages that entered all aspects of colonial life. The sermon became a civic discourse within the framework of the church.⁶

Sermons were discussions in rhetoric, points out Carlos Herrejón Peredo in his *Del Sermon al Discurso Cívico*, in that they aimed to move the audience to the desired position of the orator.⁷ As such, sermons were important discussions that had at their center the intention to instruct, and persuade an audience to reject the liberal changes

⁴ Rafael Sagredo Baeza, "Actores Políticos en Los Catechismos Patriotas y Republicanos Americanos, 1810-1827," *Historia Mexicana* Vol. 45, No.3. (Jan-Mar.,1996): 501.

⁵ Carlos Herrejon Peredo, *Del Sermon al Discurso Civico: Mexico, 1760-1834*. (Zamora, Michoacán: El Colegio de Michoacán, 2003), 11.

⁶ Sagredo Baeza, *Actores Politicos*, 503.

⁷ Herrejon Peredo, *Del Sermon al Discurso Civico*, 9.

taking place in Europe that had made their way to the New World. Sermons were framed around the circumstances in which they were pronounced, depending on the occasion and purpose of the Mass celebrated. Certainly not all took a political position. The ones here analyzed all appear to include in them a political agenda. The Mexican church was not ready to accept radical liberal ideas. Nor was the institution prepared to separate its influence from a civil society. The sermon sought a change in attitude on the part of the audience and a reinforcement of the already accepted religious ideas.⁸ The church accepted the position of the civil government embodied in the King and the Spanish institutions. The sermon was delivered as a persuasive tool to allow the Church to continue to be the ultimate moral leader of society and together with the established civic leaders advocate for a united Spanish society.

The art of persuasion, which has been attributed to the sermon, has its roots in the Greco-Roman tradition. The foundations of the sermon as a tool of doctrine, besides the mentioned Greco-Roman tradition, can be traced to the religious foundation of Judeo-Christian belief. It is the Judeo tradition that we find the elements that will play a role in the creation of the civic sermon in the early stages of the wars of Independence in the Americas. Herrejón Peredo points out that Hebrew oratory tradition provided the sermon with the elements that gave it its religious character and separated it from the common philosophical rhetoric. The sermon was based on the proclamation of law, the message of the prophets, and the exegesis of the accepted leader. By including such elements in the discourse, the clerics of colonial México, avoided taking a direct and open political stance.⁹

⁸ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermón al Discurso Cívico*, 9.

⁹ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermón al Discurso Cívico*, 10.

The structure of the sermon, regulated by established church tradition gave the clerics the ability to embed their discourse without stepping into the open political arena. Now, the object of religious discourse was to persuade, and to offer that which could not be debated within the confines of Church doctrine. It offered absolute values based on the accepted biblical and canonical tradition. In the sermon, the two ideologies came together in political and civic discourse. The orator attempted to persuade the listeners towards a point of view. Within the church, it is understood that the listener has already accepted the foundation of the sermon as truth and would not question it. By basing the civic sermon on the Bible, the cleric made it difficult to question the political message embedded in the document. To do so, would be to question the Bible, the Church and by default God. As such the religious orator, in his view did not fail in delivering his message, even if the message was rejected, his goal had been accomplished. He unlike the secular rhetorician, fulfilled his mission to deliver a message, which cannot be refuted or questioned as it is based on canon law.¹⁰ That is not to say that the audience agreed with the discourse of the sermon. Polite silence during mass did not necessarily indicate approval of the discourse.

Sermons did not impose obligatory commitments from their listeners. They did not carry the same weight as an edict or pastoral letter. But the doctrine of discipline and biblical discourse gave the clergy a substantial amount of power. The sermon did not establish or imply unity within the ranks of the clergy. But they did give unity to the clerical attempt to provide a moral guidance in civic and secular discourse.¹¹

¹⁰ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermon al Discurso Civico*, 10.

¹¹ Brian F. Connaughton, *Clerical Ideology in a Revolutionary age: The Guadalajara Church and the Idea of the Mexican Nation 1788-1853*, (Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Press, 2003), 108.

The sermon was not simply Christian preaching; it was a historical overview that was closely related to the events and circumstances of a given period. It was a Christian message, filled with solemnity and formality, based on biblical scripture and tradition, but delivered with the aid of rhetorical principles and resources. Themes of the sermon could be as varied as they were difficult to create. A sermon could be used in its traditional understanding, as a lecture and explanation of a biblical passage, and vary as much as to be used to celebrate a social event within the Christian community in which it is delivered. It can celebrate or commemorate the patron saint of a region, the birth or death of community member. The sermon can be delivered in honor of an important civic event, as the coronation or election of a new leader or any other event that affects the entire community. There are varied types of sermons, from the dogmatic and moral, to the Eucharistic.¹²

Five primary types of sermons can be observed within the Catholic tradition: The panegyric, designed to praise God, and individual or an action; the funeral sermon, given to honor the deceased and beg for the entering of the soul into heaven; the sermon offered in gratitude, be it to God or a leader; the sermon given in rogation or supplication; and, the sermon, which can vary in its intention, method, and location. All sermons resemble the original moral instruction and are always, and regardless of the intention or purpose, founded on biblical and moral lessons. They all include an element of worship and a lecture to be learned.¹³

The printed sermon in New Spain, Herrejón Peredo points out, was not as many have believed, always directed to the native Indians, nor was it a missionary, or evangelization

¹² Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermon al Discurso Civico*, 11.

¹³ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermon al Discurso Civico*, 19.

document. Most printed and publically read sermons, were directed towards Spaniards, *Criollos* and *Gachupines*. At the time of the war of independence, native communities remained relatively isolated from the urban regions and the political rhetoric prevalent in the metropolitan areas. Yet, rural priests were an important link in maintaining loyalty to Spain.¹⁴

It is worth noting that sermons delivered in the native tongues, by rural priests, adopted some of the similar elements of the Spanish sermon, in style, creation and usage. The sermon and the reader served a dual purpose as cultural intermediaries and as instructions and instructor. The role of instructor was used extensively during the tumultuous years of the independence wars. The reader held an immense amount of power to persuade his audience to believe what was being preached. The audience was captive for the duration of the sermon, which could last a couple hours. For that amount of time, the lector went uninterrupted, making his case. Not only were his views unchallenged during the sermon, they were deeply grounded on biblical teachings and church doctrine, making it difficult for anyone to openly challenge the sermon or the theme. To challenge it, would be to challenge the church, something few if any were willing to do. Surely ideas presented by the preachers were questioned and analyzed in private spaces, homes, social clubs, and other points of public reunion.

Sermons in Spain as well as in the Colonies carried in them the historical and political weight of the time. This is particularly true of the time during the Napoleonic wars and immediately prior to the wars of independence. More so than the theological elements we begin to see a heavy dose of nationalism supported by biblical teachings. Honor the

¹⁴ Eric Van Young, *The Other Rebellion: Popular Violence, Ideology and the Mexican Struggle for Independence, 1810-1821* (Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 240.

father and the mother, would appear frequently in civic sermons, King Fernando VII assuming the role of the father and Spain the Mother land. These roots can traced to the early colonial period, as mentioned, most sermons targeted Spaniards in the colony, which would give validation to the heavy nationalistic elements, particularly in a time of war and possible American revolution. The sermon developed into the voice and the representative of the political ideology of Church leaders. They began to move the listener or reader in a given direction. Therefore the sermon not only reflected the ideology of the time, they actively begun to shape the path of history itself.¹⁵

Of the elements, traditions and method used in creating the sermons, perhaps the most important for the cleric and the one that would have the biggest impact on the listener was the manner in which the Bible was interpreted. Biblical foundations all of Christian doctrine requires an accepted understanding of the Bible. Biblical scholars of the time followed two accepted schools of thought in interpreting scripture. The Antiochian school of thought gives precedence to the literal interpretation of the Bible as intended by the author. The Alexandrine school gave precedence to the typological interpretation, which was considered to be expressed in the figure of something, what we would call allegoric teachings.¹⁶ Both methods offered elements that would come into play during the time of chaos. To clarify these two schools of thought we can use the sermons that explain who has the right to rule. The first school affirms that supreme power, political or otherwise, derives from God directly to the people, and the people, then transfer it to the governors of the land. The second advocates for the idea that power was given directly to a leader, like the king. The elements of the second tradition are visible during the declaration of

¹⁵ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermon al Discurso Civico*, 22.

¹⁶ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermón al Discurso Civico*, 24.

war by Spain against France and by colonial priests in rejecting the insurgent forces during the war of independence.¹⁷

¹⁷ Herrejón Peredo, *Del Sermón al Discurso Cívico*, 24.

All is God's Will

In Christian tradition nothing happens in a vacuum. The European war and the chaos that engulfed the colonies were predetermined events, of which the Bible had given ample warning. The sermons read and printed during the war of independence can be seen as an attempt by the church to help understand why the chaos. Understanding the Bible and its predictions would, according to the clerics, make it easier to understand the will of God and their path during the war. All that was happening could be traced to ancient times and the teachings of early Church fathers. Understanding those early roots give the reader a better understanding of the sermons and the evolution of civic discourse in Christian tradition.

Biblical prefiguration took center stage in the creation of a spoken or written sermon during the years of the war. The idea of *prefiguration* became well accepted within the church of Medieval Europe and would continue on to the colonial era. However, prefiguration had its roots in much older times. The origins of the idea of prefiguration appear in the Hellenic style of education within the Roman tradition, which begun in the last century B.C.¹⁸ Varro, Lucretius and Cicero used the term *figura* in their writing, meaning an outward appearance or an outline. Over time, the word appeared to have gone through the linguistic process to give it the meaning we understand today as image or reflection. Therefore the *figura* is the realized event and the *prefigura* announces the image, event, which is to come. Events like those mentioned in the Bible, would reflect themselves in the events of the independence war according to some clerics. Chaos, war, and insubordination to God and Church were all events that the Bible warned about,

¹⁸ Erich Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Mass: Meridian Books, 1973), 12.

which according to some sermons, became a reality during the war. This tradition, one can assume facilitated the clerics' ability to tie it all together; church tradition, biblical teachings and current events into a persuasive sermon with little room for questioning. Since the events were a fulfillment of those anticipated in the Bible, the preacher did not necessarily have to give reasoning for the events. His duty was to instruct the congregation on how to navigate through the chaos, but not necessarily explain it outside of biblical doctrine.

The use of the term *figura* first appears in Christian tradition in the writings of Tertullian, who frequently used the term in his *Adversus Marcionem*.¹⁹ The passages discuss the naming of Oshea, son of Nun, whom Moses names Joshua, according to Numbers 13:16.²⁰ According to Tertullian, the naming of Jehoshua (Joshua) was the prefiguration of things to come. Where as Joshua was born into the wild, and made his way towards the Promised Land, so will in the New Testament Jesus be born into a “wild world” and lead his people into Promised Land of eternal life.²¹ This idea of liberation and promise, resurfaced in sermons prior to the independence movement in México. The aim of church prefiguration and interpretation was to show that the Old Testament was the prefiguration of the New Testament and in it laid the history of salvation, which could only be obtained by maintaining loyalty to those in power, the King, the Church and the mother land: Spain.

¹⁹ Tertullian, Roman Author from the African colony of Carthage. One of the earliest Christian Apologist. A prolific writer of early church doctrine.

²⁰ *These are the names of the men which Moses sent to spy out the land. And Moses called Oshea the son of Nun Jehoshua.* King James Bible. Numbers 3:16.

²¹ Erich Auerbach, *Scenes*, 28.

Like Tertullian, Augustine rejected the Old Testament as pure allegorical interpretation. Augustine dismissed the notion that the Old Testament was simply a “hermetic book that became intelligible only if one discarded the literal historical meaning and the vulgar interpretation.”²² Augustine maintained that a believer could penetrate the holy message of the scripture. He took the long held view that the Old Testament was prophecy for the New Testament. “The Old Testament is promised in figure, the New is a promise fulfilled after the spirit.”²³ Augustine makes his point, “For we are all aware that the Old Testament contains promises of temporal things, and that is why it is called Old Testament; and that the promise of eternal life and kingdom of heaven belongs to the New Testament: but that in these temporal figures there was the promise of future things, which were to be fulfilled in us, on whom the ends of the world comes, is no fantasy of mine, but the interpretation of the apostles...”²⁴ The war of independence was seen as time of chaos, fulfilling what those in the likes of Augustine had anticipated.

The prefiguration of the Old Testament resurfaced in Europe and the Americas. The complex times of war, liberation and exodus played a role in the sermons delivered in the cathedrals of México. They were interpreted in the light of St. Augustine and the tradition of prefiguration; nothing was new or unexpected. The Bible gave the believer ample time to prepare, and the Napoleonic wars and the movement for independence appeared as fulfillment of the foretold. Figural interpretation was active in European countries up to the eighteenth century; this did not escape the parishes in the Americas that at that same

²² As quoted by Erich Auerbach, *Scenes*, 39.

²³ Erich Auerbach, *Scenes*, 41.

²⁴ St. Augustine as quoted by Erich Auerbach, *Scenes*, 41.

point were still under heavy influence from European academia.²⁵ After the expulsion of the Jesuit, order academia in the Americas began to develop independently of the European teachings. As such, it would aid in the creation of an American identity and it would set the stage for the nationalist thinking which developed in various regions.

Scholarship of Mexican independence has favored the concept of the *rebel priest* who preached against Spain and the crown. While that can be the case in the latter stages of the independence movement, prior to 1810 and during the war in Mexico, particularly within the metropolitan areas, sermons that supported Spain and the King were common. This type of sermon appeared in the Americas even before the crisis of the Spanish crown following the Napoleonic wars. Published in Madrid in 1793, *Catecismo del Estado*, by Joaquin Lorenzo Villanueva, which supported the loyalist perspective, was widely read and it likely influenced the sermons delivered in Mexico prior to independence. The number of published sermons in support of the monarchy leads one to conclude that not all priests fell under the *rebel* category, nor were all parishioners ardent Mexican patriots.

²⁵ Erich Auerbach, *Scenes*, 61.

Chapter 2

Rebel Priests

Mexican national identity was a long process in the making, and by the war of independence, that concept was still undefined. David A. Brading has pointed out, that Catholicism united the peoples of Mexico more than nationalism.²⁶ Until recently scholars did not agree about the time when Mexican Spaniards developed a shared sense of Mexican identity. This transformation may have been delayed by the many ethnic and social differences among Spaniards, Mestizos, Indigenous, and Mulattos that composed the majority of the Mexican population.²⁷

While most political activity took place in the Mexican capital, the evidence proves that much activity was taking place in rural areas. The war for independence originated in Dolores, Guanajuato, not Mexico City. The Bajío Region composed of Jalisco, Guanajuato, Michoacán and Queretaro provided substantial evidence in the form of sermons, and validates the idea that within the Catholic Church there were divisions among the clerics as to where ones loyalty should be. Sermons from Zacatecas and Durango lend some visibility to other regions of the periphery. Mexico City, with its large metropolis produced the most substantial number of sermons, many of which support a Spanish Mexico, loyal to Fernando VII and condemned the idea of independence and rejected Hidalgo as a traitor to Spain and to the Catholic Church.

The long romanticized story of the rebel priest that led an oppressed nation to freedom has long being embodied by the image of Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. History has painted

²⁶ David A. Brading, *Los Orígenes del Nacionalismo Mexicano* (México: Secretaria de Educación Publica, 1973), 14.

²⁷ Brading, *Los Origenes*, 14.

him as the most recognizable figure of the time, but he was by no means the only church leader to favor a revolt against the broken institutions of the colony. We must also include José María Morelos y Pavón, like Hidalgo, a member of the regular clergy who had also studied in Michoacán, and in 1808, expressed himself, “totally ready to sacrifice my life for the Catholic religion and the liberty of our sovereign.”²⁸ Enrique Krauze points out that Hidalgo was part of an old tradition of Criollo patriotism who was greatly influenced by Jesuit thought while studying in Valladolid.²⁹ Krauze points out that Hidalgo was an idealistic priest who as a youth had exclaimed; “we will freely exploit the incredibly rich products of our country and within a few years its inhabitants will enjoy all the delights of this vast continent.”³⁰

When Hidalgo took up arms, he was not only defying the established order, and revolting against Spain; his action contradicted the official stance of the church.³¹ He was not only committing treason against Spain, he was seen by many clerics as a traitor to the Church and the mandate of God. Furthermore, Krauze points out that perhaps Hidalgo had other less idealistic reasons for his revolt, he and his family were in extreme debt and “the Spanish Crown had put a lien on Hidalgo’s haciendas and those of his family threatening to auction them off unless the sudden and exorbitant demands for payment were met.”³²

²⁸ Carlos Herrejón Peredo, *Morelos: Vida Preinsurgente y Lecturas*, (Zamora, Michoacán: Colegio de Michoacán, 1984), 214.

²⁹ Valladolid was the current city of Morelia in the state of Michoacán. Not to be confused with Valladolid Spain.

³⁰ Enrique Krauze, *Mexico: Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996*. (New York, Harper-Collins Publishers, 1997.), 90.

³¹ Hugh M. Hamill Jr. *The Hidalgo Revolt: Prelude to Mexican Independence*. (Wesport Conn: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1966),155.

³² Enrique Krauze, *Mexico: Biography*, 90.

A small group of outspoken rebel clerics favored a break from their European counterparts. Eric Van Young's *The Other Rebellion* demonstrates that personality, background, life, history and other circumstances that interacted with the political framework of public events produced the rebel clerics. Furthermore Van Young demonstrates that the rebel priest romanticism is an incomplete view. Twenty to thirty percent of those in a leadership position during the insurgency were members of the clergy. But most did not hold a leadership role within the ranks of the Church. Nor was the official position of the Church well defined.³³ By that we can assume that a majority of priests did not fall into the category of revolutionary leader. William B. Taylor also agrees that a small number of priests participated in the insurgency and that the claim that "warrior priest were everywhere" is an exaggeration. Parish priest were favorite targets for kidnapping by rebels and loyalist, either to recruit or neutralize their influence.³⁴

³³ Eric Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 227.

³⁴ William B. Taylor, *Magistrates of the Sacred: Priests and Parishioners in Eighteenth-Century Mexico*, (Stanford CA, Stanford University Press, 1996), 453.

With God or With Patria

Eric Van Young has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that contrary to the popular and scholarly tradition, of “rebel priests,” in México, a large percentage of the clergy remained loyal to the Crown. According to Van Young, as much as eighty percent of the clergy in New Spain, maintained a passive support for the crown during the decade of rebellion.³⁵ We cannot declare with assurance the motivation of individual clergy to remain steadfast to their calling. However, loyalty to the Church implied loyalty to the Crown. Whatever their political opinion was, loyalist, insurgent or neutral, the evidence would suggest that they made an active choice to carry out their pastoral duties within the context of loyalism.³⁶ This was an impressive feat, if we consider that many loyalist priests were often attacked, terrorized and abused at the hands of the insurgents.³⁷ Attacks upon the priestly class were more common in the countryside than in the larger cities. Violence often stemmed from personal local vengeance in response to real or imagined historic abuse by the priest upon a local community.³⁸ Further more, the clergy were to local communities a real or imagined defender of the colonial order.³⁹ As a result of the violence aimed towards priests in the countryside, a large number migrated towards larger cities seeking shelter.⁴⁰ Mexico City was the destination of the majority of the country priest. The precarious situation in the countryside and the large number of loyalist priests and citizens in Mexico City, helps to explain why the majority of loyalist

³⁵ Eric Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 240.

³⁶ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 225.

³⁷ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 227.

³⁸ Brian R. Hamnett, *Roots of Insurgency: Mexican Regions, 1750-1824* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 153.

³⁹ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 227.

⁴⁰ Eric Van Young, “Agrarian Rebellion and Defense of Community: Meaning and Collective Violence in Late Colonial and Independence-Era Mexico” *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Winter, 1993), pp. 245-269

sermons and circulars were produced in that region. Van Young points out that the number of priests migrating to Mexico City must have been in the hundreds, with lesser numbers, but in similar fashion, entering secondary cities.⁴¹ Worried about their own safety, the clergy had to decide whether to stay with their flock as their duty mandated or flee to safer grounds. No doubt it was a difficult moral decision, trying to separate theology from politics. To the Crown and to Church leaders, their most important agents had been the rural priests. They were the representatives of the Church and by default representatives of the Crown.⁴² If the message of loyalty to the Crown was to reach the countryside, the priests were an important means of delivery. The presence of a parish priest also represented a familiar presence among the mostly peasant classes. The presence of the local priest and his preaching had a stabilizing effect in the eyes of church leaders, but was also a deterrent against rebellion. The insurgency had essentially removed that stabilizing force and opened the door for chaos.

Those priests that remained in the rebel held countryside rarely spoke against the rebellion. To many rebel leaders, this silence indicated a passive support of the insurgency. We must question whether the hesitation was to take a side was real or coerced by fear. Intimidation of the priests was a useful tool for the rebel forces. Insurgents wanted priests to live outside the royalist area, this gave the impression to the masses of the countryside that the issue of loyalty to the King was an issue to be settled by force of arms only and not by the Church.⁴³

⁴¹ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 226.

⁴² Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 233.

⁴³ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 232.

Colonial authorities encouraged and at points ordered priests to remain in their parishes.⁴⁴ Authorities, ecclesiastical and secular supported what has been described as “missionary” activity within the countryside. The missionary work aimed at recovering politically sliding rural people, and claiming them for the loyalist cause. This of course followed the idea that a well functioning ceremonial life and a solid flow of religious indoctrination would be the best shield for a population against disloyalty. The church was then more than simply a basis for spiritual guidance it was a central political instrument, used by both sides, insurgent and royalist. The effort to use priests as missionaries in service of the political ideology of the Crown was more than ideological, as Van Young has pointed out, “ since disloyalty to the monarchical regime was seen officially as a irreligious and any form of heterodoxy as disloyal.”⁴⁵ To be loyal to the Church was understood to be loyal to Spain, its king and legal institutions.

The Church became a first line of defense for the Crown in rural regions, where priests were also often leaders of the insurgents, like Miguel Hidalgo and José María Morelos. The clergy, although officially loyal to the Crown, was clearly divided in rural México. The citizens of the forming nation were as divided as its politics and its church. The Church however provided the loyalist a familiar tool under which they could rally a large portion of the citizenship. The message of loyalty, honor and *patriotism* had a resounding force amongst the loyalist movement. The usage of language and of biblical scripture became a valued tool for the church in gaining loyalty.

Patriotism and loyalty were at the center of the debate within the political and religious spectrums, which as we have seen tied into a single identity. As mentioned

⁴⁴ Alejandro Villaseñor y Villaseñor, *Biografías de los Héroes y Caudillos de la Independencia, Vol. II.* (Mexico City: Editorial Jus, 1962). 63

⁴⁵ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 234.

before, the clerics were in a difficult position, having to advocate for their faith or for land they knew, the place where family lived, and for many, the only country they knew. Not only were the clerics risking alienating a percentage of the population, they were risking monetary wealth, which could arrive in the form of patronage from wealthy Mexicans. The Church was walking a fine line between religion and nationalism and would have to adapt to the current situation.

Chapter 3

Where is the Patria?

The concept of the *Patria* was an important component of the argument which created a consensus of loyalty. To be loyal to one's patria, one must first locate and define patria. We must also step aside from the idea that Spanish Colonies of the early 19th century were like those of the early colonial period. Jaime E. Rodriguez points out that although many scholars have written about the New World as a society of social hierarchies, with the Spanish on top, followed by Criollos, Mestizos, Indigenous and Blacks. The economic and social changes of Europe helped transform the old hierarchy in the Americas by the 19th century. The "society in transit" of Europe was also taking place in Mexico.⁴⁶ By the war of independence, Spanish Colonies were in themselves important and powerful parts of the Spanish kingdom, capable of self-determination and self-government. In many aspects, they had become more influential and important than some European regions. They had adopted the best of Spain and often improved on it. The colonies had developed a sense of self-determination and pride. Increasingly, the nation they spoke of and referred to was the American territory.⁴⁷ Fray Servando Teresa de Mier, a member of the Dominican Order, and an advocate for colonial rights declared that the colonies were not only equals of Spain but also that the the King held them in the same esteem as the rest of the patria. "Our Kings, far from having thought of leaving the colonies in the modern colonial period of other nations, not only did they make ours

⁴⁶ Jaime E. Rodriguez, "La Independencia de la America Española: Una Reinterpretacion. *Historia Mexicana*, Vol. 42 No. 3. (Jan-March., 1993), 577.

⁴⁷ Jaime E. Rodriguez O, *The Independence of Spanish America*, (Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press, 1996), 18.

equal to those in Spain, but with the best of them.”⁴⁸ This was the persistent ideology beginning in 1808 during the imperial crisis of Spain.

Ernst H. Kantorowicz in his analysis of the patria, identifies the changes that the concept had within the religious, Christian tradition.⁴⁹ The Christian, he points out, had become a citizens of another world. Heaven had become the new patria, the fatherland of the Christians. This however appears to contradict the sermons in which Christians are urged to defend the earthly patria established by God. There existed a clear disagreement as to where the patria was. “Ethically, death for the carnal fatherland meant little if compared with that for the spiritual patria, Jerusalem in Heaven, . . . The saints had given their lives for the invisible community in heaven and the celestial city, the true patria of their desires; and final return to that fatherland in Heaven should be the normal desire of every Christian soul while wandering in exile earth.”⁵⁰ While some sermons encouraged a patriotic upheaval and willingness to sacrifice one’s life, Kantorowicz appears to suggest that the earthly patria is only temporary for the Christians who have their permanent patria in heaven.

From medieval tradition, we know that a knight would fight for the honor and defense of his Duke or overlord or territory, his patria. As political and territorial definitions evolved in Europe, so did the power holdings and the loyalty of knights. Since power was given to the chosen few by divine right, the defense of a Duke or King was not simply a defense of terrestrial possessions, but of God’s will. The patria evolved to no longer being a territory simply represented by a king or duke, it was a territory mandated and

⁴⁸ Jaime E. Rodriguez, “La Independencia de la America Española,” 575.

⁴⁹ Ernst H. Kantorowicz, “*Pro Patria Mori* in Medieval Political Thought” *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 56, No 3 (April, 1951): pp. 472-492.

⁵⁰ Kantorowicz, *Pro Patria Mori*, 475.

subject to the will of God. When defending the patria, the knight defended God's chosen land. To serve the patria was to serve God. Loyalty to the King, was loyalty to God. "Death for the fatherland now is viewed in truly a religious perspective; it appears as a sacrifice for the *corpus mysticum* of the state [the King] which is no less a reality than the *corpus mysticum* of the church [God]." ⁵¹

The colonies viewed themselves as a part of the patria, but the patria was not well defined. On one hand, the *patria* was the land where one was born. Birth and land defined national identity. Under that concept, Mexico and its people, as well as other Spanish colonies of the Americas had by the 1800's become patrias. According to the Spanish legal tradition expressed in *Partidas del Rey Sabio*, the *patria* was the place of birth, where one had a duty to populate and cultivate the land. The patria was then, not just the physical boundaries, but a collection of social and juridical institutions, governed by one law, by one *pater*, and by one Monarch. ⁵² Scholarship has pointed to the Spanish case as a clear example of a Catholic monarchical patria. Catholicism provided the Spanish crown with the cohesion to create a single entity and gave legitimacy to a single entity. The connection between King, Religion and Patria, created what Professor Terán Fuentes described as an indivisible cohesion. México was a clear part of that cohesion. Rather than being separated by the Atlantic Ocean, Teran Fuentes argues, the waterways served as a connector between the American Colonies and Spain. ⁵³ The Atlantic was the route for connecting shared ideas and a similar identity.

⁵¹ Kantorowicz, *Pro Patria Mori*, 487.

⁵² Mariana Terán Fuentes, "La Voz '¡Viva la América!' En el Movimiento Insurgente" *Legajos* No.2 (Oct-Dic. 2009): 83.

⁵³ Terán Fuentes, *La Voz*, 86.

The patria required an established juridical system and working social institutions that were governed under the same rules.⁵⁴ In Mexico as well as Spain, this fell under the monarchy of Fernando VII. If we base it on the words of Miguel Hidalgo during the outbreak of the war, we can conclude that the not all resident of Mexico sought to separate their patria from Spain. They wanted recognition for their own established institutions under the monarchy. The criollo sought to create for México a space within Catholicism, to recognize it and identify it, rather than separate it. Sermons delivered prior to the outbreak of the war and immediately after the initial stages, as we will see, time and again advocated for loyalty to King and to Spain, honor your father and mother, was the clear message. Loyalist priests, to advocate support, for the Spanish patria, used sermons.

Yet, the support for independence engaged some of the same symbols of Catholicism to advocate for a free Mexican patria. Aiding in the creation of a space within the realm of the Spanish patria, the Virgen de Guadalupe played a central role in unifying the young nation around Catholicism, as Antonio Rubial has pointed out.⁵⁵ Not only was the Virgen a true Mexican creation, it became the standard of the insurgent forces. The image of the Virgen, the venerated image of the indigenous and the revered saint of the criollo masses, united a people under a common symbol. Guadalupe united Indian and criollo in a single space, within a bigger one, it carved a position within the realm, a Mexican patria within the Spanish patria.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Mariana Terán Fuentes, *La Voz '¡Viva la América!*, 90

⁵⁵ See, Antonio Rubial, *La Santidad Controvertida*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999.

⁵⁶ David A. Brading. *Los Orígenes del Nacionalismo Mexicano*. (México: Secretaria de Educación Publica, 1973), 34.

Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla's call to arms in the town of Dolores in 1810, was not in itself a purely political call for independence.⁵⁷ The *Grito de Dolores*, as history has labeled the call for insurgency, advocated for unity of the Mexican patria, in defense of the mother patria, Spain. Hidalgo, voiced the sentiments of the new patria in his exclamation of “¡Long live Religion! ¡Long Live our Holy Mother of Guadalupe! ¡Long Live Fernando VII! ¡Long Live America and Death to bad government!”⁵⁸ Insurgents sought a rupture with the powerful corrupt representatives of the Crown, “*the bad government*,” that was impeding the young patria from transforming into an independent realm of Spain. Loyal to the King, but with an effective local government composed of its native citizens.

Loyalty to Spain and Catholicism were just as important to the insurgents, “*Long live Religion, Long live Fernando VII.*” Yes, the call was made for independence, but not from Spain. It called for independence from the system that was holding a section of the Spanish patria as subservient to European Spain. The American Spain saw itself as an integral part of the patria as a whole, whose king, religion and territory needed to be protected from *bad government*, embodied by the systematic abuse at the hands of corrupt Peninsulares. The initial insurgents can be categorized as patriots rising in defense of their patria. America had to be represented by Americans, who sought representation within the bigger nation.⁵⁹ Those rebel patriots as David A. Brading calls them, rose in defense of an identity that had been created over the last three hundred

⁵⁷ Eric Van Young, “Moving Toward Revolt: Agrarian Origins of the Hidalgo Rebellion in the Guadalajara Region,” in *Riot, Rebellion, and the Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*, ed. Friedrich Katz, (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1988), 177-20.

⁵⁹ Jose Maria Morelos in his “*Proclama de José Maria Morelos.*” Quoted by Maria Terán Fuentes.

years. Napoleon, the French Emperor who in 1808 forced King Fernando to abdicate the throne, was the most recent and visible enemy who gave a face to all the problems that had build up within the Americans. The insurgency did not represent a rupture with the Spanish power structure, it simply sought juridical and recognition within established Spanish institutions. The rupture was to protect the territory from those like Napoleon.

Hidalgo recognized that to protect the Mexican nation, a rupture from Spain was necessary. The removal of King Fernando VII represented a threat to the sovereignty of the patria, whose interest in Europe and across the oceans had to be defended and guarded. To Hidalgo, and those who participated in the first months of the war, America was their patria, their compatriots were their neighbors, their forbearers were the Europeans, their religion was Catholicism and their king was Fernando VII. As such, the message that prevailed through the war's initial phase was the defense of the patria, the king and religion.⁶⁰ Having a similar religion, and king the Americanos also had a common birthplace that united them as a patria. Spanish America needed to be represented and defended by Americanos in loyalty with Fernando, and yes, in loyalty with Spain.

Patriotism, as Terán Fuentes has described it, fluctuated between manifestations of love and defense of the patria and the expression of loyalty to the monarchy.⁶¹ The insurgent was wedged between the expected obligation of any vassal to serve and protect its king, while also remaining a loyal vassal to his territory, his brotherhood, his patria. Furthermore, and above all, the vassal had to remain loyal to God and his religion. The Catholic Church tied the two entities together, it was the greater power that demanded the

⁶⁰ Terán Fuetes, *La Voz* 91.

⁶¹ Mariana Terán Fuentes, "De Nacion española a federación Mexicana. La opinion pública en la formación de la nacion," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* Vol.22, No.2 (Summer 20026): 258.

most loyalty. Yet, it also embodied the patria and served as a parameter for the actions of the crown. The King was by all accounts of the Church considered a blessed and chosen being placed upon the patria by God. Yet, the King could not be absent from his duties without the approval of the secular Cortes. The pulpit made sure the message of loyalty to God, patria and king reached all those, in danger of falling into insurgency.

Criollo Patriotism

By the beginning of the 19th century, the Criollo society of Mexico, as the rest of the Americas had gone through an important evolution in their self-perception. They openly embraced and exalted the Aztec past of central Mexico. Resentment towards the Gachupin, combined with an evolving self-dependence, local tradition and local religion established the foundation for the patriotic Mexican in the early stages and during the war of independence. David A. Brading, observes that unlike the rest of the American colonies, Mexican insurgents utilized the local religion and the rejection and condemnation of the Spanish conquest as powerful tools to rally support among the masses.⁶²

Scholars have expressed different opinions defining the moment when the American Spanish gained consciousness of themselves as Americans. As David A. Brading asserted, this apparently simple transition was anything but. Creating a national identity had its barriers. It attempted to unite various ethnicities, and social positions. Spaniards of European or American birth continued to hold the most important positions of power, prestige and wealth. Catholicism was the uniting force. Religion, along with the invocation of a common history and traditions, cut the distance between the Criollo masses and the rest of the population.⁶³ By the outbreak of the war, the Mexican church, except for the highest positions, was in the hands of Mexican Spaniards.

The apparition of the Virgen de Guadalupe, to the Indian Juan Diego in 1521, became a uniting force for Mexican identity. When the first published record of the apparition

⁶² David. A. Brading, *Los Origenes del Nacionalismo Mexicano* (Mexico, D.F: Secretaria de Educacion Publica, 1973), 13

⁶³ David. A. Brading, *Los Origenes*, 14.

appeared in 1648, the legend was quickly adopted into various sermons throughout the colony. Once recognized by the Pope and the Spanish Royal house as the Patron Mother of New Spain, altars were built in her honor and her story distributed through out the colony. Devotion to the Virgen of Guadalupe gave the Mexican clergy a sense of autonomy. No longer were they entirely dependent to the European church. The mother of God had chosen to appear on their land, to and Indigenous person no less. Both Criollo and Indigenous were united under a single religious icon.⁶⁴ No surprise then, that Miguel Hidalgo, rose under that same image in his call for independence.

In 1767 the Jesuit order was expelled from the dominions of the Spanish Monarchy. As a result, nearly four hundred Jesuit Cleric Scholars were forced to vacate Mexico in a single swipe. David A Brading makes it clear that as a result, the nucleus of the colonial intellectuals had been removed, leaving a vacuum to be filled by Mexican intellects.⁶⁵ As early as 1750, Mexican intellectuals were beginning to be characterized by a renewed confidence and a more intense patriotism. Brading notes that by that time, the Mexican intellectual could be characterized by their deep understanding of modern European ideas, that allowed them to stand on equal ground as the elite scholars of the European metropolitan cities.⁶⁶ Acceptance of an indigenous past combined with the flourishing cult to the Virgen de Guadalupe, gave Mexican scholars a sense of self and provided a sense of separation from their Spanish roots. At the same time, an independent American image started to develop, and a sense of Mexican patriotism flourished. Political events in

⁶⁴ William B. Taylor, "The Virgen of Guadalupe in New Spain: An Inquiry into the Social History of Marian Devotion" *American Ethnologist* Vol. 14. No. 1. Frontiers of Christian Evangelism, (Feb, 1987), 9-33.

⁶⁵ For a discussion on the changes within the Church after the Jesuit expulsion see, "Jesuit Missions, Spanish America: The Aftermath of the Expulsion" By Olga Merino and Linda A. Newson *Revista de Historia de América* , No. 118 (Jul. - Dec., 1994), pp. 7-32.

⁶⁶ David. A. Brading, *Los Origenes*, 36

Europe, France in particular reminded the Criollos that to Europe, they remained simple colonized people dependent upon Spain. What Spanish society had always whispered, the French philosophers yelled in public through the publications of Hobbes, Rousseau and others.

The intellectual revolution that engulfed Europe in the latter part of the 1700's had an impact on Spain and the American colonies. Unlike the French variant, intellectual ideas in Spain were neither radical nor anti-clerical.⁶⁷ Spain remained deeply associated with the Church that influenced its political and civic destiny. This made Spain a target of the liberal thinking that was taking place in other European nations. New philosophical ideas combined with the Protestant movement, made Spain an easy target by all who condemned political despotism and fanatical religiosity. Mexican intellectuals, influenced by French philosophy began to reject their Spanish roots.⁶⁸ Not surprisingly, during the war of independence, many of the sermons directly attacked France and Napoleon as instruments of the devil interested in destroying the patria. Mexican intellectuals, including some clerics, embraced the new philosophies to separate themselves from Spain. They evoked the past in the apparition of Guadalupe and the Aztec culture. That, along with the rejection of the conquest, begun to foment in Mexico, the sense of oneself, and one's patria, independent from European ties.

The Mexican church was not ready to accept a liberal state nor was it prepared to separate canon law from civic law. That would imply surrendering political power that the Church had maintained for three hundred years in the colony. The call for religious

⁶⁷ Jaime E. Rodriguez O, *The Independence of Spanish America*, (Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press, 19980), 36.

⁶⁸ A. Owen Aldridge, Ed. *The Ibero-American Enlightenment*, (Urbana Ill, University of Illinois Press, 1971), 21-57

unity, was then a call for a continuation of the power structure within the colony. The sermons of the time sought to reinforce real or imagine alliances between Church and society under the threat of a realigning world.

Chapter 4

The Word of God

Although we lack reliable figures on literacy rates of the end of the 18th century, and during the war of independence. Eric Van Young estimates that it is likely no more than five percent were literate.⁶⁹ Protests against the rule of Spain were carried out in small groups, in face-to-face meetings and in relatively private spaces. Yet, the support of the Crown was manifested in the large setting that the pulpit provided for the clergy. While a large amount of written propaganda was published, its reaches were limited to the small literate population, reducing the amount of information available to the masses. Sunday Mass allowed for communication to reach literate and illiterate. Within the confines of the church, all were equal participants of the doctrine. In which nothing could be challenged, and the first and last word rested with the priest delivering the sermon. As Carlos Herrejón Peredo puts it, the audience listened attentively and attempted to retain and appreciate the message. Mass was one of the few activities available outside of labor routine and family life.⁷⁰ The dominant oral tradition facilitated the work of the priests, who preached to what was understood to be a faithful audience. By setting the theme of the sermon in Biblical scripture, the preacher ensured that no open challenges would be made to his doctrine.

Sermons delivered immediately after the insurgency attempted to create a singular relationship among God, King and Patria. By Analyzing various sermons of the period, we will see how they attempted to do so, while advocating for loyalty to King and Spain and condemning the actions of the Insurgents.

⁶⁹ Van Young, *The Other Rebellion*, 311

⁷⁰ Carlos Herrejón Peredo, *Del sermón al Discurso Cívico*, 17

In the sermon given by Dr. Pedro Josef de Mendizábal, a Franciscan and Examiner of the Bishop of Durango, during a mass in honor of the Virgen del Rosario in 1810 Queretaro, a clear call was made to the congregation to rise in arms and defend King Fernando VII and that which according to the church was rightfully his. The sermon opened with a verse from the book of St. Matthew in which the congregation was exhorted to give to the King what belonged to him and to God, what belonged to God.⁷¹ To God belongs the worship of the people, to the King the throne and right to rule. The King represented God on earth, his image was to be venerated and honored as he was chosen to rule the patria. All within the terrestrial kingdom is to be given to Fernando. *"I ask now, each and every one of you. Whose name is it you carry on your ribbons and the rosette of your hat? Whose is the image we have engraved on our medals? It is the image of Fernando, Catholic King of Spain and of the Indies. Then give to Fernando what is his and to God what certainly is his."*⁷² In this instance to be a patriot was to defend the possessions of the King from an internal attack. The preacher did not call for independence from Spain. To the contrary, he urged his Catholic listeners, to fight against the insurgents responsible for what had been considered treason against God and the King.

De Mendizábal used the image of Fernando to remind the listener that all within the terrestrial kingdom of God was guarded by Fernando and as such, his subjects should guard him. De Mendizábal made an open appeal to raise arms in honor of the King,

⁷¹ Caesar's," they replied. Then he said to them, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's. Matthew c.22 v.21

⁷² Mendizabal, Pedro Jose de. *Sermón que en el Tercer día del solemne novenario de Nuestra Señora del Pueblito conducida en secreto a la Iglesia del Seráfico Patriarca San Francisco de Querétaro para implorar su favor en las actuales necesidades*. Newberry Library, Chicago Illinois, 2012(Casa de Arizpe. México, 1810), 2.

which was required of a good Christian. The preacher was cautious to differentiate between those Christians on the side of Spain and those considered to be rebels. A good Christian and vassal of the King writes Mendizábal, cannot follow in the footsteps of Hidalgo. Furthermore, Hidalgo and Morelos are labeled as responsible for the evils that had fallen upon Spain, *“The unfaithful shepherds are the fatal origin of the calamities of my church; they have brought to this chosen vineyard ruin and destruction.”*⁷³

To give to God what belongs to God, the vassal must fight against those that rise against his mandate. *“And can we, Sirs, to explain myself with clarity, can we, I repeat, be true vassals of Fernando and sustain the rights of his throne and give Christian proof if we follow the perverse footprints of the infidel Curates; Dolores, Aldama, Abasolo and their evil henchmen?”*⁷⁴ *No, of course not. The purpose of my prayer is to give to Fernando what is his and unite and fight against Allende and the fatal curate Dolores. To give God what is his, we must take up arms against the insurgents from the Comarca.”*⁷⁵

By labeling the insurgents as “evil” or “*malvadísimos*,” he removed them from the Christian faith, allowing the faithful to rise against them. Dolores and his followers were separated from the priestly and made enemies of the Church, God and of Spain. To give God what belongs to God, weapons must be taken up against them. The position of this sermon is that, a war of faith and religion was being waged. It is just, according to the sermon to fight and punish the insurgents who had violated the law of God. This ideology

⁷³ Letter from the Bishop of Durango: Signed by Pedro de Gamez, José Ignacio Iturribarria, Francisco Fernández Valentin, Pedro Millán Rodrigo, and secretary, Manuel José Pacheco. *Carta Pastoral exhortatoria dirigida a los párrocos y demás ecc[lesiasti]cos. Del obispado de Durango/por el V[enerabl]e. S[eñ]or. Deán y cabildo gobernador sede vacante, en los términos que adentro se expresa.* (Durango Mexico, 1812; The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois)

⁷⁴ He labels them as “*Malvadísimos*” in the original document.

⁷⁵ Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 2

by an eminent leader of the church, clearly contradicts the image of the rebel priest calling for arms against Spain.

Hidalgo the Troublemaker

The laws of God superseded any terrestrial law according to loyalist priests.

Therefore, it was not necessary, according to Mendizábal to consult any man made law to know who was to be obeyed. According to scripture, wrote the Examiner, God had determined who should govern and those who had been chosen to serve, should obey those that had been chosen to rule. The King is King because God determined so, says the sermon. As mentioned earlier, Hidalgo made it clear that he was not rising up against the King or Spain. But like Mendizábal, claimed to be defending that which belonged to the King and had been established by God. Yet, Mendizábal holds Hidalgo and his followers as responsible for the loss of tranquility and peace within the American territory. Clearly there is disagreement amongst church leaders as to where one's loyalty had to be.

Hidalgo and his supporters had a similar view to those that opposed him.

Rebel and loyalist priest believed to be doing what was right for Spain, for the King and all believed they were following God's mandate.⁷⁶ It must be kept in mind that Hidalgo was not calling for a rejection of Church doctrine, which favored Spain and the King, he like many others was making the call for the removal of a bad government in México. The King's property was suffering from misuse, abuse and ran the risk of being lost if not protected. Removing México from the rest of Spain, would protect the patria from fully being taken over by Napoleon, and the bad government that had exploited the territory under guise of Spanish officers. Whose side should they choose, continue to loyally serve the King, even if he was a prisoner and watch his land be lost, or support the rebels, who claimed to be also serving the King, by removing those that had abused the

⁷⁶ Antonio Pompa y Pompa, *Proceso Inquisitorial y Militar Seguidos a D. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla* (Morelia: Colegio de Michoacán, 1984), 131-135.

kings land? One can only imagine the internal patriotic, and religious debate the priests were waging.

Hidalgo was accused of profaning the image of the Virgen de Guadalupe by using the image as a symbol of insurgency. *“I now hear the trumpets with which an arrogant priest in union with three perverse insurgents, forgetting their duty and character, has declared himself General, gives orders to the troops and profanes the Holy image of María de Guadalupe and the August name of Fernando. He is on the path to destroy the union and peace we enjoy.”*⁷⁷ Hidalgo and others viewed the image as a symbol of the “*Patria Americana*” not as a symbol of rebellion against Spain or Fernando. After all, the Virgen was highly venerated by Spanish Americanos.⁷⁸ To side with the rebel movement was treason against the King and by default treason against God, who had placed the King in power.

Yet, Mendizábal and others, claimed that Hidalgo violated God’s mandate and as a result lost authority as priest of the Church. *“Sirs, do not give credit to D. Miguel Hidalgo whom you knew and respected as priest of Dolores in the bishopric of Michoacán. Disregard the haughtiness of lost military leaders, Allende, Abasolo, and Aldama. Do not be seduced by false happiness promised by the wretched sectarians and disciples of the infamous Napoleon.”*⁷⁹ Mendizábal equated Hidalgo and his followers to those following Napoleon in Europe. By doing so, Mendizábal gave continuation to the European war in México. Fighting against Hidalgo was to be fighting against Napoleon. To fight against the aggressor of Spain was a patriotic deed. By comparing Hidalgo to the French leader,

⁷⁷ Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 3.

⁷⁸ David A. Brading, *A Mexican Phoenix: Our Lady of Guadalupe: Image and Tradition Across Five Centuries* (Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press, 2001), 119.

⁷⁹ Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 4

Mendizábal was cautious not to urge a war between compatriots, but rather against a representative of a foreign threat. Here we see two different ideals of the Patria. Hidalgo is not seen as a patriot rebel, but rather as an agent of Napoleon and a foreign power. Mendizábal does appear to acknowledge that the patria extends outside of Spain proper.

Aware of the divisions within the México, Mendizábal attempted to unify the religious population under a single cause. He pointed out that all were the sons of God, and the subjects of the same king, members of the same patria and more importantly, of the same religion. *“Do you Sirs know the meaning of the words Criollo and Gachupin; which I hope will end forever and only pronounce now to speak with clarity. Gachupin means a Spaniard, father, grandfather or uncle of the Criollo that was born on the other side of the highlands and seas; Criollo is also a son of Spaniards, a son, grandson or nephew of the Gachupin that was born on this side of the highlands and seas. But understand, I repeat, that the Indians, since the conquest of Cortes, the Criollos and the Gachupines, besides being the sons of the true Church, are equally, without doubt vassals of Fernando”*⁸⁰ The author of the sermon is attempting to unite a people under a similar history, identity, King and God, for the defense of Spain, the patria, which stretched across the Atlantic. Spaniard, Criollo and Indigenous are all equal vassals in the eyes of the Church and King, regardless of birth.

To Mendizábal the insurgent war was one of religion, to conserve the mandate of God to serve the King. To fight for the patria, the King the motherland, was to fight for God and his established order. It was to give to Caesar what belonged to Caesar and to God what was rightfully his. *“Let us give to God what belongs to God, and let us take up arms against those that perturb our peace, those that infringe on the precepts of the Lord,*

⁸⁰ Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 5

those to whom the Ten have no other object according to the Catechism than to love God above all creatures and each other like we ourselves”⁸¹ To rise against Hidalgo was to demonstrate one’s love for God. In asking his followers to rise in arms, Mendizábal used the Law of Moses to give legitimacy to his request. He urged his listeners to follow the commandments and honor their father and mother as was ordered by God. “*The Fourth commands us to honor our father and mother...it demands respect and honor to the father, grandfather, and great-grandfather and to the Sovereign, the Mother Patria.*”⁸² In his sermon he included the patria and the King, “*El Soberano*”, in God’s mandate. The King was the Father, the mother was Spain, both which were to be honored. The seventh commandment, continues Mendizábal prohibited robbery, which is his eyes, is what the insurgents were committing. “*The Seventh tells us: Thou shall not steal. And who can doubt that theft is been authorized by the insurgents who have given notice in September.*”⁸³ Love for King and patria should be demonstrated on the battlefield when necessary.

⁸¹ Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 7.

⁸² Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 7.

⁸³ Mendizábal, *Sermon Que*, 9.

Catholic Soldier, Patriot Soldier

Mendizábal was by no means alone in his ideas of when and why a good Catholic should fight. In 1815, Fr. Diego Josef de Cádiz, a missionary priest of the Capuchin Franciscan order in Andalucía, Spain wrote an instructional manual to his nephew, D. Antonio Ximenez Caamaño, infantry soldier during the Franco-Spanish war. His instructions were directed to a specific person, his nephew, and not a wide audience like the sermons. Nonetheless, the manual provides evidence that in Spain, like in the Americas, there was a concern for the defense of the patria in the religious orders. In it, Cádiz outlined the duties of a Catholic in a time of war. They agreed with what Mendizábal wrote in his sermon five years earlier. According to Cádiz, defending the patria and King, were valid reasons in the eyes of God for war. Attacking the Catholic patria was a direct attack on God and must be defended.

Cádiz used the example of the Maccabees, martyrs for their patria, as a model for Christians everywhere. *“All faithful Catholics are obligated to maintain the truth of their religion, of his faith and against all enemies. And to give his life to defend it when necessary, like the Holy Matthias and his sons the Maccabees...”*⁸⁴ Cádiz and Mendizábal agreed that the issues affecting Spain were a religious matter, that had to be resolved with the sword. The sword wrote Cádiz, must be mastered by the Catholic soldier. As it is the instrument that God had provided his people to make justice upon those that traverse his mandates. *“The Military sword is an instrument of God, and legitimate human authorities should use it to exterminate the boisterous and wash with*

⁸⁴ P. Fr. Diego Josef de Cádiz. *El Soldado Católico, en Guerra de Religión. Carta Instructiva, en la que se propone a un soldado católico la necesidad de prepararse, el modo con que lo ha de hacer, y con que debe manejarse en la actual Guerra contra el impío partido de la infiel, sediciosa y regicida asamblea de la Francia.* (Córdoba, Spain, 1815): (Newberry Library, Chicago, Ill, 2012), 8.

blood that abominable stain.”⁸⁵ The insurgent leaders were also Catholic soldiers like their political opponents. Both believed to be the righteous patriot following God’s mandate.

Cádiz, in his letter made an appeal to the civic and patriotic duty of the Spaniard. To fight for the mandate of God and the established order, which included fighting for the King and Spanish institutions, was to be a patriot. The patria, says Cádiz, was all that encompassed the law and religion of a given territory. Furthermore, a good Catholic had the civic duty to obey his King, to protect him and his territory. The letter of Cadiz serves as an example that there was a clear exchange of ideas flowing between Spain and Mexico.

⁸⁵ Cádiz, *El Soldado*, 33

Honor Your Father and Your Mother

According to some of the sermons of the period, the wars were a punishment by God upon Spain.⁸⁶ Like a good father who had to punish the disobedient son, God had decided to punish Spain for failing to adhere to the divine law. The sermon written by Agustín Negrete and Francisco Pascual al Roldan, read in August of 1808 by Fr. Pedro Cortina, given in gratitude of the defeat of Napoleon's army by Spanish forces, the church is reminded that a loving father not only punishes, but tests his children. *"A Loving father not only punishes his beloved son, but through the most difficult of tests wants to let the world know that he loves him. Whether it be because he wanted to punish the excesses of his beloved Spain in which we mercifully believe. Or because he wanted to prove its fidelity and make clear in all orbit, that even if his demeanor is most severe, his grace will remain pure and without blemish in his faith. He has determined to rescue his treasure to his compassion when he believed it convenient."*⁸⁷ The authors of this sermon would be in agreement with Mendizábal and Cádiz that the war in Europe and México was a war of religion, in which God was testing Spain and would aid her as long as the people follow the divine word of God.

⁸⁶ The sermon by Fr. José Jimeno, given in Queretaro and printed in Mexico City, gives various reasons why it was believed that God was punishing the nation. Included in his reasoning are disobedience to the word of God and disloyalty to the King. The rebellion, he maintained was caused by those who ignored Holy Scripture, and had to be punished by war. Also, Don Agustin Lopez Negrete and Don Francisco Pascual al Roldan, in their sermon given in Durango in 1809, cite the invasion of Spain by Napoleon as punishment by God to his children who have disobeyed divine law.

⁸⁷ Negrete, Agustin, y Pascual, al Roldan, Francisco. *Relación Sucinta delas Demostraciones con que la Nobilísima ciudad de Durango explico su jubilo por las plausibles noticias de haberse alarmado la España antigua, oponiéndose a la dominación de los Franceses, y conseguido la derrota de sus tropas.*- Incluido, *Sermón que en la Iglesia de Religiosos Franciscanos de la ciudad de Durango capital de la nueva Vizcaya, predico en día 14 de agosto de 1808. A solicitud de los fidelísimos Dependientes del comercio de la misma Ciudad el R.P. Fr. Pedro Cortina, primer Lector de Sagrada Teología en el expresado Convento, en acción de gracias por la felicidad de las armas españolas contra los exercitos franceses.* (México, 1809): (The Newberry Library, Chicago, Ill, 2012), 6.

David. A. Brading wrote that, by the seventeenth century many within Criollo society searched for answers regarding their less than glorious position in Spanish society. Many found the answer in the writings of Bernal Diaz del Castillo, the early chronicler of the conquest.⁸⁸ The cruelty and destruction of the conquistadores was being punished with poverty and misery of their descendants. Mexico was a patria built upon a foundation of destruction, creating a nation lacking in morals and faith. By the outbreak of the war of independence, the sentiment of guilt and remorse, would once again rise as an explanation for the chaos.⁸⁹

Lopez Negrete and al Roldan, appealed to Napoleon and warned him that because of his treatment of Spain, he would be punished. God, warns the sermon, will raise a leader like Moses that will liberate his people. *“He knows how to form from time to time caudillos like Moses; that liberate his people from tyranny and oppression: He knows how to rescue from the destruction of the wild the Matthias that will fight for the law and the patria. We humbly receive the punishment that our sins deserve; but you, infamous, shall not escape the power of his almighty hands. No, you shall not go without punishment”*⁹⁰ Perhaps as church father that he was, Miguel Hidalgo viewed himself as the liberator Moses, or perhaps in the eyes of his Catholic followers he was the representation of freedom. Perhaps to some Criollos, Miguel Hidalgo was the “anti-Moses” and liberator mentioned by Negrete and al Roldan. Both, pro and anti insurgent

⁸⁸ David. A. Brading, *Los Origenes del Nacionalismo Mexicano*. (Mexico, D.F, Secretaria de Educacion Publica, 1973), 17.

⁸⁹ The writings of the time, did not necessarily condemned the conquest. Publication of the period were characterized for a deep nostalgic view of the heroic deeds of the conquistadores, both military and spiritual. The criollo of the early 19th century, much like their earlier brothers, were conflicted about their two patrias, the Spanish and the American and sought to reconcile both into one.

⁹⁰ Lopez Negrete, and al Roldan, *Relacion Sucinta*, 15

sides were deeply religious and their actions were based on the same faith structure. It would not be surprising if both used the same teachings to accomplish the opposite goal.

The sermon by Lopez Negrete and al Roldan, read in the city of Durango, resembled the ideology among the Peninsulares; who were referred to Spain as their patria and condemned Napoleon for his actions. There was no distinction between Spaniards and Americanos, both viewed themselves as children of the mother land Spain, the loved patria. Interesting to note that one year before Mendizábal's sermon in which he urged, Criollos, Gachupines and Indios, to fight against the insurgents, the same message was delivered by Negrete and al Roldan against Napoleon. The French war and the one that would eventually be labeled war of independence, to the clergy, appeared to be the same battle. The Mexican war was simply a continuation of the European. In the two wars, religion was at the center, both required sacrifices by the sons for the patria. "*Our beloved brothers, the inhabitants of the old Spain gladly spill their blood to liberate you: and us, since we cannot do the same because of the immense space that separates us, will raise our hands to the heavens, and soaked in tears will implore Divine Clemency, so that the chains that oppress you be broken and for the restitution to your patria and throne. Oh of me! Who will grant me to see you free of such cruel captivity? Who will grant my beloved patria the joy of your presence?*"⁹¹ Similar messages being delivered on opposite coasts of the Atlantic cannot be purely coincidental. There was an established doctrine of loyalty and patriotism being echoed on both sides.

Miguel Hidalgo in 1810, two years after Negrete and al Roldan's sermon was read in Durango and just one year after it was published in México, would echo some of the

⁹¹ Lopez Negrete, and al Roldan, *Relacion Sucinta*, 18-19.

same sentiments. “*Among us, let there be no other voices than Long Live Fernando VII: Long Live the Patria and our Religion,*” was read in the city of Durango, in reference to war against France.⁹² Hidalgo would express “Long Live Religion, Long Live Fernando” but to some clerics, the enemy was now within the patria. The enemy had penetrated the Spanish and Catholic institutions in the form of disobedient subjects of Spain. Miguel Hidalgo’s insurgency was against the enemy within, “the bad government” that was embodied by the powerful corrupt Gachupines.

José Maria Hidalgo y Badillo, secular priest, a graduate of the Universidad de Guadalajara, founded in 1792 to meet the demand for education after the expulsion of the Jesuit order. He went on to become its sixth Rector and a member of the Junta Consultiva y Auxiliar de Gobierno de la Sociedad Patriótica de Guadalajara. Delivered a sermon on August 29th, 1811, in which a comparison, much like López Negrete and al Roldan had done two years prior. Given in commemoration of the discovery of a plot against the viceroy of New Spain at the hands of the insurgents. The war in Spain, claimed Hidalgo y Badillo, like Mendizábal did before him, was announced and determined by God. The call made by God to the Jewish people in past times, according to the sermon was the prophecy now being manifested in México in the form of insurrection. The Jewish prophecy was the prefiguration of the new patria in México, according to the cleric. “*The lion has come out of his cave, the thief of nations has risen to turn our land to desert. Our cities will be isolated, and on that day that the hearts of King and of Princes’, faint, the priests will be stunned and the prophets will be in dismay. Does this not sound like our*

⁹² Lopez Negrete, and al Roldan, *Relacion Sucinta*, 19-20.

current history, instead of prophecy directed to Jerusalem?”⁹³ Here, Miguel Hidalgo is the lion that ravages the patria and aims to destroy it.

The ties between México and Spain were greater than its divisions. México continued to be part of Spain and many criollos continued to see themselves as patriots of both regions. México, was in the eyes of many a Spanish province that had been neglected, but like Granada or Sevilla was equally Spanish. Despite the turmoil that was brewing, the clerics continued to advocate for loyalty to the King and motherland. The Spanish-Franco war had a deep impact on the psyche of the church that was like the rest of the population attempting to establish and reassure their loyalty to Spain. After all, to be Catholic was to be Spanish. King Fernando, although absent, continued to be leader and father of Spain and as such deserved all the loyalty from the Catholic leaders, who continued to accept the King as God’s chosen leader. He was the direct representation of God on land. The Bible of course served to support this ideology and facilitated the church’s ability to instruct its parishioners as to where their loyalty should be. Dr. Joseph Mariano Beristáin, de Souza, a secular priest, scholar, writer and Archdeacon of the Metropolitan Church in México, anticipating the chaos that was to come, delivered a sermon advocating for Spanish loyalty in 1809.⁹⁴

Honor the father and the mother was the message of Beristáin de Souza. His sermon was pronounced in Mexico City in 1809, during the festivities of Carnival. The Cleric started by posing questions to his listeners and answering them, *“Do you know who our Father is? The King of Spain! And our Mother? The generous and unbeaten Catholic*

⁹³ Hidalgo y Badillo, *Sermón Eucarístico*, 4

⁹⁴Beristáin de Souza, Dr. Joseph Mariano. *Discurso Político-Moral y Cristiano, Que en los Solemnes Cultos que Rinde Al Santísimo Sacramento en los días del carnaval.*(México: 1809): The Newberry Library, Chicago Illinois, 2012),

Spanish Nation!”⁹⁵ Not only was the cleric equating the nation to the mother, he makes sure to point out that Spain was a Catholic nation, and as Spaniards, they had to maintain loyalty to her. The father unquestionably is Fernando, King of Spain. Miguel Hidalgo, a year later echoed a similar sentiment in his expression of “Long Live King Fernando.” To Beristáin de Souza the Spain should be honored by a state that three hundred years later remained indebted to her, according to the cleric. De Souza preached that, “*The Kings of Spain pulled you from a life of nothing. From the darkness to the light. From ignorance to the knowledge of the Sciences, From misery to happiness. From poverty to abundance. From rudeness to the costumes of delicacy and refinement, and a rational life*”⁹⁶ Spain is the motherland to which México is indebted to, and as descendants of Spaniards, the loyalty of Criollo, Gachupin and Indio had to be with her. The sermon provided evidence to what has been stated earlier, that to many criollos, México continued to be seen as part of Spain. They had been conquered by Spain and as such, their patriotic duty was to her.

Not only was México part of Spain, it was more Spanish than it was Mexican, according to Beristáin de Souza. This of course would relate back to the previous discussion of where ones patria was. The cleric made it clear, that although of Mexican birth they continued to be Spanish. The distance did not separate the two. The church served as the connector between American and European. All provinces remained equally Spanish according to the cleric, distance should not be a factor, nor should it impede loyalty. “*You are Mexican: But you do not stop being Spaniards. Was not the Andalusian born in Andalucía and the Vizcaine in Vizcaya and in Castilla the Castilian and in Aragon the Aragonian? But who is their Mother? Is it not Spain? And could it be a*

⁹⁵ Beristáin de Souza, *Discurso Político-Moral*, 5

⁹⁶ Beristáin de Souza, *Discurso Político-Moral*, 8.

*different one that of the Limeño or the Mexican? No: Because they are all provinces of Spain, more or less separated each from the other”*⁹⁷

The thematic thread in most of the sermons was loyalty to Spain and King. Relying on Biblical scripture, clerics made an argument for loyalty and unity. Whether the clerics were personally in agreement with the official policy of the Church can be questioned. Evidence suggests that clerics were not all in disagreement with the rebel movement and the likes of Miguel Hidalgo and others. One can speculate that their sermons were however structured around official Church policy, which remained pro-Spain. The Catholic Church was interested in maintaining a united patria. As long as Spain held its power, the Church would remain the dominant civic force of the various Spanish regions. The actions of Miguel Hidalgo and his followers had the potential to open the doors to foreign powers that would destroy what in the eyes of the clergy God had given to Spain. All which had been conquered in the name of God, would fall into the hands of outsiders.

Miguel Hidalgo in his rebellion did not have the interest of México or Spain argued loyalist priests. Greed and personal gain was what drove his rebellion, cautioned the Archbishop of México Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont in a sermon read in 1810.⁹⁸ The Archbishop warned the population about Hidalgo’s imminent defeat. *“That Diotrephes⁹⁹ who has taken from their homes those of San Miguel and Dolores, does not seek their fortune or ours, but his own. The day least expected he will be defeated by a spirit worse and stronger than himself who will gain your trust with more flattering*

⁹⁷ Beristaín de Souza, 15-16.

⁹⁸ Printed in México in 1810 in the office of Don Mariano de Zuñiga y Ontiveros. It is unknown the exact date in which it was read or printed.

⁹⁹ Diotrephes is mentioned in the Bible, *“I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loved to have the preeminence among them, received us not.”* 3 John 1:9. It refers to an individual who is proud, rebellious and disrespectful of Apostolic authority.

promises”¹⁰⁰ Once Hidalgo was defeated, cautioned the cleric, the population must not fall into the traps of others, but must remain loyal to the Catholic ways and behave in the manner of a civil man, as instructed in the Bible. The sermon highlighted what was expected of the civil, patriotic man. The Church was not only taking the position of religious leader, it believed itself to be a monitor and guide of civic duty and behavior. “*The good citizen should not know any other than the religion that honors him and the reason that instructs him: The good Christian, who prefers above all the law of the Redeemer, must comply with the duties of the civil man, but must also look upon his neighbor with love as God mandates.*”¹⁰¹ Those that did not follow the instructions of God failed to comply with their civic duty and contributed to the destruction of the kingdom.

Interesting about the sermon by Lizana y Beaumont is that unlike others, it was labeled as a “*carta de exhortación.*”¹⁰² It provided guidelines to be followed by a Spanish patriot, which also meant to be a Spanish Catholic. Ignoring the will of God, cautioned the Archbishop, would divide the kingdom, and make it easy prey for a foreign power. The fear of the Clergy was then not only that México would fall from Spain. But that it would fall to become a non-Catholic power. “*The kingdom will be divided and it will be desolated. It will finally be prey to some stranger, not Gachupín or Criollo, but of dark and dubious birth that does not recognize God or his neighbor. One who governs himself only by the ideas of politics and of unlimited ambition*”¹⁰³ If Spain remained in

¹⁰⁰ D. Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont, “*Exhortacion del Exmo. Illmo. Sr. Don Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont A sus fieles habitantes de este Reyno.*” (Oficina de Don Mariano de Zuñiga y Ontiveros. México, 1810): The Newberry Library, Special Collections, Chicago, Ill. 2012), 5

¹⁰¹ D. Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont, *Exhortacion*, 4.

¹⁰² *Sermones de Exhortación* aimed to persuade the listener to take a particular stance on an issue. See *Del Sermón al Discurso Cívico* by Carlos Herrejón Peredo.

¹⁰³ D. Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont, *Exhortacion*, 5.

power, so would the Church. It was in the best interest of the Catholic Church that México remained Spanish. The Church saw it as a threat to their position if México became independent. The clerical stance was to limit the opportunity of a foreign power, and more importantly of a different religion, Protestantism in particular from taking hold in the colony.

There certainly appears to have existed a sense of anxiety within the ranks of some clerics Mexico and Spain would take the same turn as France. The Napoleonic war was seen as an example of the possible outcome of the insurgent war. The Archbishop of Mexico, D. Francisco Xavier de Lizana, born and educated in Spain, exhorted the faithful and *“the rest of inhabitants of this Kingdom”* to follow the word of God, the Church and King. Should evidence be needed as to the possible future of Mexico, they had but to look at France. *“Don’t you see this verified in the French Revolution? A few have been praised: All others have died, up to two million men, or have been left in the same indigence and class in which they were, or are worse. The same will happen to you, you will work to strengthen the most intrepid; but will remain defrauded. The best government of each country is the one they currently have.”*¹⁰⁴ The most “intrepid” of whom the preacher speaks of, one can assume is Napoleon which he appears to compare to any leader in Mexico, like Miguel Hidalgo.

To the Church, the biggest foreign threat was seen in France. They were responsible for the demise of the King of Spain. To the church fathers, Napoleon was an agent of the devil, who could not be trusted and had to be defeated, as mentioned in the sermon by Jose Maria Hidalgo y Badillo. As others before and after him, he maintained that to defend ones religion was to defend the patria. The patria, he maintained, belonged to God

¹⁰⁴ D. Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont, *Exhortacion*, 6.

and as such it was up to the sons of God to protect it. To the ecclesiastic, patria and religion were dependent of each other. Both, along with the King, represented a terrestrial trinity. José María Hidalgo y Badillo in his sermon given in Guadalajara in 1811, made a call to arms in defense of the God, the mother land and the terrestrial father, King Fernando, *“Suenan todos la trompeta guerrera, y se reúnen para defender la tierra y los montes en que os habéis dignado habitar, para librar la patria y purificarla de los excesos y abominaciones con que esos desnaturalizados hijos han pretendido amancilla.”*¹⁰⁵

The sermon, like others implied that the war was a religious war validated by biblical scripture and church doctrine. However, unlike other clerics, José María Hidalgo y Badillo, specified that indeed, in his view it was not a war of religion. *“When I say, Sirs, that Religion calls upon us to take up arms to repel the aggression of our own compatriots, I do not mean that the current war is a war of Religion. Nor do they aim to remove us from this Divine deposit, nor do they attack some of the articles of our beliefs”*¹⁰⁶ This contradicts earlier assertions in the same sermon in which the cleric made it clear that God was a God of war, calling on his followers to take up arms in his name. *“The religion that makes us look upon strangers as sons of God, is the same that places in our hands weapons when we must restrain their haughtiness and condemn their ambition”*¹⁰⁷ The contradictions in the sermon are indicative of the greater issue that the church was facing. Within the institution itself it was unclear what position should be taken. Yes, the Church hierarchy supported Spain and favored a war against the insurgency. The sermon by Hidalgo y Badillo was a reflection of the position of many

¹⁰⁵ Hidalgo y Badillo, *Sermón Eucarístico*, 9.

¹⁰⁶ Hidalgo y Badillo, *Sermon Eucarístico*, 38-39.

¹⁰⁷ Hidalgo y Badillo, *Sermon Eucarístico*, 18.

Méxican born clerics. Unlike the upper Church leaders, the average cleric had little to no connection with Spain. They were Mexican born, to Mexican families. Most had been educated in Mexico. Their lives, friends, family and loyalty was Mexican. Yet, they were caught between their loyalty to their Spanish patria and the loyalty to the Church. Miguel Hidalgo and Jose Maria Morelos, in their rebellion, were also as patriotic, by defending and liberating their Mexican patria, they helped protect the interests of their Spanish patria.

José María Hidalgo y Badillo, in his difficult position as church leader, attempted to separate religion from political issues. Even after having made several calls to arms in defense of Spain and God, based on biblical scripture, he attempted to separate the two at the end of the sermon. To him, those that were fighting for Spain were patriots, as were those in the insurgency. Both sides were Catholic and both Spanish patriots. The war, he implied at the end of the sermon was a political war, between patriots, not an attack on Catholicism, a contradiction to his earlier messages of religious war. His difficult position gives some indication as to the unsure and uneasy position some clerics appeared to be under.

Not only were the Clerics in the difficult position of taking sides. They faced the difficult task of explaining to their congregations why such events were happening. The idea of prefiguration mentioned earlier gave them one method of explaining it. Everything was simply a fulfillment of God's word. It was the sign of the bad time that the Bible had warned about. The Clerics in their interpretation of the war took a millenarianistic approach. While some took the position that the war was the fulfillment of Gods word as written in the Bible. Others, like Lopéz Negrete and Pascual al Roldan

held the position that it was a test by God upon the people's faith. In 1811, an apparition of the Virgen de Los Remedios served, according to the cleric, as evidence that God was with his people and had not abandoned them in the difficult times. Because the people, according to Don Juan Bautista Díaz de Calvillo cleric of the Cathedral of Guadalajara had maintained the faith. The Virgen appeared to reveal to the faithful that God had not abandoned them. *"Countless were the fasting's, the corporal mortifications and other acts of virtue that were exercised; which could not defeat the irate justice of God who appeared to be determined to end with the inhabitants of Mexico as punishment for our great sins. Using as such the insurrection then lead by Hidalgo and his wretched partners."*¹⁰⁸ The sacrifice of prayer and faith had been rewarded with the apparition. More so would be the reward for those that remained loyal to Spain and Catholicism. The sermon and apparition was a message of loyalty and patriotism. It was an invocation to reject all temptations made by the insurrection.

Through the sermon of Díaz Calvillo, the recurring theme of linking Napoleon to Miguel Hidalgo is once again present. To the preacher, Miguel Hidalgo was an agent of Napoleon and like others makes the connection between the two wars. The Mexican clerics refused to accept that a fellow Spaniard would commit treason against Spain and Catholicism. They sought to explain the behavior of Hidalgo, Morelos and their followers outside of the Spanish territory. Díaz Calvillo accused Hidalgo of having met with a French representative by the name of D'Alvimar, who in his passing through the town of Dolores maintained meetings with the rebel priest. *"He maintained long conferences with*

¹⁰⁸ P. Dr. Don Juan Bautista Díaz Calvillo, *Sermón que en el Aniversario Solemne de Gracias a Maria Santisima de los Remedios, celebrado en esta Santa Iglesia Catedral el dia 30 de Octubre de 1811 por la victoria del Monte de las Cruces*. The Newberry Library. Chicago, Illinois, 2012. (Imprenta Arizpe, Mexico, 1811), 87.

Br. D. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, parish priest of that location. Man of arrogant character, possessed by the abominable vice of luxury, accused since 1800 to the Holy Tribunal of Faith because of various errors in Lutheranism, Judaism, and materialism amongst others”¹⁰⁹ Hidalgo is also accused of maintaining ties to the Lutheran movement and of embracing Judaic beliefs. No doubt, changes in the European church worried the Spanish and Mexican Catholic Church. This would also relate to the fear of the Catholic church of losing power to another religion.

The sentiment expressed by Díaz Calvillo in 1811 would reappear in a sermon by Fr. José Ximeno, a Dominican and lector of the college of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas in 1813. To Ximeno, the insurrection was the result of liberal thinking that arrived in Mexico from France. He warned the audience that it was not only necessary to resist liberal ideas, but that they had to be actively involved in exterminating them. The war that involved Mexico was both a test on the people and a punishment. Clearly the Church was well aware of the progressive ideas of Hobbes, Rousseau, Voltaire and others. Ximeno cautioned the people not to be swayed by false ideas. The law of God superseded all new laws and any ideas that called for the removal of the King.

*“Libertines, skeptics, freemasons and false prophets, Hobbes, Espininosas’ Rousseaus’ and Voltaires’. Ungodly, study and learn from nature and make the necessary connections, the powerful influence of religion and true virtue with the happiness and fortune of that society all which was recognized by the origin of the true religion, and the compliance with holy law and just nature.”*¹¹⁰ The war fought by the Catholic Church

¹⁰⁹ Don Juan Bautista Diaz Calvillo, *Sermón que en el*, 107.

¹¹⁰ Fr. José Ximeno, *La Verdadera Felicidad, La Libertad e Independencia de las naciones. Motivos porque Dios las castiga, y medio para que cesen las presentes degracias*. The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois. (Casa de Arizpe, Mexico, 1813.), 21.

was being waged on several fronts, not limited to the military. It was war against changing political ideology, cultural evolutions and varying degrees of patriotism and identity.

Ximeno and Díaz Calvillo both searched for answers to the rebellion outside of México. They both agreed that France was the likely suspect. Ximeno viewed the rebellion as inspired by France, as an attempt to introduce ideas contrary to the mandate of God. Not only was he labeling them as political enemies, he made the distinction of marking the rebels as enemies of God, the King, the Church and the Pope. *“Libertines, ungodly false prophets, freemasons, wicked iniquitous Machiavellics, feigned politicians, enemies of the rights of the throne, of the Church and of the Pope, in vain you fatigue yourselves in wanting to set foot and introduce your poison and misguided motto upon the Catholic Spain, in the Catholic America.”*¹¹¹ Labeling the insurgents as enemies of God, the Church and the Pope carried a strong message to the congregation, their entire belief system was under attack. The rhetoric of the sermons implied a religious war. The Catholic Church treats the war and the possible influence of liberal ideas as a direct threat to their institution and to their power and as anti-patriotic.

Yet, José María Hidalgo y Badillo, cautioned against mistaking the rebellion as a religious war two years earlier.¹¹² In the same sermon in 1811, Hidalgo y Badillo made it clear that a good Christian must enlist under the standards of the patria to defend her. Not only did he validate going to war, he legitimized killing in battle as a Christian duty. *“Not only is it time to spill the spirit of devotion before the God of Peace, but also to continue between the corpses and follow the God of war. Honor dictates it and our conscious*

¹¹¹ Fr. José Ximeno, *La Verdadera Felicidad*, 32.

¹¹² See, Hidalgo y Badillo, *Sermon Eucaristico*, 38-39.

*demands it. The unchanging truth of natural law and venerable holiness of our religion authorize us to repel the unjust aggression with a just defense*¹¹³ Official Church policy supported Spain and the King. They rejected Miguel Hidalgo and the rebellion. Yet, various sermons have shown that there indeed was confusion and division within the ranks of the clerics.

In 1812, a year before he cautioned about the liberal thinking of France. José Ximeno warned the public about the evils of rebellion. In the earlier sermon he ignored French influence and held Miguel Hidalgo responsible for the insurrection. He condemned the rebellion for violating the law of God and King. But also, he directly condemned the rebellion for violating Church law. “*We continue to see the scandal and outrage caused by the insurgents upon religion, publically disregarding the authority of the Church and of its Bishop, specially in the tribunal of Faith.*”¹¹⁴ The Church was clearly concerned about losing power if the rebellion proved successful. It was in their best interest to ensure that their laws were followed. If Church laws were upheld, they gave the institution a place of power even during the revolt. Furthermore, the Cleric made the point that as representatives of God, they, the clerics, held a position of power that had to be acknowledged, “*He who listens to the shepherds and prelates of the church, listens to God; he who disregards them, disregards God.*”¹¹⁵ The Church is asserting its position, as a moral and political authority within the population that cannot be ignored even in the time of chaos.

¹¹³ Hidalgo Y Badillo, *Sermon Eucaristico*, 30.

¹¹⁴ Fr. José Ximeno, *La Fe, La Religión, La Iglesia. La Real Potestad, La América, Las Costumbres, y La Moral Cristiana Ultrajadas por la Milicia de Insurrección y de los Insurgentes*. The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois. (Imprenta de Doña Maria Fernandez de Jáuregui, Mexico, 1812), 16

¹¹⁵ José Ximeno, *La Fe, La Religion*, 17.

As moral authority of the population, the Catholic Church positioned itself to be an integral part of the Spanish nation. Ximeno's argument that the Church was the patria, as the patria was the Church, coincided with the point of view of past clerics. By 1812 when Ximeno's sermon was delivered the notion of the Church as a civic leader had not changed within the perspective of the leading clerics. *"The American nation is clearly on the party of the King. Which his made up of his Excellency the Virrey, of the Audiencias and the illustrious Bishops and inquisitors of the vey illustrious ecclesiastic Cabildos and seculars; of the venerable body of curates and priests."*¹¹⁶ Only those approved by the Church and the legal standards of Spain, were accepted as part of the moral and legal nation. All others writes Ximeno, *"The others, the insurgents, in all law and truth are nothing more than group or groups of confused people without law, without King and without authority; and as such, the war they promote is unjust."*¹¹⁷

Lopez Negrete and al Roldan, in their 1809 sermon, took the position that the war was punishment by God upon his children.¹¹⁸ The message of that sermon, in response to the war between Spain and France would repeat itself four years later in México. The repeating theme in the sermons from 1808 until the later stages of the war of independence was consistently the call for unity and loyalty. Sermons served the dual purpose of filling the religious need of the country and attempting to establish the authority of the Church as the civic leader of the people. By 1813, the war of independence was in full scale in México. As is the case in most armed conflicts, the

¹¹⁶ José Ximeno, *La Fe, La Religion*, 45.

¹¹⁷ Jose Ximeno, *La Fe, La Religion*, 46.

¹¹⁸ See sermon *Relación Sucinta delas Demostraciones con que la Nobilísima ciudad de Durango*, by Agustín Negrete and Francisco Pascual al Roldan.

population begun to experience the sufferings of war and searched for answers within the Church.

To restore peace and prosperity, the good Christian Spaniard had to endure the test and suffering that God had chosen for the people. To suffer for the patria and religion was the duty of a good Christian Spaniard. To which Bringas y Encinas responded by stating, *“I will willingly suffer the label of insolent, the hardest of censorships, the most demeaning satires, as long as my last breaths are faithfully consecrated on the altar of truth. In reward of public health and of the true interest, not only of the Americans, whose country is mine, as it is my native land, but of anyone who has the luck of setting foot on the most critical and dreadful of circumstances.”*¹¹⁹ The words read by Fr. Diego Miguel Bringas y Encinas in Queretaro in 1813, attempted to show himself as a willing victim for the good of the patria in order to restore order. The Mexican people should embrace that same position, they should endure the test of God and endure all which is placed before them, as the cleric has. The preacher, admitted in his sermon to be an American, born in México which he calls *“my country,”* yet his loyalty is to the Church and Spain. Bringas y Encinas appears to see México as part of Spain still in 1813.

Bringas y Encinas, like most Church leaders, was well aware of the political impact of the revolution. Perhaps more so, his concern was for the position the Church would take under a new government if México obtained its independence. As the title of the sermon makes clear, it was a political and civic discourse. The documents and sermons so far

¹¹⁹ Fr. Diego Miguel Bringas y Encinas, *Sermón Político Moral, que para dar principio a la misión extraordinaria. Formada de venerables sacerdotes de ambos cleros, dirigida a la Concordia y unión de los habitantes de esta América, y establecimiento de la paz, predicen la plaza de Santo Domingo de México el 17 de enero de 1813, y repito de muchos sujetos celosos del bien publicó en la iglesia de nuestra señora de la Merced de la misma ciudad el 24 del propio mes, con asistencia del Exmo. Sr. virey, nobilísima ciudad &c.* The Newberry Library, Chicago Illinois. (Mexico, 183), 14.

analyzed, have included in them a substantial amount of political instructions, embedded within the religious discourse. The Clerics understood that their own political future was at stake. For the first years of the war, they sided and advocated for the side they best knew and understood, Spain. That would change as the war evolved. The part of Spain that they considered México to be, the Church would be judged by the rest of Spain and the world according to their alliance. Those who sided with the mother Spain and the father King would gain the graces of not only God, but of the universal Church.

The duty of all Christians was to fight for the patria. Bringas y Encinas by 1813, held the same position that José Maria Hidalgo y Badillo in 1811. When he made the call to defend the patria as was expected of the religious man. “*Listen to the cry of truth, that I, the chosen authority intent to manifest to you; first, what the Patria demands of you, and second, what religion expects of your fidelity*”¹²⁰ Bringas y Encinas two years later would demonstrate that the Church was evolving at a slower pace than the rest of the population. As the revolution grew, more people aligned with the insurgent forces. Yet, the Church continued to not only support Spain, but it enthusiastically advocated for rising up against the rebels. Within the confines of the churches, parishioners were actively encouraged to take up arms against the insurgency.

Those that sacrificed and fought for the patria, will be the example to follow in the American territory, preached Bringas y Encinas. His message unlike many of the other clerics, is aimed towards the soldier actively participating in battle. He directs his words to the military and reinforces the idea of where their loyalty should lie. “*So you brave military, loyal soldiers, honor the unfading crown of the American nation, of which you*

¹²⁰ Hidalgo y Badillo, *Sermón Eucarístico*, 16.

form a large part, you have sacrificed to reason, justice and truth as much as a man can in this lifetime. Without forgiveness on the battlefield, not even for your own brothers of the womb. And when you have not lost the battle, return from the field of Mars, with the most brilliant evidence of your valor, heroics, fidelity and religion. Covered in glorious injuries to become the most dignified of the benefits of the sovereign. The envy of the good and the respected of men: immortals that will excite the astonishment of posterity”¹²¹

The language used by Bringas y Encinas is particularly interesting, he advocates a full war against all those that oppose the patria. The cleric calls for no forgiveness between enemies even if blood brothers, “*brothers of the womb.*” Fidelity to the religion was as important as loyalty to the patria. This again followed the concept of tying patria and religion into one entity. Yet, unlike other clerics of the time, Bringas y Encinas, dwells deeper into the political grounds than others had done. His sermon, although religious in nature was heavily reliant on political rhetoric. He, like many other of his time, was walking that fine line between following official church doctrine and taking a personal stance on the issues. He condemns the revolt and gives various reasons why loyalty should be to Spain. His argument appears to be grounded in politics more than religion.

It is difficult to fully understand where clerics like Bringas y Encinas stood with regard to the religious and political issues. He called for unity by all Americans in favor of Spain, and dismissed as traitors all those that rose against her. It is of interest to note that he does give a hint of support for the indigenous population if they were to revolt against Spain. He posed a question to the congregation, as to what would be the purpose

¹²¹ Bringas y Encinas, *Sermon Politico Moral*, 21.

of forming an independent government and removing who was in his view the legitimate ruler. “*What would it be? To form an independent government? Great project! Depose the legitimate owner of his jewel and then lose it surely by the same means, which intends to conserve and trample all natural sentiments and the most stretched connections. It is an irrational deed contrary to justice and politics.*”¹²² In answering his own question, he responded, “*Tolerable would be that such reason be given by the Indians; but the insurgents, in what would that favor them?*”¹²³ In the interpretation of the sermon, we can conclude that the argument was made that the Criollo population really had no reason to revolt, according to the author. Yet, he implied that the Indigenous population does have a reason. In the argument of whom the land rightfully belonged, the King and Spain or the colonizing Gachupin and Criollo, Bringas y Encinas contradicts the understood knowledge. His validation of an indigenous revolt, removes the King and Spain as legitimate owners. In doing so, can it then still be argued that México was a Spanish patria?

¹²² Bringas y Encinas, *Sermon Politico Moral*, 23-24.

¹²³ Bringas y Encinas, *Sermon Politico Moral*, 26.

In defense of American Independence

Patriotic sentiment in México in pre-revolutionary times condemned the conquest of the New World. Patriot Criollos embraced the indigenous past of the land the Virgen of Guadalupe as a symbol Mexican patriotism. The clerical hierarchy, as has been shown, maintained a pro Spanish doctrine, liberal ideas penetrating from Europe. As the ideology of the population evolved, had the Church's. The sermons here shown have demonstrated that loyalty for King and Spain was at the core of doctrine during the war. The Clerics, where not only taking sides during the war, they were siding with the position that had given them power. Once the society was restructured and the Spanish institutions removed, once again the Church had to make a decision that best benefited their institution, and best allowed them to again be part of the fabric of the new Mexican society. It is no surprised then, that a member of the clergy, advocating loyalty to the new nation, and condemning the past actions of Spain, published a letter in post war Mexico. The condemnation of the conquest was not new, nor was it the first time such letter was published. Such rejections had been made before the war, during the creation of Mexican patriotism. What the letter does show is the changing tides of the time and the realignment of ideology within the Church following independence.

Manuel de la Barcena, a Franciscan priest born in Santander Spain and educated in México, opposed the insurgency in the initial stages, but who later agreed with the Plan de Iguala¹²⁴, wrote in 1821 about what he considered to be binding oaths and to who the loyalty should be. No Mexican was obliged to be loyal to Spain or King as most had

¹²⁴ The Plan de Iguala or the Plan of the "Three Guarantees" was signed on February 24th 1821 in the city of Iguala in the modern state of Guerrero. The three guarantees included in the plan were, Catholicism as the official religion, the proclamation of Mexico's independence and social equality for all. "*Religion, Independencia y Union.*"

never sworn such allegiance. En reference to the oath of loyalty, “*Such oath is not obligatory, because it was made under great fear; Secondly, the majority of the people did not take the oath, and therefore did not contract an obligation; thirdly, what need is that law, there is no religion that demands and unjust or impossible deed.*”¹²⁵ A clear contrast from the argument of loyalty to the King preached by the clerical hierarchy during the years of war. Yet, being cautious, the same cleric warns about total disobedience to the King. Even after making the above statement, he continues in his same letter, “*What did we swear? Fidelity to the King? We maintain it; let the King govern us, that is what we want: fidelity to the King, but not to the Virreyes and tyrants, not to the intruders and reckless.*”¹²⁶ This reinforces the initial idea that the war was not against the King or Spain, it was again the corrupt institutions of the colony that had committed treason against the patria by not upholding the laws of the King and Church.

The Catholic Church had to adapt to the changing times in order to survive as the powerful influence of society. México was a deeply religious nation before and after the war. The Church would continue to be the center of much of Mexican activity, but first it had to reconcile with the patria. To do so, Manuel de la Barcena, urged his Spanish compatriots to accept Mexico’s right to independence, “*let us confess brothers, let us be just, and confess in good faith. That Spain does not have the right to dominate the Mexican pueblo, they have right to demand against the seizure of their sovereignty, and demand their Independence,*”¹²⁷ The changing views of de la Barcena are just one small example of how Church Ideology changed with the evolving political world. Brian F.

¹²⁵ Manuel de la Barcena, *Manifiesto al Mundo; la Justicia y la necesidad de la Independencia de la Nueva España*, (Puebla, Mexico; Imprenta Liberal de Moreno Hermanos, 1821), 6.

¹²⁶ Barcena, de la, Manuel, *Manifiesto al Mundo*, 6

¹²⁷ Barcena de la, Manuel, *Manifiesto al Mundo*, 1821, 7.

Connaughton in his study of the Church in Guadalajara during the war points out that immediately before 1821, the Church had moved away significantly from the royal state and was completely committed to the new, independent Mexican state.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ Connaughton, *Clerical Ideology*, 106.

Conclusion

The dissolution of the Spanish Crown set in motion a series of events that culminated with an independent México and the rest of the Latin America. The initial stages of independence started much earlier than the invasion of Spain by Napoleon. For centuries the people of the México and the rest of the Americas had been forming their own identity, based on their local experience. Their loyalty had shifted and unlike the early conquistadores, many did not identify with Spanish culture. The European world was alien to most Americans. However, they maintained a strong religious connection with Europe which kept them connected to the motherland.

Catholicism remained the uniting force for the two patrias. The church continued to play an important role in civic matters on both sides of the Atlantic, and such, it is no surprise that in a time of war, the religious orders were caught in between their two alliances. Like their compatriots, most Mexican priests had never been to Spain, they were Mexican born, raised and educated. But unlike the rest of the population, they had sworn to remain loyal to the Church. Loyalty to the Church was loyalty to Spain. But that does not indicate a disloyalty to Mexico. The clerics that took an active role in the loyalist movement through their preaching did so in loyalty to the Church and to their faith.

The sermons have shown that at least at a local level, some Church leaders attempted to guide parishioners towards a desired political position. Treason against Spain by Miguel Hidalgo was treason to the Church by one of their brothers. We can speculate that the actions of Morelos and Hidalgo were a direct insult to the Church hierarchy who was during the war attempting to maintain its position as civic leader and instructor.

As we have seen not all were rebel priest and not all were loyalist. The discourse of loyalty to Spain and Church was not well defined amongst citizens of Mexico and the same was true within the Church ranks. No monolithic view existed and as such the war of loyalty was being fought on several fronts. The clerics no doubt had their personal political views, and like the rest of society had a vested interest on the outcome of the war. The discourse of loyalty took many dimensions, including the religious and the patriotic. The war of independence was a time of adjustment for the Church. It had to carefully negotiate its alliances. Surely some priests were moved to rebellion based on their own experience within the colonial system. A sermon does not paint the complete picture of the reasoning for the individual loyalist discourse, but it offers a glimpse of the personal struggle.

Bibliography

BOOKS

- Aldridge, Owen, Ed. *The Ibero-American Enlightenment*, Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*. United States: Meridian Books, 1959.
- Brading, David, A. *A Mexican Phoenix: Our Lady of Guadalupe: Image and Tradition Across Five Centuries*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Brading, David A. *Origenes del Nacionalismo Mexicano*. Mexico, D.F: Secretaria de Educacion Publica, 1973.
- Brading, David A. *The First America: The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots and the Liberal State 1492-1867*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Connaughton, Brian F. *Clerical Ideology in a Revolutionary Age: The Guadalajara Church and the Idea of the Mexican Nation (1788-1853)*. Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Press, 2003.
- Hamill, Jr. M, Hugh. *The Hidalgo Revolt: Prelude to Mexican Independence*. Wesport, Connecticut, 1966.
- Hamnett, Brian, R. *Roots of Insurgency: Mexican Regions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Herrejón Peredo, Carlos. *Del Sermón al Discurso Cívico: México, 1760-1834*. Mexico, D.F: Colegio de Michoacán, 2003.
- Herrejón Peredo, Carlos. *Morelos: Vida Preinsurgente y Lecturas*. Zamora, Michoacán: Colegio de Michoacán, 1984.
- Katz, Friederich, Ed. *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Krauze, Enrique, *Mexico: Biography of Power: A History of the Modern Mexico, 1810-1996*. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers, 1998.
- Pompa y Pompa, Antonio. *Proceso Inquisitorial y Militar Seguidos a D. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla*. Morelia: Colegio de Michoacán, 1984.
- Rodriguez O, Jaime E. *The Independence of Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Taylor, William B, *Magistrates of the Sacred: Priests and Parishioners in Eighteenth-Century Mexico*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Tutino, John, *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Van Young, Eric. *The Other Rebellion: Popular Violence, Ideology and the Mexican Struggle for Independence, 1810-1821*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Villaseñor y Villaseñor, Alejandro. *Biografías de los Héroes y Caudillos de la Independencia, Vol. II*. Mexico City: Editorial Jus, 1962

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Kantorowicz, H Ernst. "Pro Patria Mori in Medieval Political Thought" *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 56, No. 3 (April., 1951): pp. 472-492. Accessed, via Jstor.org, 06/06/2012.

Jaime E. Rodriguez, "La Independencia de la América Española: Una Reinterpretación." *Historia Mexicana*, Vol. 42 No. 3. (Jan-March., 1993).

Sagredo Baeza, Rafael, "Actores Políticos en Los Catecismos Patriotas y Republicanos Americanos, 1810-1827," *Historia Mexicana* Vol. 45, No.3. (Jan-Mar.,1996), pp. 501-538. Accessed, via Jstor.org, 09/29/2012.

Terán Fuentes, Mariana. "De Nacion española a federación Mexicana. La opinion Pública en la Formación de la Nacion," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* Vol.22, No.2 (Summer 20026), pp. 251-274. Accessed, via Jstor.org, 10/31/2012.

Terán Fuente, Mariana. "La Voz '¡Viva La América!' En el Movimiento Insurgente," Universidad de Zacatecas, 2009. Accessed from Fondo Aleph, Archivo General de la Nacion. Accessed, via Jstor.org, 02/18/2013.

Terán Fuentes, Mariana. "Por Lealtad al Rey, a la Patria y a la Religion. Los años de transicion en la Provincia de Zacatecas: 1808-1814," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicano*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Summer 2008), pp. 289-323. Accessed, via Jstor.org, 10/15/2012.

Van Young, Eric, "Agrarian Rebellion and Defense of Community: Meaning and Collective Violence in Late Colonial and Independence-Era Mexico" *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Winter, 1993), pp. 245-269. Accessed, via Jstor.org, 05/01/2013.

SERMONS

Barcena de la, Manuel, *Manifiesto al Mundo; La Justicia y la necesidad de la Independencia de la Nueva España*. (Puebla, Mexico, Imprenta Liberal de Moreno Hermanos, 1821): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Fr. Diego Miguel Bringas y Encinas, *Sermón Político Moral, que para dar principio a la misión extraordinaria. Formada de venerables sacerdotes de ambos cleros, dirigida a la Concordia y unión de los habitantes de esta América, y establecimiento de la paz, predicen la plaza de Santo Domingo de México el 17 de enero de 1813, y repito de muchos sujetos celosos del bien publicó en la iglesia de nuestra señora de la Merced de la misma ciudad el 24 del propio mes, con asistencia del Exmo. Sr. virey, nobilísima ciudad &c.* (Mexico, 183): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Beristain de Souza, Joseph Mariano. *Discurso Político-Moral y Cristiano, Que en los Solemnes Cultos que Rinde Al Santísimo Sacramento en los días del Carnaval*. (México, 1809): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Bringas y Encinas, Diego Miguel, Fr. *Sermón Político Moral, que para dar principio a Misión extraordinaria. Formada de venerables sacerdotes de ambos cleros, Dirigida a la concordia y unión de los habitantes de esta América, y el restablecimiento de la paz, predicen la plaza de Santo Domingo de México el 17 de enero de 1813, y repito a petición de muchos sujetos celosos del bien publico en la iglesia de nuestra señora de la Merced de la misma ciudad el 24 del propio mes, con asistencia del Exmo. Sr. Virey, nobilísima ciudad &c.* (México, 1813): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Cadiz, Josef de. *El Soldado Católico , En Guerra de Religión. Carta Instructiva, en la que se propone a un soldado católico la necesidad de prepararse, el modo con de la infiel, sediciosa y regicida asamblea de la Francia*. (España, 1815): The Newberry Library, Chicago Illinois, 2012.

De la Barcena, Manuel. *Manifiesto al Mundo; La Justicia y la necesidad de la Independencia de la Nueva España*. (Imprenta liberal de Moreno Hermanos. (Puebla, México, 1821): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Diaz Calvillo, Juan Bautista. *Sermón que en el Aniversario Solemne de Gracias a María Santísima de los Remedios, celebrado en esta Santa Iglesia Catedral el día 30 de Octubre de 1811 por la victoria del Monte de las Cruces*. (Imprenta Arizpe, México, 1811): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Hidalgo y Badillo, Jose Maria. *Sermón Eucarístico que en la solemne función celebrada en la Santa Iglesia Catedral de Guadalaxajara, el día 29 de Agosto de 1811 por el singular beneficio del cielo, en haberse descubierto e impedido la conspiración tramada en México contra el primero y mas digno jefe del reyno, y contra todos los buenos cuídanos*. Guadalajara, (México, 1811): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Lizana y Beaumont de, D. Francisco Xavier, *Exhortacion del Exmo. Sr. Illmo. Sr. Don Francisco Xavier de Lizana y Beaumont. A sus fieles y demás habitantes de este Reyno.* (Mexico: Oficina de Don Mariano de Zuñiga y Ontiveros, 1810): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Lopez Negrete, Agustin, y Pascual, al Roldan, Francisco. *Relación Sucinta delas Demostraciones con que la Nobilísima ciudad de Durango explico su jubilo por las plausibles noticias de haberse alarmado la España antigua, oponiéndose a la dominación de los Franceses, y conseguido la derrota de sus tropas.-* Incluido, *Sermón que en la Iglesia de Religiosos Franciscanos de la ciudad de Durango capital de la nueva Vizcaya, predico en día 14 de agosto de 1808. A solicitud de los fidelísimos Dependientes del comercio de la misma Ciudad el R.P. Fr. Pedro Cortina, primer Lector de Sagrada Teología en el expresado Convento, en acción de gracias por la felicidad de las armas españolas contra los exercitos franceses.* (México, 1809): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, 2012.

Mendizabal, Pedro Jose de. *Sermón que en el Tercer día del solemne novenario de Nuestra Señora del Pueblito conducida en secreto a la Iglesia del Seráfico Patriarca San Francisco de Querétaro para implorar su favor en las actuales necesidades.* (Casa de Arizpe. México,1810): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois.

Ximeno, Jose. *La verdadera Felicidad, La libertad e Independencia de las naciones. Motivos porque Dios las castiga, y medio para que cesen las presentes desgracias.* (Casa de Arizpe. México, 1813): The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois.