

EXILIOS LATINOAMERICANOS EN EL LARGO SIGLO XIX

GUEST EDITORS:
EDWARD BLUMENTHAL AND ROMY SÁNCHEZ

Introduction

EDWARD BLUMENTHAL

Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, CRIAL, Institut Convergences Migrations

ROMY SÁNCHEZ

Université de Lille, IRHiS, Institut Convergences Migrations

Abstract

This dossier seeks to examine the role of exile in nineteenth-century Latin America, in order to give historical perspective to the growing literature on exile in the region in the twentieth century and provide a wider perspective to European-centered studies of exile in the period. Ranging from the independence period to the early twentieth century, it explores the continuities and the evolution in the practice of exile during the formative century that saw the birth of independent republics and the emergence of modern nation-states. The introduction highlights this historiographical contribution, exploring the particularities of Latin American exile. Using a broad definition of exile, it also addresses the legal and social categories used to understand and regulate exile in the period, independent of political ideology, and explores how the study of the mechanisms of exile can shed new light on the familiar political historiographies, or those of war, class, race, and gender. Finally it examines how exile intersects with questions of sovereignty, nation-building, and territorial dynamics, underscoring the transnational and foundational aspect of exile in the national and international politics of the region.

Keywords: exile; Latin America; nineteenth century; transnational perspectives

Resumen

Este dossier pretende evaluar el papel del exilio en el siglo XIX latinoamericano, para darle trasfondo histórico a la creciente literatura sobre exilios del siglo XX en la región y también para intentar abrir las perspectivas de los estudios sobre exilios decimonónicos que tienden a concentrarse en Europa. Yendo desde las independencias hasta el principio del siglo XX, se trata de explorar las continuidades y la evolución de la práctica del exilio durante el período clave del nacimiento de las repúblicas independientes y de la emergencia de Estados-naciones modernos. Esta introducción realza este aporte historiográfico, explorando las especificidades del exilio latinoamericano. Adoptando una definición amplia de la noción de exilio, también se abarcan los temas de las categorías legales y sociales que pueden usarse para entender y regular dicho exilio durante el período. Se indaga además en el estudio de los mecanismos del exilio, independiente de la ideología de los actores, y en la manera en que pueden renovar la historia política, o de dinámicas de clase, de raza o de género. Finalmente, se analiza la intersección entre exilio y cuestiones de soberanía, de construcción de la nación y de dinámicas territoriales, recalcando el papel transnacional del exilio como fundamento de las políticas nacionales e internacionales de la región.

Palabras clave: exilio; América Latina; siglo diecinueve; perspectivas transnacionales

A great portion of the common representations of nineteenth-century political exile seems to be shaped by European contexts: post-revolutionary political forced migration engendered by the upheavals of 1789, 1830, or 1848 within the continent, Victor Hugo's being banned from Imperial France, or Communards and anarchists being expelled as potential political dangers. The imagery of Europe's nineteenth century is paved with exiles' experiences linked to political transnational history, while the Latin America of that period is generally better known for caudillos, internal wars, and crises. Latin American exile in the nineteenth century has often been seen and portrayed as a question of Europeans fleeing to the "new world" or Latin American elites finding refuge in the heart of "civilization."¹ And the historiographical imagination continues to be shaped by twentieth-century exile, from Spanish Republicans in Mexico to South American political dislocation during the national security dictatorships.²

This dossier seeks to question the very roots of such enduring clichés by focusing on the Latin American nineteenth century's history of exile. The authors whose work is featured here show that such phenomena were foundational during that period in the region, shaping Latin America's political, social, and cultural history in many crucial ways. Rethinking Latin American nineteenth century history through the lens of exile has proved fruitful for revisiting significant aspects of the continent's history such as the emergence of the nation, independence, and

empire, or others such as circulation and migrations in general. It also helps to re-engage with such central topics as race, class, gender, or family from a new and original perspective. By exploring a theme that has long seemed marginal, peripheral to “general politics,” this dossier seeks to show how political exile can renew nineteenth-century Latin American history in a much deeper way than previously thought. It also suggests bridges between historiographies that often ignore each other and seeks to take stock of a new subfield within Latin American nineteenth-century history.

Historiography

One of the main goals of this dossier is to establish links between historiographies that seldom converse with one another. The recent boom in historical studies on migrations, circulations, and even political exile has evolved quite simultaneously in the European, Anglophone, and Hispanophone fields. The last two decades, with the concomitant explosion of the transnational paradigm and its criticism, has seen the exponential rise of publications on mobility, whether voluntary or constrained. On the topic of political exile, the study of European liberalism and revolutionary movements in the first half of the nineteenth century, for instance, have proven very fruitful to suggest a rereading of European history through the lens of exile. Thus, seminal works by Maurizio Isabella, Konstantina Zanou, Juan Luis Simal, and Alexandre Dupont have explored the relevance of exiles within the Mediterranean world and its political chronology.³ In France, scholars such as Sylvie Aprile, Delphine Diaz, or Catherine Brice have made political exile their main subject of interest in order to suggest new readings of nineteenth-century France and Italy.⁴ Their work has launched collective research projects on European exiles, such as *AsileuropeXIX*, which explores asylum and exile in nineteenth-century Europe through state sources, iconography, vocabulary, and the trajectories of expelled foreigners.⁵ More recently, the same group of scholars has started another project on the intimate and familial dimension of political exile. Eastern European nineteenth-century exiled politics have also been explored in Elena Toth’s work,⁶ and the topic of Communards sent to penal colonies or evolving with anarchists in the late nineteenth century has also been revisited recently.⁷

However, few of these works fully address the transatlantic or global connections as they claim to do, either because their subjects remain confined to Europe or because their analyses ignore extra-European dimensions. The Americas, for instance, are rarely considered extensively, except in Isabella and Simal’s works, and, to a minor extent, in Diaz and Aprile’s synthesis of

European exile.⁸ Conversely, the blossoming historiography on political exiles in American territories rarely takes into account European events or dimensions, even though the methodological claim is always transnational.⁹ Thus, the synthesis by Mario Sznadger and Luis Roniger focuses on the Latin American specificities of political exile,¹⁰ and other thematic studies such as Matthew J. Smith's research on political exile in the area of Haiti and Jamaica,¹¹ or Dalia Muller's book on Cuban separatists exiled in the area of the Mexican Gulf,¹² all focus on a regional approach and do not explore links on a broader scale. In a similar way, Rafael Rojas has written a suggestive essay on the role of political exile within republican political culture in its Latin American specificity.¹³ But here again, his approach is explicitly regional and does not seek comparison with European republican political culture. Maya Jasanoff's study of loyalist exiles leaving the independent United States for a large range of worldly destinations is perhaps the only one that adopts a proper global approach, mainly because of the imperial dimension of her study.¹⁴ This dossier seeks to bridge the gap between twentieth-century historiographies of Latin American exiles and European studies of nineteenth-century exile in order to highlight regional specificities, common themes, and transatlantic connections while calling attention to the unresolved tensions between regional approaches and transnational ones, and those visible on a global transcontinental scale.¹⁵ That being said, the transnational paradigm, though important as a new methodology for the history of circulations, has its limits. Some connections fail, either because they do not allow the actors to fulfill their objectives, or because historians lack sources to prove they did. Mobility does not always mean that networks can be mobilized to political ends and sometimes it occurs in ignorance of similar phenomena happening somewhere else on the globe.¹⁶

This dossier focuses explicitly on Latin American political exiles, even if our general aim is to put this field in dialogue with European and Anglophone literature on the same subject, due to the notable boom on the topic over the last two decades. As some of the previously mentioned essays have emphasized, there are some undeniable specificities to this Latin American context in the long nineteenth century, starting with the imperial crisis that erupted at the beginning of the period analyzed in this special issue. Colonial continuities and legacies are key to understanding political exiles and their dynamics in a world where "new independent nations" are far from being "built," let alone "achieved." The imperial paradigm, much present in this dossier's texts, is also crucial to analyze the weight of political exile in a region where some places are republics and others remain pieces of empire. Finally, as we have both tried to show in our respective works, including the history of political exile within broader narratives of the Latin American nineteenth century's major disruption

means writing a social history of political changes. That is also the approach adopted by the authors of this dossier's pieces.

Defining Exile in Latin America

The term "exile" was seldom used in nineteenth-century Latin America. The actors themselves tended to use other expressions to refer to their situation, such as banishment (*destierro/proscripción*) or emigration, often calling themselves émigrés (*emigrado*). While the first set of expressions, which were also used as adjectives (*desterrado/proscrito*) were in fact legal categories referring to state policies of expulsion, they were also used more broadly to refer to the experience of exile or to the actors themselves. For example, when Francisco Bilbao referred to himself as the "universal exile" (*proscrito universal*) he was not only evoking his legal status—though he had indeed suffered legal banishment on several occasions—but rather a more Romantic literary representation of his political struggles. The use of the word émigré to refer to the exilic condition, which conveyed much the same meaning, seems to have come from the experience of the French Revolution, and its use spread rapidly in the Spanish-speaking world.¹⁷ The use of these expressions was often imprecise, and the same person could use a different expression to further a political argument or to defend themselves from accusations of criminality stemming from banishment.

The juridical framework of exile was centered on state policies of expulsion and asylum, as well as broader citizenship practices. Banishment was a legal penalty with origins in European practice that implied expulsion from the political community. The eighteenth-century Law of Nations jurist Emer de Vattel, broadly distinguished between exile and banishment: the former was an honorable exclusion from the court for political reasons, while the latter implied a degrading criminal expulsion from the polity.¹⁸ Though the shameful connotation persisted into the nineteenth century, the terms gradually became more neutral as the practice was incorporated into the criminal code. Banishment was related to longstanding penal traditions in Iberian empires, in which offenders were sentenced to military service on the frontiers with lands held by Indigenous peoples or relegated to isolated parts of the empire.¹⁹ In its different forms, it continued both internally and externally after independence. Internally, this was an extension of colonial practice, and offenders were sentenced to military service or prison colonies (in Tierra del Fuego, notably, in the case of Chile and Argentina), or simply confined to rural properties. With the creation of new international borders, however, banishment took on a new international aspect, and sentences of exclusion for a set period of time became

increasingly common. Though this could be quite informal, such as when the police summarily took political opponents directly from jail to a boat that was to set sail, it was also codified by law and the result of a trial. For instance, in Chile, summary courts-martial instituted after failed revolutions sentenced political prisoners to 4 to 10 years of banishment, often after paying a hefty bail.²⁰ Banishment also developed a more political connotation and was almost exclusively used in the case of political crimes, though a sentence of military service continued to have strong class connotations and was still common for *vagos y malentretenidos*—though this was not always political. The banishment of citizens tended to disappear towards the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, however, as internationalists began to argue against statelessness—everyone, according to this view, should have one, and only one, nationality—, and as the expulsion of foreigners came to be consolidated as a legal category. The latter was codified internationally in the Penal Treaty of Montevideo (1889) and nationally, starting with the Argentine Law of Residence (1902) and similar legislation across the region in the following decades.²¹ These intersections between exile, nationality, and statelessness are analyzed in Dalia Muller’s article in this dossier. She shows how Cuban émigrés found it difficult to return home after independence because Cuba’s circumscribed sovereignty made it difficult to establish effective repatriation policies, while US occupation authorities washed their hands of this responsibility. Although not legally stateless, former Cuban exiles in the U.S. were bereft of consular protection, whereas African-born people were obligated to take on Cuban citizenship.

The reverse side of banishment was state-sponsored asylum. Though today we understand asylum to be a legal condition that authorizes a foreigner’s presence on national territory for reasons of protection from persecution, in the nineteenth century it was understood more basically to refer to the state’s right to refuse extradition. This can be seen in the article by Alexis Medina on the exile of conservative Ecuadorian Catholics to neighboring Colombia, in which an agreement was reached whereby asylum would be respected and extradition would not be sought as long as the two states controlled the émigré populations. In Latin America there was, however, no equivalent for individual administrative refugee status. This is an important difference with regards to the French case, in which refugee status developed after the French Revolution as an administrative category, centered on confinement in a *dépôt* and the provision of a subsidy, in order to both maintain subsistence and control the émigré’s political activities.²² Asylum emerged from early modern Christian practices of sanctuary, which became increasingly secularized and politicized, particularly after the Atlantic revolutions. As states began to reserve the right

to offer asylum to foreign political opponents, extradition became a way of collaborating in the fight against common crime, though the definition of political offenses always remained problematic. This parallel evolution of asylum and extradition can be seen clearly in the aforementioned Montevideo treaty, which sought to distinguish between the categories.

As mentioned above, these juridical categories did not refer to the individual's right to reside in a foreign polity. In Latin America, political émigrés were treated like any other foreigner and incorporated under legal understandings of citizenship and residency. Since colonial times, basic political rights were afforded at the municipal level to residents, a criteria associated with marriage, property, and standing, and the category of *vecino* was associated with citizenship after independence and expanded among the male population. On the one hand, the association between citizenship and residency, as well as the longstanding cultural, familial, and economic ties between Spanish American elites, made integration into host countries relatively easy, though not without friction. On the other hand, from the general tendencies of the Law of Nations to the new republican constitutions, the law tended to grant wide civil rights to foreigners.²³ Examples of this integration can be found in the articles by Fabio Wasserman and Mario Etchechury Barrera, respectively on the exile of Francisco Bilbao in Argentina and that of Guiseppe Garibaldi and the Italian Legion in Montevideo. The former shows the centrality of family and political ties to the integration of Bilbao into Argentine society in the mid-nineteenth century. The latter, while blurring the line between economic and political migration among Italians in Montevideo before 1852, highlights the importance of political dislocation in local factional disputes. Both cases reveal the potential extent of exile participation in local politics and raise the question of what it means to be a political émigré in societies highly permeable to foreign participation in public affairs.

We use the term "exile" broadly, as an analytical category, to refer to the wide range of practices linked to political displacement, and to incorporate many of the different situations alluded to here. Whether applied to banishment or voluntary exile, recognized by the authorities or overlapping with economic migration, using a broad definition of exile allows for the comparison of different situations in order to understand the wider tendencies of political dislocation. The examples of loyalist exile in the context of the revolutions of independence, analyzed here by Sarah Chambers and Scarlett O'Phelan Godoy, are instructive concerning the use and limits of these terms. The first question is whether they can be considered exile at all, given that their emigration did not involve exclusion from the polity and was in part a performative act of loyalty, as both authors point out. Yet they are clearly examples of political dislocation, given that many were uprooted from lands they had lived in for decades and thrust

into an uncertain situation. The actors themselves recognized these differences, as Chambers notes: the term “refugee” was applied to the French who fled to Cuba after the Haitian Revolution but less so to the Spanish loyalists who fled *Terra Firme*, though the categories were used imprecisely. *De la patria chica a la madre patria*: strangers but not foreigners.

Exile Politics: Ideologies and Practices

Sociologist Stéphane Dufoix has suggested the neologism “exopolitics” to designate and characterize the kind of politics that is carried out abroad by exiles in the context of their political exclusion.²⁴ Included in this notion is the creative capacity of exile, whose circumstances fostered new political trends and ideas, to launch groups and associations, to enhance sociabilities and press, and sometimes to make much ado about not much.²⁵ Such political and social activity, which is said to be specific to exile communities, is certainly the most studied aspect of these contexts and groups. Nevertheless, the research we present in this dossier shows that Latin Americans themselves were at the center stage of “exopolitics” and were not just witnesses of European arrivals. In their articles, all the authors gathered here show how internal politics were determinant in the transnational or transimperial migrations at stake, whether it is warring factions in the context of Rio de la Plata or Ecuador (Reali and Medina), as well as in Garibaldi’s Uruguay (Etchechury Barrera), or ideological confrontations when it comes to loyalists fleeing independence wars (O’Phelan Godoy and Chambers).

Other than the Latin-American specificities of “exopolitics”, this dossier emphasizes another important topic: the political diversity of Latin American exiles in the nineteenth century. The European political cases have mostly been studied in their revolutionary dimension,²⁶ leaving aside until very recently the conservative or counterrevolutionary waves that also characterized the evolution of the long nineteenth century.²⁷ Our perspective seeks to reinvigorate this approach, by showing that Latin America was not only the stage for socio-political “liberations” since the Age of Revolutions and until the final independences (Cuba, Puerto Rico, 1898) and that political conflicts over sovereignty changes were often a cause or a consequence of exiles, and not only of “libertadores” or “patriots” (Chambers, O’Phelan Godoy, Medina). In the nineteenth century, exile was not just the province of liberals or republicans; conservatives and monarchists of all types experienced it.²⁸

War and post-war contexts also offer a privileged viewpoint on how political exiles shaped the Latin American nineteenth century. Several articles in this

dossier show not only how the very dynamics of wars often produce exiles, but also how nineteenth-century Latin American conflicts and their specificities created particular forms of exile. For instance, the concentration of so many conflicts of sovereignty on the same continent during the same period shows the importance of borders and their uses for political migrations (Medina, Reali). In another order of ideas, postwar dynamics and their social and racial consequences sometimes generate exiled politics, just as Muller shows in examining Cuban post-independent lost citizenship and racial claims.

Finally, another fault line that runs through these articles is that of class, race, and gender. Though much of literature focuses on elite, white men, in part because of available sources, several articles take up the issue of more popular exiles. Particularly in the case of war, when soldiers and their families were forced to flee across international borders, the mass of non-elite exiles appears slightly off-stage (Medina, Reali). This class fracture come up more explicitly in the racialized Cuban exiles analyzed by Muller. Whether in the case of working-class émigrés in Florida, regarded as racially inferior by US authorities, or the “internal exile” of African-born Cubans who rejected their Cuban nationality, racial categories are reinforced as a consequence of political dislocation. Moreover, in the process of mutation from empire to nation-state, the chronology of abolition—delayed in the case of Spain’s Caribbean colonies—is tightly linked to the constrained mobility of exile.²⁹ Major turmoil, the Haitian Revolution most prominently, produced intense refugee flows and shaped issues relating to citizenship and freedom. A major missing theme of the dossier, however, is that of Indigenous exile. The question of gender and exile is another theme that needs to be more thoroughly developed, though Sarah Chambers has shown how political mobility can give women greater opportunities for political mobilization.³⁰ In this dossier, she shows that women appear in the archives both as the women who stay behind and also as political exiles themselves.³¹

Exile, Sovereignty, and Territorial Dynamics

The articles in this dossier contain important clues for understanding the connections between exile and territorial patterns relating to migration routes, border formation, and the shifting limits of sovereignty. It is common in the growing literature on exile, cited above, to note the difficulties in distinguishing between economic and political migration. Exile tends to be part of larger waves of immigration, and the reasons for displacement are varied, particularly when it is not a case of banishment. Typical scenarios include political émigrés who find work in immigrant labor markets, economic migrants who are

politicized abroad as well as multiple ambiguous reasons for migration, such as a combination of political pressure from above and economic opportunities abroad. Clear examples of these phenomena appear in Mario Etchechury Barrera's article on Garibaldi's insertion in Montevidean politics. He shows not only the importance of Garibaldi's South American exile in the construction of his later political career in Italy, but also how the military leader drew on Uruguay's Italian immigrant community to construct a military career in Montevideo. He was depicted in Montevideo as an "Italian caudillo" at the head of the Italian Legion, a position which allowed him to receive a military commission from the Oriental Republic, as the country was then known. This bicephalous legitimization—as a Uruguayan military officer and a representative of the Italian immigrant community—underscores the relatively smooth integration of foreigners in Latin American society at the time, both politically and socially.³² It also shows the difficulties in defining political displacement, as the Italian Legion not only included Mazzinian émigrés and those who fled the peninsula for political reasons, such as Garibaldi himself, but also many immigrants—"Italian" or not—and Afro-descendants attracted to the egalitarian republican ethos symbolized by the exiled leader. This phenomenon can also be observed in Laura Reali's article on Uruguayan exile at the beginning of the twentieth century, in which political dislocation was closely related to economic migration to neighboring countries, particularly Argentina.

Another common dynamic in exile studies which emerges from the articles of this dossier is the establishment of specific sites and circuits of exile.³³ Montevideo was an important site, as underscored by the Italian exile experience, that also included Argentines, Brazilians, and Chileans, among others. Across the Rio de la Plata, Buenos Aires—another important locus of economic immigration—was also an important site of exile for Chileans, Uruguayans, and Paraguayans, among others, as can be seen in the study on Bilbao in these pages.³⁴ These sites developed largely for geographical reasons, with political dislocation occurring across the nearest border. Certain countries, such as Uruguay and Chile, also developed a strong ethos of a tradition of asylum, though this did not preclude them from expelling their own populations for political reasons.³⁵

Brazil and Cuba were important sites of loyalist exile during the independence period, specifically because of the monarchist political system still in place there. Articles by Scarlett O'Phelan Godoy and Sarah Chambers illustrate this phenomenon. Loyalist émigrés from Peru sought refuge in Rio de Janeiro, whether as a temporary step before returning to Madrid through Portugal, or as a more permanent exile closer to home.³⁶ The sea route leading to Rio, with a stop-over in Valparaíso, meant that émigrés were relatively close to Peru in case a change in fortune might allow them to return and perhaps maintain some

sort of political presence from afar. The choice of Madrid or Rio as a site of exile was itself inherently political, as liberal constitutionalists preferred Brazil and absolutist conservatives, restored Spain. Sarah Chambers' article, on the other hand, calls attention to mobility patterns in the Caribbean in the context of various Atlantic revolutions, and the differences in asylum policy with regards to Spanish and French émigrés. Whether in the Caribbean or South America, the articles in this dossier highlight sites of exile beyond the United States and Europe, often seen as places of refuge for Latin American elites.

While these dynamics are present in wider studies of exiles, others seem more particularly Latin American, due to the region's recent independence and the close cultural, economic, and political ties that still existed between the new countries. Border dynamics are a case in point, as can be seen in Alexis Medina's article, where he shows that while conservative Catholics sought exile in Colombia, liberal Colombians found refuge across the border in Ecuador. Playing the card of asylum thus allowed countries to intervene in the politics of neighboring countries and afforded émigrés a tool through which to carry out politics in exile. These cross-border dynamics played a particular role in reinforcing borders, which, although still quite porous—and often contentious—offered protection to fleeing refugees. Similar dynamics can be seen in the articles on the Rio de la Plata. When Francisco Bilbao's political situation became difficult in Buenos Aires, during the period of its secession from the Argentine Confederation, he was able to secure employment in the Confederation's capital, Paraná. Though not facing any particular physical danger in Buenos Aires, greater political freedom in a neighboring polity allowed for transnational politics to play out. Similarly, the situation in Montevideo shows how overlapping sovereignty and its geographical location between Argentina and Brazil allowed for it to develop as a site of exile. Political dislocation, in other words, has played a role in border formation in the region, one which has yet to be explored.

This dossier also hints at the different, overlapping scales of exile in the Americas: the Caribbean (including Caribbean exile in the U.S. and Mexico), the Pacific coast, the Andes (these last two overlapping somewhat) and the Rio de la Plata. Mexico and much of the Andean space are unfortunately somewhat absent from this volume, as is Chile as an important site of exile. The importance of maritime connections should not be underestimated here. Many of these paths and connections developed from the cabotage practiced between American ports. Politicized in the independence period, they quickly became part of established patterns of exile.

These exile border dynamics also had an impact on the emergence of nationalities in the period. As previously noted, it was relatively easy for foreigners,

particularly Spanish-speaking, to integrate socially and politically into host societies. Though Garibaldi, being European, might seem the exception here, this is perhaps due to the high percentage of Europeans present in Montevideo and the independence-era practice of absorbing European officers into local military service. In other cases presented here, particularly that of Bilbao, the integration into host country political dynamics indicates the permeability of political rights, particularly in local settings, in the Latin American context. Yet, this cosmopolitan integration could also heighten distinctions between citizens and foreigners. As Sarah Chambers shows, a difference was made between “foreigners” and “strangers” in Spanish asylum policy, particularly in the Caribbean. These incipient differences would play a role in emerging nationalities in the Caribbean islands. Similarly, Dalia Muller notes the ambiguities of nationality in the context of Cuban exile almost a century later, in which African-born populations were forcibly included while émigrés were de facto excluded from the polity.

We hope this dossier shows both the promise and the accomplishments of exile studies in nineteenth-century Latin America, shedding new light on a century of upheaval that saw the birth of independent republics and the slow transition from empire to nation-state. Exile, we believe, was a fundamental part of this process, at the heart of national and international political order in the region.³⁷ The phenomenon of exile was common to this process on both sides of the Atlantic, in an entangled dynamic revealed by the methodologies of transitional and connected history. The field also gives historical depth to a burning contemporary subject in a period in which many Latin Americans continue to flee from their homelands.

Notes

1. Rafe Blaufarb, *Bonapartiste in the Borderlands: French Exiles and Refugees in the Gulf Coast* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006); Ingrid E. Fey and Karen Racine, *Strange Pilgrimages: Exile, Travel, and National Identity in Latin America, 1800s–1990s* (Wilmington: SR Books, 2000); Juan Luis Simal, *Emigrados. España y el exilio internacional, 1814–1834* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales – Asociación de Historia Contemporánea, 2012).
2. See the work done over the past decade in the *Jornadas de exilios políticos*, for example: <https://jornadasexilios.colmex.mx/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/programa-jornadas-exilios.pdf>
3. Maurizio Isabella, *Risorgimento in Exile: Italian Emigrés and the Liberal International in the Post-Napoleonic Era* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Maurizio Isabella and Konstantina Zanou (eds.), *Mediterranean Diasporas: Politics and Ideas in the Long 19th Century* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015); Simal, *Emigrados*; Alexandre Dupont, *Une Internationale blanche. Histoire d’une mobilisation royaliste*

- transnationale entre France et Espagne dans les années 1870* (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2021).
4. Sylvie Aprile, *Le siècle des exilés. Bannis et proscrits de 1789 à la Commune* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2010); Delphine Diaz, *Un asile pour tous les peuples. Exilés et réfugiés étrangers dans la France du premier XIXe siècle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2014); Brice, Catherine (ed.), *Exile and the Circulation of Political Practices* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2020).
 5. Delphine Diaz and Sylvie Aprile (eds.), *Banished. Travelling the Roads of Exile in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Oldenburg: De Gruyter, 2021) <https://asileurope.humanum.fr/>
 6. Helena Toth, *An Exiled Generation. German and Hungarian Refugees of the Revolution, 1848-1871* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
 7. Constance Bantman, *The French Anarchists in London. Exile and Transnationalism in the First Globalization* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013); Benedict Anderson, *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination* (London: Verso Books, 2007); Juan Suriano, *Trabajadores, anarquismo y Estado represor: de la Ley de Residencia a la de Defensa Social (1902–1910)* (Buenos Aires: CEAL, 1987).
 8. Diaz and Aprile (eds.), *Banished*.
 9. Delphine Diaz, Jeanne Moisand, Romy Sánchez, and Juan Luis Simal (eds.), *Exils entre les deux mondes. Migrations et espaces politiques atlantiques au XIXe siècle* (Bécherel: Les Perséides, 2015).
 10. Mario Sznajder and Luis Roniger, *The Politics of Exile in Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
 11. Matthew J. Smith, *Liberty, Fraternity, Exile, Haiti and Jamaica After Emancipation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).
 12. Dalia Antonia Muller, *Cuban Émigrés and Independence in the Nineteenth-Century Gulf World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017).
 13. Rafael Rojas, *Las repúblicas de aire: Utopía y desencanto en la revolución de Hispanoamérica* (Mexico: Taurus, 2009).
 14. Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Vintage Books, 2012).
 15. The literature on transnational history is vast. Recent contributions include Akira Iriye, *Global and Transnational History: The Past, Present, and Future* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Ori Preuss, *Transnational South America: Experiences, Ideas, and Identities, 1860s-1900s* (New York: Routledge, 2016).
 16. Nancy L. Green, *The Limits of Transnationalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019).
 17. Romy Sánchez and Juan Luis Simal, “Lexiques et pratiques du destierro,” *Hommes & migrations. Revue française de référence sur les dynamiques migratoires*, no. 1321 (2018), pp. 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.4000/hommesmigrations.4178>.
 18. Emer de Vattel, *Le droit des gens, ou Principes de la Loi Naturelle, appliqués à la conduite & aux affaires des nations & des souverains*, Vol. 1 (London: no publisher, 1758), pp. 208.
 19. Sznajder and Roniger, *The Politics of Exile*, pp. 41–45.
 20. Chile. *Código penal de la república de Chile* (Santiago: Imprenta de la república de J. Nuñez, 1874), p. 30. Also see Edward Blumenthal, *Exile and Nation-State Formation in Argentina and Chile, 1810–1862* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), pp. 179–84.

21. Edward Blumenthal, “Droit d’asile, droit d’expulsion et représentations de l’exilé en Amérique du Sud au XIXe siècle.” *Diasporas. Circulations, migrations, histoire*, no. 33 (2019), pp. 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.4000/diasporas.3537>.
22. Delphine Diaz, *Un asile pour tous les peuples ? : Exilés et réfugiés étrangers dans la France du premier XIXe siècle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2014). It is, however, similar to the British case in which political refugees were treated as any other migrant in a context of open immigration. Thomas C. Jones, “Définir l’asile politique en Grande-Bretagne (1815-1870),” *Hommes & migrations. Revue française de référence sur les dynamiques migratoires*, no. 1321 (2018), p. 13. <https://doi.org/10.4000/hommesmigrations.4156>
23. Pilar González Bernaldo, “Una ciudadanía de residencia: la experiencia de los extranjeros en la ciudad de Buenos Aires (1882-1917),” *Entrepasados*, 30, 2006, pp. 47–66; Tamar Herzog, *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003).
24. Stéphane Dufoix, *Politiques d’exil. Hongrois, Polonais et Tchécoslovaques en France après 1945* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002). We have translated the French neologism “exopolitie” as “exopolitics.”
25. Brice, *Exile*.
26. Diaz, *Un asile*; Aprile, *Le siècle des exilés*; Simal, *Emigrados*; Isabella, *Risorgimento*.
27. Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles*.
28. Such a typology leaves aside the major topic of refugees and exiles from the Haitian Revolution, which is included in our analysis. See among many others Ada Ferrer, *Freedom’s Mirror. Cuba and Haiti in the Age of Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2010).
29. As in the case of Muller’s chapter. Also see Chambers’ piece in the dossier, as well as Jean M. Hébrard and Rebecca J. Scott, *Freedom Papers. An Atlantic Odyssey in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014).
30. Sarah C. Chambers, *Families in War and Peace: Chile from Colony to Nation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).
31. Nancy Green, *Repenser les migrations* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002); Aprile, *Le siècle*.
32. Fernando F. Devoto, “Immigrants, exilés, réfugiés, étrangers: mots et notions pour le cas argentin (1854-1940),” in Fernando F. Devoto and Pilar González Bernaldo (eds.), *Émigration politique. Une perspective comparative. Italiens et Espagnols en Argentine et en France XIXe-XXe siècles* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2001), pp. 77–99.
33. Sznajder and Roniger use the terms “sites” and “circuits” in *The Politics of Exile*.
34. Chile was another important site for the Pacific coast, though unfortunately not covered here.
35. Another example of a tradition of asylum that developed in this period—not covered here—is that of Mexico, which constitutionally guaranteed the status starting with the 1857 reform constitution. Pablo Yankelevich (ed.), *México, país refugio: La experiencia de los exilios en el siglo XX* (Mexico: Plaza y Valdés and INAH, 2002).
36. Also see Elsa Caula, “Diplomacia y política. La legación española en Río de Janeiro ante la invasión portuguesa a la Provincia Oriental (1817-1820),” *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez. Nouvelle série*, 49:2 (2019), pp. 271–91. <https://doi.org/10.4000/mcv.11525>. See also work by Nicolas González Quintero on conservative Caribbean political circulations, “The Monarchical Caribbean. Tomas Wood, Exiles and the Royalists Strongholds

- during the Spanish American Independence Wars,” World History Connected, 16:1 (2019). [https://worldhistoryconnected.press.uillinois.edu/16.1/forum_quintero.html](https://worldhistoryconnected.press.uiillinois.edu/16.1/forum_quintero.html).
37. Snzajder and Roniger, *The Politics of Exile*.