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Spirits lubricated every social function, from meals in hotel taverns when the lucky recruits were billeted in Colombian towns to the momentous diplomatic summits where the fates of nations were signed with a pen and a toast. In all these ways, alcohol use among the Irish and British recruits in the service of Colombian independence reflected broader trends on both sides of the Atlantic.

Colombian independence was not borne of moderation. Its battles were not led by modest men with moderate goals. Its constitutions were not drafted by modest minds with moderate visions. Its citizens did not make modest sacrifices for moderate gains. Rather, Colombian independence was a long, passionate night of revolution during which all participants drank deeply of the spirit of the times and awoke to find themselves confused, forgetful and living among strangers. Alcohol was closely entwined with the rhetoric of revolution and was an ever-present feature of daily life for soldiers and citizens alike. High-minded ideals intoxicated South American patriots and their foreign supporters, all of whom viewed themselves as attending a global party, advancing the cause of liberty, freedom and justice on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. After all, the words 'liberty' and 'libertad', as well as 'libation' and 'libación', all derive from the same Latin root liber, meaning 'free'. [1] On a more mundane level, homesick soldiers who suffered the unimaginably difficult conditions in the Colombian Andes and the Venezuelan plains took refuge in the bottle when they needed to dull their pain, strengthen their resolve or take their payment in whatever form they could get it. Rum and recruitment were essential and ever-present features of military life in the early nineteenth century. The Irish and English recruits who fought in the patriot armies for Colombian independence reflected the typical drinking habits of military men of their generation. Rum, recruitment and revolution marched together toward the goal of an independent Colombian nation.

At an etymological level, both the English and Spanish languages reveal a close connection between patriotism, the social compact and altered states of consciousness. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word 'spirits', entered the language as a theological concept related to the Holy Trinity but eventually mutated to include both alchemical and metaphysical descriptions of a higher intangible essence separate from one’s corporeal existence. In this way, the word 'spirit' came to mean any sort of divine animating passion and thus found its way into eighteenth-century Enlightenment discourse about the life-giving nature of the patriotic impulse. In a parallel evolution, by 1610 'spirit' had also come to mean a distilled alcohol, revealing a subconscious linguistic awareness that the altered state of consciousness induced by excessive drinking and that induced by idealised thinking were very similar. By the early nineteenth century, there were dual rhetorical motifs which harnessed the word spirit/espíritu to opposing purposes. Colombian patriots and loyalists alike decried their opponents for being blinded by 'partisan spirit' and lamented 'the sunken spirits' of the weary population. [2] Detractors warned Colombian President Francisco de Paula Santander that he had 'drunk many a bitter draught,' which would cause him to fall victim to 'some party zeal or factious spirit' (O'Leary 1969: 11). Throughout Colombia, rebels suffered from 'restless and turbulent spirits', while great figures like Simón Bolívar remained 'in good spirits'. Each day nameless heroic soldiers pressed onward 'cadaverous, scrawny in body but strong in spirit' (O'Leary 1969: 11). In fact, revolutionaries posited that in some mystical, quasi-religious way,
Similarly, in both English and Spanish, the word 'cordial' also has connotations that are related both to genteel behaviour and to the use of alcohol. Etymologically, the word 'cordial' is related to matters of the heart [cardiac, corazón], and is used to denote respect and sincerity; it also describes a medicalised, comforting beverage that is typically a sweetened aromatic form of alcohol. The term found its way into common parlance and by the early nineteenth century its usage revealed the complex cultural interconnectedness between alcohol and gentlemanly agreement. For example, Spanish royalist general Rafael Sevilla recalled that he was greeted with 'extreme cordiality' by an English veteran at Margarita; another time, an indigenous cacique [chief] 'greeted me and showed me cordial affection' during their transactions (Sevilla 1916: 194, 232). Patriot general Manuel Piar was well-liked for 'his cordial attention to everyone' and Bolívar showed his respect by expressing his 'cordial wishes' to his subordinates in his correspondence with them (Ducoudray-Holstein 1829 I: 243-244). When Richard Bache visited a monastery near Tunja, he recorded that its twenty-eight-year-old principal José Antonio Chávez greeted him 'cordially' before offering him a cigar 'and a liquor made from coffee, a cordial which was new to me' (Bache 1823: 219). On both sides of the political gulf and on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, patriotism and partisanship produced a state of mind that was linguistically and sensually related to intoxication. Alcohol has a deep and meaningful place in human cultures. One scholar notes that it 'has accrued over the millennia a rich and almost infinitely diverse set of symbolic contexts' which can be celebratory, consolatory, medicinal, scholastic, gastronomic and sacramental in nature (Walton 2002: 5). Alcohol and other drugs have been used to achieve higher consciousness, to blunt feelings of despair, to enhance sociability, and to perform important religious rituals. Drinking has been viewed as a communal activity that releases tension and binds people together, and decried as a demon of social corruption and agent of individual ruin. It is possible that both views are true. The ancient Greeks worshipped Dionysus, the god of wine, and the Romans had their counterpart in the figure of Bacchus, also known as 'Liber'. Both cultures recognised the centrality of alcohol to their daily lives, but did not stigmatise drunkenness as worse or different to excessive indulgence in any other type of luxury (Austin 1985: xvii). With the advent of Christianity, however, a bifurcated attitude toward alcohol started to emerge. On the one hand, the Old Testament clearly holds out wine as a comfort to the sick and Church fathers incorporated it into their central liturgy, the Eucharist; on the other hand, Saint Paul praises voluntary temperance and warns that habitual drunkards would be denied a place in Heaven. [3]

The two attitudes co-existed comfortably over many centuries. Beer and wine were the predominant forms of alcoholic beverages and functioned as important sources of nutrition and medical treatment. By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, distilled liquor with much higher alcohol content had become cheaper and more accessible through improvements in technological capabilities. Cheaper, faster and more frequent states of public inebriation among the common folk caused the more genteel classes to express their concern that spirits led to a breakdown in social order and a threat to personal salvation (Schivelbusch 1992: 153). In England, critics of the seventeenth century gin craze pointed to what one historian has called 'the dangers of plebeian sociability', and considered taverns to be 'nurseries of vice' (Warner 2002: 56). Furthermore, the discourse of the English elite increasingly associated uncouth and disruptive behaviour with both the lower classes and with potentially subversive foreign elements like the Irish (Wilson 1991: 386). [4] Samuel Crumpe made the stereotype explicit in 1795 when he wrote that drunkenness is a vice 'to which the lower Irish are particularly addicted', reducing their industry, and leading to the 'riotous feuds so remarkable among the Irish' (Austin 1985: 371). These ethnic stereotypes followed the Irish Legion to Colombia where they received similar criticism for their insubordination, feuding and riotousness, all of which were code words for drunkenness in that era.

By the time the wars for Colombian independence commenced in the 1810s and 1820s, scientific opinion had started to pathologise alcohol use and eliminate moral implications and the element of free will in chronic alcohol abuse. Physicians such as the American Benjamin Rush and Briton Thomas Trotter clearly described drunkenness as, 'a disease, produced by a remote cause, and giving birth to
actions and movements in the living body, that disorder the functions of health' (Trotter 1804: 8). Alcohol use was widespread and beer, wine and spirits were consumed in quantities far exceeding those of the present day. Potable water was scarce, and difficult to transport over long distances. Furthermore, alcohol reflected important gender expectations in Anglo-American culture. Hard-drinking men who could hold their liquor and still function were seen as praiseworthy and masculine, while alcohol itself was feminised as Mother Gin or Madame Geneva and treated as an item to be conquered and consumed. [5] Indeed, one historian highlighted the masculine status conferred by alcohol consumption when he repeated Dr. Johnson's observation that 'claret is the liquor for boys, port for men, but he who aspires to be a hero [...] must drink brandy' (Kopperman 1996: 460).

Rifles and Bottles

Irish, Scottish and English recruits played a significant role in the independence wars of northern South America, and they fought with a rifle in one hand and a bottle in the other. Living in exile in London, Venezuelan envoy Luis López Méndez and Colombian minister plenipotentiary José María del Real actively recruited soldiers and sailors who were out of service after the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars. [6] Both diplomats served time in the debtors' prison for contracts undertaken on their countries’ behalf, and both offered promises to starry-eyed young men that their patriot governments were subsequently unable to keep. Nevertheless, recruitment mania was palpable on the streets of London, Edinburgh, Liverpool and Dublin in the years 1817, 1818 and 1819. Thousands of young men set sail for South American shores, hoping to strike a blow against tyranny, and perhaps find their fortune along the way. Based in London in June 1817, Gustavus Hippisley outfitted the First Venezuelan Hussars, Colonel Wilson took the Second Venezuelan Hussars, Lt. Col. James Gilmour headed an artillery brigade, and two regiments of Venezuelan Lancers also signed up with enthusiasm. The following year, several more expeditions departed, followed by General John Devereux’s ten ships filled with the future Irish Legion in 1819. It was common practice at the time to recruit soldiers and sailors in taverns; unscrupulous recruiters often cruelly took advantage of a man’s inebriated state to enlist him or even to force him onboard a soon-to-depart ship. Not surprisingly then, many of the recruits who went to Colombia were as fond of alcohol as they were patriotic. Indeed, Colonel Francis Hall blamed three-quarters of deaths among foreigners in Colombia’s wars of independence to excessive alcohol consumption and the various evils that arose from it (Hall 1827: 99).

As Spanish Ambassador to the Court of King James, the Duke of San Carlos vigorously protested against the active recruitment that was proceeding openly and unchecked while Great Britain and Spain purported to be allies. In November 1817, he succeeded in convincing the Prince Regent to issue a proclamation that banned British subjects from joining the Spanish American patriots; anyone who contravened the order would be divested of his rank and pension. The order was widely and publicly ignored however, and two years later, Parliament finally passed a more stringent Foreign Enlistment Act that again prohibited British soldiers from accepting commissions in a foreign service; before the bill took effect in September, thousands of recruits rushed to depart from Liverpool, Dublin, and other ports (Hasbrouck 1969: 56, 111). In Colombia, Simón Bolívar strategised with Luis Brión, sharing bottles of wine and awaiting their foreign recruits before undertaking any major new offensives. The Irish Legion participated in battles at Pantano de Vargas, Boyacá, and Ayacucho, among many others (Echeverri 1972: 32). Although they fought valiantly on most occasions, their reputation remained forever stained by the behaviour of a few dozen angry, hungry, bored and unpaid Irish soldiers who rampaged in frustration at Riohacha in 1820. The Legion was disbanded and absorbed into other units around at the same time, but the charges of dissipation, depredation and disobedience took longer to overcome. [7]

The Irish Legion’s involvement in South American independence was commemorated, fittingly enough, with a toast at a Dublin hotel in 1819. At a meeting to celebrate the cause of South American freedom, Charles Phillips raised his glass to praise his countrymen’s efforts on behalf of their Colombian brothers. Fully sated after a sumptuous dinner and drunk on porter, wine and lofty ideals, Phillips praised John Devereux’s and the Irish troops’ commitment to the noble cause:
To unmanacle the slave, to erect an altar on the Inquisition’s grave, to raise a people to the attitude of freedom, to found the temples of science and commerce to create a constitution, beneath whose ample arch every human creature, no matter what his sect, his colour, or his clime, may stand sublime in the dignity of manhood.

He railed against the tyranny of Ferdinand VII who kept an entire continent in chains, denying them their freedoms and perverting their Catholic faith with brutal inquisitorial techniques. Phillips turned to Devereux, and closed his speech with a dramatic flourish, saying ‘Go, then, soldier of Ireland, Go where glory awaits thee’. [8] Devereux’s critics, however, interpreted that same glory as a dangerous revolutionary tendency that threatened monarchy not just in South America, but also at home in Great Britain. An Irishman named George Flinter who fought against Devereux on the royalist side in Gran Colombia, mentioned a rumour that the mercenary general could be linked to the 1798 Irish rebellion and proclaimed that

by suppressing the spark of rebellion in the Spanish colonies, I was indirectly rendering an important service to my King and country [...] I foresaw that these unauthorised military associations, headed by a certain class of men, would be a prelude to something of a serious nature in Ireland (Flinter 1829: 9).

Irish partisans fought for (and against) Colombian independence on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

Alcohol pervaded all aspects of the soldiers’ lives. They drank while they were being recruited. They drank while they waited at port for their ship to be ready. They drank while the departure was delayed and they drank while they sailed. Contemporary memoirs are filled with anecdotes of duels, pranks and drinking games on board the ships that sailed for Colombia. Dr Thomas Trotter counted over 200 gin shops lining the harbour front at Plymouth Dock alone which he believed was ‘destroying the very vitals of our naval service’ (Trotter 1804: 48). Crossing the Tropic of Cancer on his journey to America, Captain Adam mentioned the tradition of ‘levying contributions of grog in favour of the sailors’. Another officer was appalled to discover that the crew of his ship was always too intoxicated to carry out their duties properly (Adam 1824: 35-36).

A soldier’s provisions typically included generous rations of alcohol. The ship Two Friends, for example, was delayed until a sufficient cargo of wine could be loaded. Each soldier-passenger paid £40 for his passage, which included one pint of wine, half a pint of spirits and one bottle of porter per day. [9] They stopped at Madeira to replenish their supplies; six officers purchased 180 gallons of spirits for themselves, and then ‘in order to reduce it, they were daily, nay, hourly, drinking’. On board the Emerald in 1817, £41 bought the recruit his passage and a pint of wine at dinner, a gill of spirits at supper, and a bottle of porter per day (Hippisley 1819: 40-41). Once on land and in the service of the Colombian army, recruits continued to drink regularly as part of their rations. One officer recalled that their meals consisted of ‘dried beef, plantain, biscuits, wine and London bottled porter, of which last Bolívar is remarkably fond, and had a good store with him’ (Recollections 1828 II: 5).

At the same time, officers were nervous about the toll that heavy drinking was taking on the regular troops and more than once issued orders to curtail its worst excesses. Gustavus Hippisley spoke contemptuously of the grog provided to enlisted men, saying ‘the rum I could not drink, that is the ration rum; and I would willingly have debared my companions from the use of it, as it was killing them all’ (Hippisley 1819: 276). [10] In May 1818 he issued a regimental order than barred the Venezuelan Hussars from going to grog-shops or becoming intoxicated at the risk of the most severe punishments that could be meted out; he reminded his men that Bolívar had an abhorrence to drunken soldiers who gave a bad name to the patriot cause, rendered themselves unfit for duty and drew shame and opprobrium upon the entire nation. This attitude was becoming increasingly common among the British officer corps during the Napoleonic period who wanted to prevent unsanctioned and possibly adulterated liquor from poisoning their men; their policies were given additional weight by a growing body of medical opinion that charged that one of the greatest evils of modern warfare was the ‘vast consumption of spirituous liquors’. [11]
It was not uncommon for great leaders of the era to be heavy drinkers. Lord Cochrane, the British founder of the Chilean navy, once commented contemptuously that the Argentine patriot leader José de San Martín was ‘ambitious beyond all bounds’ but ‘his physical prowess [was] prostrated by opium and brandy, to which he was a slave whilst his mental faculties day by day became more torpid from the same debilitating influence’ (Dundonald 1859 I: 222). Patriot general José Francisco Bermúdez reputedly ‘drinks hard’, while Irish Colonel Aylmer could be found ‘in a permanent state of drunkenness’. [12] According to his Irish aide-de-camp and close friend Daniel Florencio O’Leary, Simón Bolívar was ‘sober. The wines he liked best were grave and champagne [sic]. When he drank most, which was in [18]22 and [18]23, he never took at dinner a pint of the former or more than two glasses of the latter’ (O’Leary 1969: 30). An anonymous British soldier who served in the Colombian campaigns also noted that the Liberator was ‘uninfluenced by wine, which he used sparingly’ (Recollections 1828 II: 31). Even Bolívar’s harsh critic Louis Perú de Lacroix agreed that the Liberator ‘never used Aguardiente or other strong liquors. He never drank wine with lunch, nor did he put it on his dinner table except for special occasions’ (Peru de la Croix 1935: 336).

Other patriot generals were less restrained and often traded insults that centred on each other’s masculinity and sobriety. For example, Gustavus Hippisley complained that his patriot rival Mariano Montilla was neat and tidy in appearance, but was ‘so addicted to drinking, that he is scarcely known to go to his hammock sober at night and too frequently commences his potations soon after mid-day’ (Hippisley 1819: 249). For his part, Montilla regularly wrote to his superiors complaining that the Irish recruits under his command were drunken, disorderly, and behaved in a manner contrary to all military discipline; despite his clear orders, they pillaged and sacked the very same villages that they were supposed to be liberating. [13] Alcohol use became an observable component of leadership abilities and therefore a signifier not only of a one’s class status, but the degree to which one exhibited self-control, patriotism and dedication to the greater cause.

Dinners and balls were common among the elite and urban residents throughout Gran Colombia during the wars for independence and were an important vehicle for expressing one’s patriotic sentiments and national allegiances. When Gustavus Hippisley dined with General Bermúdez at Angostura in 1818, both men drank to the health of the King of England and success to the South American patriots (Hippisley 1819: 248). Visiting Colombia in November 1822, Richard Bache recorded a dinner given in his honour at which he was served twelve or fourteen courses of food, exquisite wines, and had to sit through long toasts or ‘short patriotic speeches most in vogue’. Everywhere he went during his journey, however, he was pleased to note that Colombians exhibited an impressively sober character that was in marked contrast to that of his fellow citizens back home:

> The wines were excellent, rich cordials, Madeira, muscadel, and the inspiring champagne [sic] flowed in abundance, yet our English vice of excess on these occasions is never indulged in by the Colombians (Bache 1823: 52).

If Colombians were considered to be a sober people, British observers considered *caraqueños* [residents of Caracas] to be more riotous and prone to violent outbreaks. Similarly, the Irish and the English were understood to be habitual drunks. Mariano Montilla reported to the Governor of Jamaica that the Irish soldiers had united dishonour with barbarism at Riohacha and complained to anyone who would listen about their rebellion, insolence and insubordination. [14] Significantly, these are identical to the terms that English critics applied to Irish rebels and Catholic agitators in their domestic rhetoric.

Although there were regular and severe shortages of most consumer goods and foodstuffs, it seems that alcohol continued to flow freely. Colonel Adam fondly remembered a dance at Angostura where he enjoyed fruits, sweetmeats, fine wines and plenty of *sangaree* [*sangria*], with the town’s patriotic young ladies (Adam 1824: 130). Gustavus Hippisley dined with the Governor of St. Bartholomew and enjoyed meat, preserves, fruits, confections and ‘every sort of European wines, porter, cider [sic] and perry’ (Hippisley 1819: 125). These elaborate meals, however, were a dramatic exception to the life of privation faced by average recruits. Soldiers regularly complained about their constant hunger and recounted
the horror of being reduced to eating cats, rats and dogs. Alcohol was an important source of nutrition and calories for the recruits, and helped to distract them from the miseries of their current condition. Daniel Florencio O’Leary noted that Colonel Gregor MacGregor ‘considered his loss and his fatigue and dangers to be rewarded by the capture of the tobacco and rum found at Chaguaramas’ in 1816 (O’Leary 1969: 44). Captain Adam faced heavy rains on his trek to Angostura in December 1819 ‘aided by a glass or two of rum’ and found that liberal use of spirits distracted him from the bad food and biting insects (Adam 1824: 57, 94).

When the battles died down and former enemies sat down to negotiate their peace treaties, alcohol figured prominently at the events. Sometimes the drinking was joyful and celebratory; other times, excessive indulgence resulted in insults being added to injuries. For example, when Spanish royalist general Rafael Sevilla agreed to capitulate to British and Irish generals at Margarita Island in 1820, he was already disgusted by the liberal Riego revolt back in Spain that had ended support for his regiment in America, but he became even more offended by the pressure to toast his victorious hosts with rum and beer into the early hours of the morning. At another meeting with the British generals, Sevilla recalled the exuberant toasts ‘repeated an infinite number of times, [with] the best Spanish wines, until we had emptied many, many bottles [...] until we were all drunk, we [Spaniards] more than the English’ (Sevilla 1916: 194, 257). That same year, Simón Bolívar recognised the great contribution that foreign recruits had made to his Colombian campaign by frequently making toasts to the health and continued success of the sons of ‘the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland’ (Recollections 1828 I: 246). He wrote to Francisco de Paula Santander that his summit meeting with Spanish General Pablo Morillo had gone well and had been punctuated by ‘many courteous and clever toasts.[...] Indeed it would take a volume to record the toasts that were offered.’ [15]

Rum, recruitment and revolution flowed in tandem during the wars for Colombian independence. A soldier’s life was hard and often short, and he took meaning wherever he found it, whether it was the lofty rhetoric of liberty and patriotism, or the dizzying depths of a glass of grog. In differing circumstances, alcohol could be used to motivate the troops, or to keep them sedated; it could be used to fire them up for battle or to diffuse their energies after it was over. Spirits lubricated every social function, from meals in hotel taverns when the lucky recruits were billeted in Colombian towns to the momentous diplomatic summits where the fates of nations were signed with a pen and a toast. In all these ways, alcohol use among the Irish and British recruits in the service of Colombian independence reflected broader trends on both sides of the Atlantic. Class status, masculine identity and leadership qualities increasingly came to be identified with a man’s approach to liquor. Similarly, drunkenness and sobriety were behavioural traits that became associated with particular nationalities or ethnicities. Colombians condemned the lawless and dissolute Venezuelans much in the same way that English politicians and pundits targeted the rowdy and rebellious Irish. Thomas Paine, known to be a heavy drinker himself, was widely read throughout Spanish America during the independence era, and correctly gauged that those were, indeed, times that tried men’s souls. Liquor, like liberty, could not be consumed in moderation.
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Notes


[4] Porter, a heavily fermented, strong, dark beer, originated in London in the 1720s but was perfected by Arthur Guinness in Ireland and reinforced the English tendency to link drunkenness with the Irish people.


[7] The Morning Chronicle reported on the Irish soldiers’ and patriots’ burning of Riohacha around the same time as the events of Peterloo revealed the intensity of lower-class discontent in Great Britain, Morning Chronicle (Tuesday, 25 July 1820).


[10] Regimental Order dated (San Fernando, 2 May 1818) and reprinted on p.585.


[14] Montilla to the Duke of Manchester (April 1820) quoted in Cuervo Márquez 1938 I: 396; Montilla to Santander (Barranquilla, 30 July 1820) in Homenaje, II:690. John DeCourcy Ireland notes that the Irish Legion was disbanded for 'indiscipline' in 1819, 'Soldiers and Seamen', p.299.
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