

After Junin followed the battle of Ayacucho, fought on December 9, 1824, at which Bolivar was not present, although he had really directed its operations, having given his instructions to General Sucre, the commander of the patriot army. The Viceroy, La Serna, had collected the whole Spanish army, which was 10,000 men strong, while Sucre's army consisted only of 4500 Colombians, 1200 Peruvians, and 80 Argentinians, the remnant of San Martin's army. Both armies had been for two weeks before the battle within sight of each other, manœuvring on a broken and difficult ground for the purpose of selecting their positions, and both fought with great bravery at Ayacucho, losing about twenty-five per cent. of their respective forces. The loss of the Spaniards was 2000 killed and wounded, and 3000 prisoners; the remainder of the army surrendered to Sucre, who sent them back home at Peru's expense. The result was a complete success for the patriots, who in that battle finally destroyed Spanish power in South America.

San Martin never had any political ambition and never administered the affairs of the government in the countries that he liberated, excepting the time when he exercised the government in Peru as protector. He respected the different nations which he found in America, that is, the political divisions established by the Spaniards during the colonial domination based on similarity of races and on natural geographical barriers, and did not attempt to annex Peru or any portion of it to his country or to Chili; while Bolivar had great political ambition, always assuming the reins of government in every country which he liberated, being at the same time Liberator and Dictator, and annexing some of them to Colombia.

Both San Martin and Bolivar died poor, the former having spent during the war a large fortune which he had inherited. San Martin ended his life in Europe in 1850 as a voluntary exile, while Bolivar died in Santa Marta in 1830, at the age of forty-seven, broken-hearted at the disruption of the Republic of Colombia, which he had founded, by the breaking out of civil war in that country, and at the ingratitude of many whom he had befriended.

Had they lived before Plutarch's time the lives of these two men were worthy of appearing in his *Parallel Lives of Celebrated Greeks and Romans*, and they would indeed have excelled in lustre many of those commemorated in his book.

When the enormous difficulties are considered that the liberating armies had to contend with, traversing immense distances in a very difficult and broken country without railways or even wagon-roads, having often to transport their artillery on mule-back, without any commissariat or money to pay the army, and often even without arms or ammunition, without any Government to lend its aid, as was the case with San Martin, and with constant changes of government, and

even anarchy in some cases, what those men accomplished may be regarded as truly wonderful, and their march will bear favorable comparison with Alexander's invasion of Persia, with the difference in Alexander's favor that he went into a rich country, and had at his disposal the spoils of the Persian royal family, one of the richest at that time, while these men went into a poor and unsettled country, terribly ravaged by a destructive war.

In Mexico, as in all the other Spanish colonies, the war of independence had begun in 1810, and we consider that it ended on September 27, 1821, when Iturbide entered the City of Mexico with his victorious army, although the war had been practically ended when the Spanish Viceroy, O'Donoju, signed with Iturbide, at the city of Cordova, on August 24, 1821, a treaty in which he recognized on behalf of the Spanish Government the independence of Mexico. In a paper entitled "The Philosophy of the Mexican Revolutions" I have given more details about the war of independence in Mexico, which I think unnecessary to repeat here.

In what is now called Central America the people remained under the Spanish Government without any attempt to proclaim independence, very likely because they thought they could not cope with the power of the Spanish Viceroy in Mexico, until they heard of Iturbide's success, after which they proclaimed their independence and annexation to Mexico on September 15, 1821, seceding from Mexico in 1823, and establishing then the Central American Confederation, under the name of the United Provinces of Central America, a confederation which lasted until 1839, when each of the five States became an independent nation. In a paper entitled "Boundary Question between Mexico and Guatemala," I have spoken more at length about the independence of Guatemala.

It is a remarkable fact that almost all the leaders of the Spanish-American independence were shot either by the Spaniards, or by their own people on account of internal dissensions. Hidalgo, Morelos, and Iturbide in Mexico, and a long list of others in South America, suffered that fate. The Spaniards considered the insurgents as rebels and traitors, and gave them no quarter; they believed that by pursuing a sanguinary policy they would awe the masses and prevent them from taking part in the insurrection.

Many others met a violent death after independence had been achieved, like Iturbide and Guerrero in Mexico, Sucre and Cordoba in Colombia, and Bermudez in Venezuela. Many escaped death on the scaffold by ostracizing themselves, like O'Higgins in Chili, San Martin in Argentina, and even Bolivar was overtaken by death at the port of Santa Marta, on the eve of sailing for Europe.

While Spain was waging a war of independence against France, and

the Spanish King was held in captivity by Napoleon, that is, from 1808 to 1814, she could with difficulty defend her American colonies, and only occasionally did she send reinforcements to the royalists maintaining their authority there; but when, with the assistance of England, the French were driven from Spain, after Napoleon's downfall in 1814, and Ferdinand VII. was restored to the throne, the Spanish monarch took active measures to subdue his American dominions and sent out large expeditions, the principal one, under General Morillo and consisting of 10,000 veterans, being intended for the La Plata Provinces, but finally landing in Venezuela; and with this expedition and others Spanish rule in America was almost restored.

In 1819 Ferdinand, assisted by the French, and as it appears by Russia also, straining every nerve, had collected at Cadiz a very large expedition, consisting of about 20,000 men, for the purpose of putting an end, as he anticipated, to the American insurrections; but the military chiefs of the expedition rebelled against the despotic government of the King, and proclaimed the restoration of the Liberal Constitution decreed by the Cortes in 1812, which constitution the King was obliged to accept, at least for the time being; and thus was frustrated Ferdinand's last serious attempt to subdue his rebellious subjects. During the insurrection the Spanish Government had sent out eighteen expeditions, consisting of about 45,000 men, at a cost of about \$75,000,000, which was then a very large force and a very large amount of money.

Spanish Overtures for Compromise.—The Liberal Cabinet, established after the restoration of the Constitution of 1820, believed that they could restore the Spanish power in America by compromising with the revolted colonies and granting them a degree of autonomy, or possibly by carrying out the plan proposed by Count Aranda, and, acting under authority granted to the King by the Cortes in two resolutions approved in 1820 and 1821, to enter into negotiations with the governments established in the American colonies, sent special commissioners to some of the colonies to offer them autonomy on condition that they should take the oath of allegiance to the King.

Ferdinand VII., then King of Spain, at the urgent solicitation of the Liberal leaders, or rather compelled by them, issued a proclamation in April, 1820, of which the following is an extract: "A sad experience of six years, and the excitement brought about by its energetic manifestations, had convinced everybody that the policy unwisely restored in 1814 had brought about greater evils, and had been a drawback to the advancement made until then." The King furthermore said that "the Spanish Americans, drawn aside from the pathway of rectitude, had succeeded in obtaining what they sought through war,—that is, tears and disaster." Wherefore he invited them

to enter into peace negotiations with their metropolitan brethren on an equal footing. But, in order to attain this end, he offered them the rights they had under the Constitution of 1812, which they had rejected when they declared their independence. Finally, Ferdinand VII. said in this proclamation that he made his offer so "that there should be a renewal of the friendly relations existing during the past three centuries, and in conformity with the enlightenment of the age," and threatened that force should be employed if his paternal advice for harmony and union was not accepted.

The Spanish Cortes issued in 1820 a decree extending amnesty to all those who had taken part in the insurrection of the American colonies against Spain, and soon afterwards a second one, by which they authorized the sending of commissioners to the insurgent colonies for the purpose of ending the war by peaceful means.

Commissioners were sent to Bolivar in Colombia and San Martin in Peru. Bolivar accepted the invitation of the Spanish commissioners, and sent his own commissioners to Spain, but with instructions to treat under the basis of the recognition of the independence of Colombia, and he did so more to gain time than with any idea of coming to a satisfactory agreement.

The change of policy brought about in Spain by the success of the Liberals and the decision of the Cortes just referred to, explains why the Spanish representatives, both in Mexico and Peru, accepted the independence of those countries on condition of establishing there monarchies under a Spanish prince. But these agreements were finally rejected by the King of Spain, who, as a true Bourbon, would not hear of any suggestion tending to the independence of the colonies, but who, on the contrary, as long as he lived, was continually making efforts to fit out expeditions against them; and in 1829 he sent a large one from Havana, under General Barradas, against Mexico, which landed at Tampico, but was defeated and obliged to return to that port. Ferdinand VII. was consistent in not recognizing the independence of the colonies, even after it had been for many years an accomplished fact, and recognition by Spain did not take place until 1836, after his death.

American Monarchical Views.—The Republican seed had been sown in America by the Pilgrims in New England, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the cavaliers in Virginia; and when the United States established their independence under a republican form of government, it was almost impossible for the other new countries to adopt institutions of a less liberal character.

If Charles III. had accepted Count de Aranda's advice to establish three empires in America, all the turmoil and loss of life which were necessary to accomplish independence, and which followed the same, would have been avoided, and free institutions and a republican form

of government would have finally been established peacefully and by evolution.

Several attempts were made to establish a monarchical form of government among the new nations of America. Godoy, the Prime Minister and guiding spirit of Charles IV., of Spain, advised his sovereign, after he had been dethroned by the Emperor Napoleon in 1808, to go to America and establish his empire there. Had Charles IV. followed that advice, the example of Brazil would have been repeated in the Spanish colonies, and this would have allowed them to pass from a despotic to a republican form of government without the serious disturbances, the turmoils, and the bloodshed which followed their independence, and liberal institutions would have finally prevailed, as was the case with Brazil. John VI. of Portugal, who did what was suggested to Charles IV. of Spain, that is, established his empire in Brazil, when he was driven from his country, was unable to found an absolute monarchy in America, and he returned to Portugal only to establish there a constitutional monarchy; and the Brazilian empire which succeeded him was really a Democratic government with a remarkably good man as a figure-head on the throne.

San Martin and the principal leaders of the Argentine revolution, foreseeing the unrest and political disturbance which the adoption of republican institutions would necessarily entail on the new nations, they not being prepared for that form of government, which is adapted only for an enlightened people, capable of self-government, favored the establishment of a constitutional monarchy as affording the best guarantee of the life and stability of the new nations, and in those views they had the support of the Chilian Government under O'Higgins and of the Lautaro Lodge, a political secret society established in Buenos Ayres for the purpose of securing independence, which was afterwards extended by San Martin to Chili and Peru. In this they were largely influenced by Montesquieu, who, by his praises of the English Constitution, had inculcated in the French and Spanish speaking people of the world the opinion that it was a perfect form of government.

In 1814, at the suggestion of England, it was proposed by the Argentine Government that a Spanish infante, or son of the King of Spain, should be sent as king to the La Plata Provinces, a proposition which was not accepted by the Spanish King. The Argentine Congress, which declared the independence of their country in 1816, accepted secretly the monarchical form of government, and the Argentine representatives in Europe were authorized to enter into negotiations with the European powers for the purpose of establishing in the Argentine Provinces that form of government, the prevailing idea being to establish a monarchy with a native prince, a descendant of the old

Incas of Peru, on the throne, fixing the capital at the city of Cuzco. Between 1816 and 1819 the monarchical plan was again agitated. France was very anxious that a monarchical government should be established in Argentine, and the Argentine statesmen, believing that if they accepted that form of government, the European powers would support the independence of their country, favored it, and authorized their representatives in France and England to accept as king the French candidate, the Prince of Luca, a member of the Bourbon family and a nephew of the King of Spain.

While San Martin was Protector of Peru he sent to Europe, in December, 1821, Señor Don Juan Garcia del Rio to negotiate an alliance with Great Britain for the purpose of accepting a prince of the English royal family to be Emperor of Peru, on condition that he accepted the constitution which the nation's representatives should approve; and if the English Government was not disposed to accept this scheme, the same proposition was to be made to the Emperor of Russia, accepting a prince of his dynasty or any candidate whom he should propose, or finally any prince from the reigning houses of France and Portugal would be accepted, even the Prince of Luca.

But when in 1823 Mr. Canning stated to the French Government that England did not require the establishment of a monarchy as a condition of recognizing the independence of a new nation, the idea was given up. The appointment of a native as monarch, as in the case of Iturbide in Mexico, proved the futility of the idea of making any of the revolutionary leaders king or emperor.

Anarchy made such headway in Colombia that Bolivar in his message to the Colombian Congress, of January 20, 1830, said "I blush to say it, but independence is the only blessing we have obtained, and that at the cost of everything else," and it is believed that he became then a convert to the idea of a constitutional monarchy.

Many persons continued to be of the opinion that the best way to end anarchy was to establish a monarchy under European auspices. The futility of this theory has been since demonstrated by the tragic failure of Maximilian's experiment in Mexico. This experiment was undertaken under the best auspices. The Emperor Napoleon supported it with all the power of France, aided by that of Austria and Belgium, who contributed with armed contingencies to its establishment, and the so-called emperor was taken from the oldest and one of the noblest reigning families of Europe, the House of Hapsburg; its complete failure, therefore, proves conclusively the folly it would be to think of the establishment of a monarchy in America.

A distinguished Spanish-American historian¹ says that the United

¹ General Bartolome Mitre, *Historia de San Martin y de la Emancipacion Sud-Americana*, vol. i., chap. i., paragraph xv., p. 107, Buenos Ayres edition of 1887.

States in the first decade of the nineteenth century was a sun without planets, which shed light only upon its own sphere and that the appearance of a group of new nations which came out of the nebulous colonies of the South, formed for the first time in the history of the world a planetary system in the political order with natural laws, universal attractions, and democratic harmony, raising the United States to the rank of a first-class nation.

The simultaneous establishment of ten republics in the American continent just at the time when a very strong reaction was taking place in Europe in favor of absolute monarchical government, was indeed one of the most remarkable phenomena of the present century, and justified Mr. Canning in saying that the republics of the new world would restore the equilibrium of the old.

The psychological phenomena which marked the transplanting of the European races, Spanish and Anglo-Saxon, to the American continent, is very interesting, as most of the encumbrances, abuses, and wrongs prevailing in Europe as the result of the feudal system and of many centuries of hard struggles and oppression, were wiped out by their establishment in a new field with different environment. Class privilege, hereditary rank, the autocratic ideas, the complete disregard of the rights of the people which had become in Europe deeply-rooted institutions, were blotted out in the New World. Just as water that after many years of stagnation in a lake becomes polluted, by transferring it to another place loses through evaporation all its impurities and is restored to its pristine purity, so it happened with the transplanting of European races to the New World.

Differences between the Independence in Mexico and South America.— I think it worth while to notice some of the most striking differences which I find in the war of independence in Mexico and in South America. In the chapter, "Beginning of Mexican Independence," I have already stated the striking difference between the bold way in which independence was at once proclaimed in Mexico and the indirect manner in which it was done in almost every other country in South America, and here I will point out some of the most notable differences.

In South America the movement of independence began with the educated classes which were the higher classes, that is, the men of Spanish descent born in America, who had had the opportunity of acquiring some education by reading books forbidden by the Inquisition, but which in some way had found their way into their hands. They became impressed with the cause of independence, and finally were the leaders of that cause, while the lower classes by ignorance and prejudice generally favored the existing condition of things, and in the beginning opposed independence. But in Mexico the higher classes,

either because they were more ignorant than in the South American colonies, or because the advantages they derived from the Spanish rule were greater, on the whole sided with the King, and offered the most decided opposition to the cause of independence. The leaders of this cause were the poor priests, who, of course had some education, and were great patriots, and they were assisted by the masses, including the Indians.

The movement for independence, which in the other Spanish colonies originated with the higher classes, in Mexico sprang originally from the lower classes, the higher classes always opposing it. Miranda, Bolivar, Mosquera, and Bermudez in Venezuela; Alvear, Belgrano, Pueyrredon, and Rivadavia in Buenos Ayres; Nariño, Caldas, Zea, Torres, and Gomez in Colombia; O'Higgins, Rozas, and the Carrera brothers in Chili; Riva Agüero, and Unanue in Peru; Montufar and Rocafuerte in Quito; Caro in Cuba, all belonged to the higher classes of those countries, while Hidalgo and Morelos were only humble Mexican priests.

A point in which the case of Mexico differs from the other Spanish colonies is in regard to the Indians. Several Indian insurrections took place in South America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which sometimes assumed a very serious character, but which were finally suppressed by the Spanish authorities. In all these cases the Indians intended to revert to their old form of government, that is, the one that they had before the conquest, thus really inaugurating a war of races, which deprived them of the assistance of the creoles, but in the war of independence in South America the Indians remained passive, and the movement was headed and carried out almost exclusively by the creoles. The gaucho of Argentina, the llanero of Venezuela, the roto of Chili, the cholo of Upper Peru were all creoles, while in Mexico we never had any Indian insurrection for the purpose of reverting to the Montezuma empire, and our Indians assisted manfully and bravely in our war of independence against Spain, being really our main reliance.

The principal difference between the war of independence as carried on in Mexico and in South America, was the attitude of the Catholic clergy. In Mexico the clergy was the mainstay of the Spanish Government, while in the South American colonies the clergy either remained passive or indifferent to the struggle, or sided with the patriots.

When one of the Mexican priests who sided with the independence, and especially if they were leaders like Hidalgo, Morelos, Matamoros, etc., fell into the hands of the Spaniards, they were at once placed at the disposal of the clergy, and tried by the Inquisition as transgressors of divine law and as heretics, and finally degraded in a very pompous

public ceremony, before they were given up to the military authorities who tried them for the purpose of obtaining information about their plans and followers, and shot them without mercy. I am not aware that the process of degradation took place in the other Spanish-American colonies. The higher dignitaries of the Catholic clergy in Mexico attempted to make the common people believe that all patriots were heretics and devils, and that the object of the revolution was to destroy the Catholic religion, with the purpose of giving to the war of independence the character of a religious war.

The Spanish colony in South America which most resembled Mexico in this regard was Peru, where the higher clergy lived in opulence and were decidedly attached to the King, while the lower clergy were in favor of independence, and the participation of the clergy in Peru was of little consequence as compared with what took place in Mexico. The Peruvian clergy in general, and especially the parish priests, were decidedly in favor of independence. Not so, however, the higher dignitaries. During the uprising of Pumacahua, a leader in Upper Peru, which began at Cuzco, on August 3, 1814, the municipality and the ecclesiastical council elected a Junta to head the revolution, and the curates and monks preached rebellion in the adjoining provinces. The curate of the Sanctuary of Cuzco, Ildefonso Muñecas, having distinguished himself for his ardor, had been one of the principal promoters of the revolution, and took afterwards a leading part in the same. San Martin having due respect for his gray hairs did not repress him in any manner. The Archbishop of Charcas, the Bishops of Cuzco, Maynas, Huamango, and secretly the Bishop of Arequipa, had constituted themselves promoters of the movement against independence and ardent orators of the royalist cause. Lord Cochrane, in his *Memoirs*, of which I have seen a translation into Spanish, published in Lima in 1863, states that two monks incited the garrison of Chiloe and ran over the walls with a crucifix in one hand and a lance in the other to oppose the patriots. The Archbishop of Lima could not withdraw from the influence which surrounded and attracted him.

Archbishop Las Heras, although submitting to the inevitable, obeyed the impulse of his conscience and the commands of the Pope when "he recommended fidelity to the Spanish monarch and the uprooting and complete destruction of the seeds of disturbance and sedition that the enemy had sown in America, inspiring his flock with a just and stable hate, leaving no stone unturned,"¹ for which he was exiled by San Martin. But even in Peru, the Archbishop himself, who was a native-born Spaniard, did not refrain from allowing a Te Deum to be sung in the Cathedral of Lima when independence was pro-

¹ *Encyclic of Pope Pius VII.*, of January 30, 1816. Later Pope Leo XII. issued in 1824, another encyclic against South American independence.

claimed, and he attended himself that Te Deum, something which no Mexican bishop would have consented to do.

The South American leaders, if we are to judge by the opinions expressed in the document above referred to, and more especially General Miranda, who had undoubted military talent, and was a distinguished soldier and an enthusiast in the cause of independence, believed that independence could not be achieved with native resources only, but that it required as an indispensable element of success the armed assistance of foreign nations, although they never succeeded in obtaining any. The views of the Mexican leaders were altogether different. They never dreamed of seeking any foreign assistance, but relied entirely upon the strength and resources of their own country. It is true that Hidalgo, soon after he proclaimed independence, and while he was retreating toward the north, sent a representative to the United States, but I believe that he had no intention of asking for material assistance, and desired only to obtain the good-will of a neighboring country in the contingency that, in the course of his military operations, he should reach its frontiers.

One of the differences between the struggle for independence in Mexico and that in South America, is that in the latter case the Argentine Provinces, Chili, and Colombia had diplomatic agents in Europe who worked steadily for the cause, and kept the leaders of the revolution well informed of the movements in Spain and in Europe against them, and even took part in the conspiracies in Spain for the purpose of preventing the sending of reinforcements to America, spending much money for that purpose, while Mexico was entirely isolated, had no representatives of any kind in Europe or the United States, and she depended entirely on her own resources, without even dreaming of foreign assistance of any kind. In the lists of official and unofficial agents sent by the colonies to the United States there does not appear any coming from Mexico, nor does it appear that the United States sent any commissioner or agent to Mexico, to inquire into the condition of the country.

As a consequence of the more intimate contact between the leaders of the independent movement in South America and Europe and of Mexico's isolation, the former had the active support, not only of foreign officers of high rank and even of private soldiers in the army as well as in the navy, but of whole regiments, like the Britannic Legion of Bolivar. The South American patriots had in their ranks some of the most distinguished European officers, among others Lord Cochrane in Chili, and Marshall Brayer, who had fought with Napoleon, and was with San Martin in Peru, while in Mexico, with the exception of Mina and his fellow-followers, who were not foreigners but Spaniards, I do not know of any foreigner who took part in our war of independence.