

also <sup>134</sup> equally impossible. The abuses which now actually exist would not be reformed, and our regeneration would be unavailing. These American States require the care of paternal governments, that the sores & wounds inflicted by ~~despotism~~ <sup>despotism</sup> and wars may be healed. The Metropolis for example might be ~~despotism~~ Mexico, which is the only fit place from its <sup>intrinsick</sup> ~~extensive~~ power, and without that in fact there can be no metropolis. Let us suppose the Isthmus of Panama as a central point of this vast Continent, would not these last Continents in their <sup>present</sup> ~~state~~ <sup>circumstances</sup> of ~~disorder~~, and even in ~~the present~~ <sup>actual</sup> disorder & for a Government alone, to animate, give life to, & <sup>put in action</sup> ~~support~~ all the resources of public <sup>prosperity</sup> ~~property~~ to correct, illustrate and perfect the new World, it would indeed require the faculties of a divinity, and <sup>at least</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>of the</sup> ~~perfection~~ and virtues of all mankind.

That party Spirit which now afflicts our provinces would then burn with greater fury, from the want of a sufficient power to restrain it. Besides the Magistrates of the Chief cities would not allow the preponderancy to the Metropolitans, but would consider them as so many Tyrants, and their jealousy would carry them so far as to compare them with the odious Spaniards. In <sup>fact</sup> such a Monarchy would be like a ponderous Atlas, which its own weight would shake down on the <sup>slightest</sup> ~~slightest~~ convulsion.

Mr De Pout has very wisely divided America into fifteen or seventeen distinct States, independant of each other, and governed by as many Sovereigns. I agree with him in this division, because America <sup>can contain</sup> ~~contains~~ <sup>of</sup> seventeen Nations; but with regard to his governments, although more easy to be acquired, they are less useful, and consequently I am not favorable to the opinion of American Monarchies, and I will give you my reasons. The interest of a republic, when well understood, is confined to preservation, prosperity and glory, <sup>not</sup> ~~exercising~~ <sup>exercising</sup> liberty <sup>imprudently</sup> ~~excessively~~, for that is precisely opposite to it, no stimulus excites republicans to extend their boundaries, <sup>of their nation</sup> to the sacrifice of their means, or for the sole purpose



of inducing their neighbours to participate in a liberal con-  
stitution. They acquire no right, no advantage by conquering  
them unless they reduce them to Colonies, Conquests, or allies of the like by following  
the example of Rome. Their conquests are  
reduced to Colonies, or made allies.



Such maxims & examples are in direct opposition to the principles of justice in republican systems, and I will say more, <sup>they</sup> are in manifest opposition to the interest of the people; for when a State becomes too extensive either in itself, or from its dependencies, it falls into confusion, converts its free form into a sort of tyranny, abandons those principles which <sup>ought</sup> to preserve it, and at length degenerates into despotism. The essence of small republics is permanency, that of great ones is changeable, but always inclined to dominion. of the first almost all have been of long duration; of the second Rome alone maintained itself for ages; but this is because Rome alone was a republic, and the rest of her territories were not so, but were governed by different laws and institutions.

Very different is the policy of a King whose constant attention is directed to the augmentation of his possessions, his riches and his prerogatives; and rightly enough for his authority increases with these acquisitions as much with respect to his neighbours, as to his own subjects, who fear in him a power as formidable as his Empire, and which is preserved by war and conquest. For these reasons I think that the Americans, desirous of peace, sciences, arts, commerce, and agriculture, would prefer republics to monarchies; and it occurs to me that this wish corresponds with the views which Europe has with respect to us.

I do not approve of that federal system, between popularity and representation, as it is too perfect, and requires virtues and political talents <sup>much superior to ours</sup> which we do not possess. For the same reason I disapprove of a monarchy composed of aristocracy & democracy which has raised England to such fortune and splendor, not being able amongst republics & monarchies to <sup>obtain</sup> a perfect and <sup>complete</sup> accommodating system, we content ourselves with not admitting any dogmatical, anarchical, or oppressive tyrannies, but sought a medium between the two extremes, which would conduct us to the same end, to dishonor & unhappiness. I will <sup>explain</sup>



the result of my <sup>though</sup> ~~speculations~~ <sup>14 v.</sup> as to the <sup>future</sup> best fate which can attend  
America, not perhaps the best, but that which will be most  
Acceptable to her

From the situation, riches, population and Character of the  
Mexicans, I imagine they will first establish a representative republic,  
in which the executive branch will possess great power, and will be  
centered in an individual, who if he discharges his functions with  
diligence and justice, it is natural to suppose will preserve a durable  
authority. If his incapacity, or violent administration, should excite any  
popular commotion, that may prove successful, the very executive  
power will ~~disperse~~ <sup>disperse</sup> into an assembly. If the more  
powerful party should be military, or aristocratical, they would  
probably found a Monarchy, which at first might be constitutional  
and limited, but which would inevitably afterwards decline into  
an unlimited one; for it must be admitted that there is nothing  
more difficult in political order than the preservation of a mixed  
monarchy, and it is equally true that none but a patriotic Nation  
like the English, can submit to the authority of a King, and  
maintain the Spirit of Liberty under the dominion of a Sceptre  
and Crown.

The provinces on the Atlantic of Panama as far as Guatemala  
will perhaps form a league - This magnificent position between  
the two great seas, may in time become the Emporium of the  
Universe. Her Canal will shorten the distances in the world,  
will extend the commercial intercourse of Europe, Asia &  
America, and will bring to that happy region the products  
of the four quarters of the globe. Here only <sup>perhaps will be the day</sup> can the Capital  
of the Earth be fixed as Constantine <sup>wished</sup> ~~Rustant~~ <sup>to be that of the</sup>  
old World.

New Granada will unite with Venezuela if they agree  
in the form of a central republic, and Maracaybo from its  
situation and advantage will be the Capitol - <sup>no 8</sup> This Government  
will imitate the English, with this distinction, that in place  
of a King, they will have an executive power which will be  
elective, perhaps during life, but certainly <sup>never</sup> ~~not~~ hereditary,  
with for a republic <sup>times of political</sup>  
a hereditary legislature, senate or house which in <sup>popular words</sup>  
~~times~~ may interpose between the <sup>corruptions</sup> of the people,



17

~~burning rays~~

free elected

and the ~~rest~~ of the Government, and a legislative body called by the free elective franchises and without any other restrictions than those imposed on the English House of Commons. This constitution will be composed of all forms, but will not I hope participate in all vices. as this is my native Country, I have an incontestible right to wish her what in my opinion may be most to her advantage.

15



It is possible that New Granada may not agree in the recognition of a central government, as she is extremely partial to Federalism. In such case, she may perhaps establish a State by herself, which, if it should last, will be very happy from the very great and various advantages she possesses.

We know little of the opinions which prevail in Buenos Ayres, Chile, and Peru; But judging from that little, and from appearances, it is fair to presume that in Buenos Ayres there will be a central government, in which the Military will take the lead, on account of their internal dissensions and external wars. This constitution will necessarily degenerate into an oligarchy, or Monarchy, under certain restrictions, and the denomination of which no one is able to divine.

The Kingdom of Chili is intended by nature, from the peculiarity of its situation, from the innocent and virtuous customs of the inhabitants, from the example of her neighbors the free republicans of Arica, to enjoy the blessings which emanate from the just and moderate laws of a Republic. If in any part of America that system of Government should continue for any time, I am inclined to think it will be in Chili. The spirit of liberty has there never been extinguished, the vices of Europe & Asia will very late, and perhaps never, corrupt the pure morals of that part of the Earth. Her territory is limited, and will always be beyond the reach of the contagious influence of the rest of Mankind; her laws, customs and manners will never be polluted.







How sublime would be the spectacle if the Isthmus of Panama should be come to us what Corinth was to the Greeks. I hope that some day we shall have the happiness of installing in one august congress the representatives of republics, Kingdoms and Empires, and of treating and discussing with Nations <sup>16</sup> of the other ~~three~~ parts of the Globe, the great and interesting questions of Peace and War. This sort of Corporation may very possibly occur during some happy epoch of our regeneracy - any other expectation is futile, such for instance as that of the abbott St Pierre, who with commendable delirium conceived the idea of reuniting a European Congress, to decide on the Fate and interests of these Nations



"Important and happy changes" you observe "may very" frequently be produced by individual exertions.

"The Americans have a tradition" which relates that when Quetzalcohuatl, the ~~Hermit~~ <sup>or Widen</sup> Budha of South America, resigned his power, and <sup>withdrew</sup> ~~abandoned~~ them, he promised that after the expiration







<sup>appointed</sup>  
 a ~~desert~~ time, he would return to them, re-establish their government,  
 and restore them to happiness. This tradition encourages the belief that  
 he will shortly re-appear. Consider <sup>for what effects</sup> would be  
 produced by the appearance of an individual among them, who would  
 accomplish <sup>without doubt</sup> the character of Quetzalcohnath, the <sup>Worthy</sup> Budha of <sup>the</sup> Aztecs,  
 or Mercurius, of whom other nations have said so much. Do you not  
 think it would <sup>result in the rise of a patriotic party of sufficient magnitude to combat or expel the</sup> ~~induce~~ all parties to unite? <sup>union of all parties</sup> ~~Do you not~~ think all that  
 is <sup>necessary</sup> ~~is necessary~~ to put them in a condition to resist the Spanish troops,  
 and other partizans of corrupt Spain; to enable them to establish  
 a powerful empire, with a free government, and liberal laws?

I agree with you that individual efforts may be  
 productive of general good, particularly during revolutionary periods.  
 But Quetzalcohnath the hero and prophet of Anahuac, is not the  
 one capable of bringing about the prodigious benefits which you  
 contemplate. This personage is very superficially, and not  
 very advantageously, known to the people of Mexico, for such  
 is the fate of the vanquished, although they may be God.  
 Historians and literati have carefully confined themselves to  
 the investigation of his origin; his mission, whether true or  
 false, his prophecies, and the termination of his career.  
 It is disputed whether he was an apostle of Christ, or a Pagan.  
 Some suppose that the definition of his name both in the  
 Mexican and Chinese languages is Saint Thomas; some  
 that it means a feathered snake, as Torquemada; and others  
 that he is the famous prophet of Tlacatan, Chulam, Cambal.  
 In a word, most of the Mexican authors, polemic and prophetic  
 historians, have treated with more or less probability the question  
 of the true character of Quetzalcohnath - Acosta says that  
 he established a religion, the <sup>rites</sup> ~~rites~~, dogmas, and mysteries of  
 which bore an admirable affinity to that of Christ; and  
 perhaps more than any other resembles it. Notwithstanding  
 this, many catholic writers have continued to disallow  
 that this prophet was a true one, and have refused to  
 recognize