

IMAGES AND INFLUENCES:  
THE LEGACY OF THE FOUNDING  
FATHERS AND THE FEDERAL SYSTEM  
IN ECUADOR

*Joedd Price*  
*University of Delaware*

Generally speaking, all nations have stereotyped images of other nations. These are frequently inaccurate, yet they form the basis upon which people "feel for or against other nations, interpret their behavior as villainous or good, judge their actions, and judge what they themselves as a nation should do in relation to the others. It follows, of course, that if the images are false, the resulting course of action can hardly ever be adequate."<sup>1</sup> As noted in an image study by UNESCO: "If the peoples of the world are to learn to live together in peace they need to know one another better. As matters stand, each of us has oversimplified, stereotyped concepts of other peoples. These concepts are usually erroneous, out of date and, all too frequently, negative in character. Clearly this is not material with which to build mutual understanding and tolerance."<sup>2</sup>

Image studies of the United States began long before independence from England and have continued to the present day. Foreign observers have analyzed almost every aspect of this nation. As Henry Steele Commager pointed out, "No other people, it is safe to say, was ever so besieged by interpreters; none had its portrait painted, its habits described, its character analyzed, its soul probed so incessantly."<sup>3</sup> Among the best known of these writers were Alexis de Tocqueville, James Bryce, and Michel Guillaume Jean de Crèvecoeur. They and other observers engaged in a lengthy debate about "what America was" and "what it was becoming." Some praised America for her freedom, democracy, and industrial growth while others condemned her for the same.<sup>4</sup>

Latin American writers have also contributed to the image literature on the United States and almost every nation has had its outstanding critic of the "Yankees." Domingo Faustino Sarmiento of Argentina stands in the forefront of such nineteenth century writers, but certainly José Martí of Cuba, José Enrique Rodó of Uruguay, and Manuel Ugarte of Argentina, to name only a few, are also well known to Latin Americanists. In addition, numerous scholars from various fields have published works describing the "gringo image" in Latin America.<sup>5</sup>

Most of this literature is concerned with the twentieth century. There are perhaps two main reasons for this emphasis. The first is that during previous centuries the image of the United States was generally favorable and there

seemed little reason to dwell on the subject. But as relations between the United States and Latin America deteriorated during the early twentieth century, more and more critics were anxious to point out the negative side of North American society and the imperialistic nature of its economic and foreign policies. They pictured the United States as the "Colossus of the North" and the North Americans as the "Yankee imperialist" to be feared.

The second explanation is that nineteenth-century image studies involve serious research problems. The scholar cannot sample opinion with questionnaires or personal interviews, nor can he limit himself to the views of but a few major leaders. For the study to be valid, one inevitably must search through literally thousands of pages of newspapers, official documents, books, and unpublished manuscripts. These efforts, however, are rewarding, for without such insight into nineteenth-century opinions, one cannot fully place contemporary views in perspective or appreciate the extent to which they have influenced the thinking and ultimately the actions of the Latin Americans.

Perhaps the best general survey of image literature of the nineteenth century is José de Onís's *The United States as Seen by Spanish American Writers, 1776–1890*.<sup>6</sup> This study introduces the ideas of the major literary and political figures as well as the most important travelers of the century. It is obvious, however, that in a work of this general nature one must be selective, and the tendency is to choose the most outstanding or best-known commentators and to quote from their writings. There is no way of knowing whether the chosen commentators are truly representative of the country or the area unless one has surveyed extensively the literature of the particular countries. Without such research, for example, one could never be reasonably certain that the views of Vicente Rocafuerte and Juan Montalvo, the only Ecuadoreans quoted at length in de Onís, are truly representative of that country. For this reason, in-depth studies of the image literature of each country in Latin America are needed.<sup>7</sup>

There were reasons for my choice of Ecuador. The first was the paucity of published materials on the United States and Ecuador in the nineteenth century. Though Ecuador was certainly mentioned in many works on United States relations with Latin America, no detailed summary was available. The second lay in the perspective which Ecuador offered. It was a country that was relatively unimportant to the United States, and an image study of Ecuadorean views might avoid the strongly biased nationalistic view that one gets from a country with closer ties such as Mexico. Also, unlike the British and French, Ecuadoreans had less knowledge of and contact with North America. Their distant view provides an additional perspective to complement the knowledgeable analysis of men such as Tocqueville. One could also argue that Ecuador, "The Land of Contrasts," as Lilo Linke refers to it,<sup>8</sup> offers the perfect nation for a case study.

The problems in researching Ecuadorean views, however, were sizable. In fact, Manuel Larrea, the most famous of the Ecuadorean bibliophiles, flatly stated, "*Es imposible*." There were, he said, too few sources on the subject.<sup>9</sup> During two years of research, sponsored by the Doherty Foundation and the Fulbright Commission, I searched through all types of materials—everything from private correspondence to official documents. Most of the materials for the study were

found in the Archivo y Biblioteca de Relaciones Exteriores del Ecuador in Quito, the Biblioteca Ecuatoriana de Aurelio Espinosa Pólit in Cotacollao, the Archivos-biblioteca de la Función Legislativa del Ecuador in Quito, the Carlos A. Rolando library in Guayaquil, and the private libraries of Miguel Díaz Cueva of Cuenca, Manuel Larrea of Quito, and the Jijón y Caamaño family in Quito. I acquired microfilming equipment and copied almost every document available on the United States in the nineteenth century.<sup>10</sup> This resulted in eighteen rolls of microfilm, or approximately thirty-five thousand pages of documents. The materials fell naturally into certain categories: Political comments, opinions on North American society, interpretations of the causes of the U.S. Civil War, and views on economic and diplomatic matters. From my index<sup>11</sup> of these materials, I selected the writings which were the most typical or informative.

In preparing this manuscript, I tried to avoid value judgments of the Ecuadorean views. Though I am certain that my North American biases may have determined the choice of material, I tried to make the study as objectively Ecuadorean as possible. It was my purpose to let the Ecuadoreans speak for themselves. What did they say? In brief, they expressed admiration of the Founding Fathers and their achievements; they were impressed with the *gringa* and educational institutions in this country; they were optimistic about the future of the "Great Republic" and often expressed the desire to imitate its economic and political successes; and, until 1854, they indicated little or no fear of U.S. imperialism. In the Mexican War, for example, they preferred to blame Mexico or Spain for causing the conflict—Mexico, because its leaders failed to establish political stability, and Spain, because it failed to define adequately the borders of Mexico.

On the other hand, Ecuadoreans strongly disliked the North American Protestants, whose presence they feared worse than an invasion of the Tartars; they criticized the North American press and various authors for being unjustly critical of their country; they lamented the coming of the U.S. Civil War and reasoned that the conflict was unnecessary, although southerners were justified in defending their rights; and in 1854, they began to see the United States as a potential aggressor. In that year rumors spread throughout the country that the United States had acquired or would likely seize the Galápagos Islands, which many erroneously thought had large deposits of guano. The incident led to repeated scares throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century and created, perhaps more than any other event, the fear of U.S. imperialism. Certainly the guano incident, in combination with the arrival of the Protestants in 1895 and the political controversy surrounding the presence of U.S. engineers who were to build the Guayaquil-Quito Railroad, all made for an increasingly negative image of the United States.

By the turn of the century, however, one must admit that the imperialistic parts of the mosaic image of the U.S. were certainly visible and growing. Ecuadoreans openly expressed criticism of U.S. foreign policy and were suspicious of Yankee motivations. In the Spanish American War of 1898, for example, they favored Cuban independence but simultaneously expressed the desire for Spain to defeat the United States. At the same time, however, the image of the United

States had by no means changed entirely. As we shall see from the materials dealing with the Founding Fathers and the federal system, many Ecuadoreans continued to speak favorably of the United States throughout the nineteenth century.

During the nineteenth century, the Founding Fathers were held in very high esteem by the Ecuadoreans. They seldom mentioned Washington's name without referring to him as "the immortal Washington,"<sup>12</sup> and often "the land of Washington,"<sup>13</sup> was used to denote the United States. Washington's greatest contribution was his success in launching the American ship of state: "Así Washington trazó a su país el camino por el que la rectitud, la probidad, el sentimiento religioso del deber conducen a segura prosperidad a las naciones. Así por el contrario los pueblos que no poseen hombres modelos, son a modo de mares rocallosos, despojados de faros que eviten los naufragios y los desastres."<sup>14</sup> This statement by Carlos R. Tobar revealed both his admiration of Washington and his regret that Ecuador and other countries had been so unfortunate in not having such "model" leaders as their Founding Fathers. Fray Vicente Solano, the famous Jesuit scholar of Cuenca, in discussing why the United States had risen so quickly to such a high level of civilization, affirmed that the Founding Fathers were beyond reproach; Washington and Franklin, in particular, were patriotic, disinterested, and generous; and they left a legacy of virtue similar to that of Fabius and Cincinnatus of Rome.<sup>15</sup> Juan Montalvo, theorizing about what would have happened if God had made it possible for Washington to inspire the American governments, wrote that a poor America, torn to pieces, oppressed, and thrown about as a top, would have become a great nation composed of virtuous members.<sup>16</sup> The Washington image reached such levels of grandeur in Ecuadorean minds that *El Poder de los Principios* was obliged to remind its readers in 1839 that all governments, even that of Washington, had enemies as well as friends;<sup>17</sup> and *El Foro* added that not even Washington had been entirely free of personal enemies.<sup>18</sup>

Ecuadoreans liked to match Washington with other famous historical figures, and Juan Montalvo made the most incisive comparison—Napoleon, one feared; Washington, one venerated; Bolívar, one admired and feared.<sup>19</sup> He presented an analysis of the various reasons why Washington was as great as, but not greater than Bolívar. To determine superiority, he said, one had to consider the difficulties which each overcame and Bolívar, without doubt, faced the greatest obstacles. There were at least a hundred men, the Ecuadorean contended, who could have taken Washington's place in the wealthy, civilized United States, as he was surrounded by such figures as Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin. Bolívar, on the other hand, had to deal with men like José Antonio Páez who, after destroying the Gran Colombian Federation, became Venezuela's first president. Bolívar's task was harder and therefore his accomplishments more meritorious. Washington was less ambitious but also less magnanimous than Bolívar; more modest but less elevated. Yet together these two men were great personalities and "the glory of the New World."<sup>20</sup>

The same general conclusion was reached some forty years earlier in another comparison written by Pedro Gual, the famous minister of foreign affairs

for Gran Colombia. Though Gual was not Ecuadorean, he resided in the country on numerous occasions, was its representative to England and Spain, and died in Guayaquil on 6 May 1862.<sup>21</sup> His essay on Washington and Bolívar was widely circulated in Ecuadorean newspapers. He wrote that, as an agent of a people already formed and constituted, there was no one more honorable, more patriotic, or more exacting in fulfillment of his duties than Washington. But when the social foundations of Colombian society received such a bad blow as to lose its hope of returning to civilized life, Gual argued, then no one was more capable than Bolívar in bringing harmony and restoring society to its pristine vigor.<sup>22</sup>

To many Ecuadoreans, Benjamin Franklin was second only to Washington as the most important of the North American precursors, and a few writers even acclaimed him as the greatest of the Founding Fathers. *La Concordia's* editor in Quito, for example, described him as "the first republican in America," "the first American scholar," "the most illustrious, the most judicious, the most just of the founders of liberty and republicanism of North America."<sup>23</sup> A respected figure throughout the nineteenth century, Franklin was perhaps the only North American whose biography was written by an Ecuadorean historian: *La vida de Benjamín Franklin*, by Pedro Carbo.<sup>24</sup> Carbo also included a forty-seven page history of the life of Benjamin Franklin in the introduction of his translation of Franklin's work, known in Spanish as *La ciencia del buen hombre Ricardo*.<sup>25</sup> Here was a man, he observed, whose life was full of ups and downs, of hard times, of prosperity and glory. He was one of the most honored men because he was able to present himself as a model, especially for the working classes from which he had come. Franklin was known for his constant love of work and study and for his private and public virtues. He worked for his own fortune, made useful discoveries, acquired fame among the scholars, and served his country with devotion and disinterest. Franklin, Carbo judged, deserved the love, respect, and appreciation of his fellow citizens and deserved to be the object of universal admiration.<sup>26</sup> Celiano Monge, inspired by the North American's great scientific contributions, was also enthusiastic in his praise. In his poem, "Franklin y Morse," he referred to Franklin as the "American Titan," armed with his "magic wand."<sup>27</sup> In the Ecuadorean mind, Washington and Franklin were the Founding Fathers who were primarily responsible for the creation of the political institutions which made the United States known as the country where democracy existed in theory and in practice.<sup>28</sup>

Ecuadorean writers seemingly agreed that the United States was a true democracy. A newspaper in 1845 stated that the successful exchange of the presidency was one practical proof of the fact that the citizens of the United States were "the first democratic people of the modern world."<sup>29</sup> "The classical land of liberty" was an expression that appeared on numerous occasions in Ecuadorean newspapers, including the famous *El Quiteño Libre*,<sup>30</sup> the liberal periodical of Quito. Rocafuerte left little room for doubt in his numerous writings that the United States was the asylum for oppressed peoples and a bulwark of liberty.<sup>31</sup> Ecuadorean poets, such as José Joaquín Olmedo, concurred: In the famous "Canto á Bolívar: La victoria de Junín," Olmedo referred to the North American people as "the first happy people of Liberty."<sup>32</sup>

This view of the United States as the land of liberty did not change in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In 1883, in an article dealing with human rights, Pedro Carbo wrote that the United States had begun with a declaration of the rights of men and with liberal institutions, succeeding to such an extent that it was still known as “la tierra clásica de la libertad, como el refugio y el asilo de todos los hombres oprimidos por el despotismo y la tiranía en otras naciones.”<sup>33</sup> Liberty in the United States was guaranteed to all of its citizens, said *La Defensa*, because its republican institutions, the secret of the greatness of the United States, were not myth; they were a reality.<sup>34</sup>

To some nineteenth-century Ecuadoreans, the United States was a land where enlightened justice could be obtained in contradistinction with European justice. Rocafuerte expressed this well:

Sobre el magnífico edificio llamado en New York City Hall, he observado sobre el remate de la torre del medio una hermosa estatua de la Justicia; está sin venda en los ojos, en la mano derecha tiene una elegante Romana moderna, apoya su mano izquierda sobre la guarnición de una espada cuya punta está clavada en el suelo. Es decir que la Justicia no es ciega en América como en Europa en donde la pintan y existe [en los Estados Unidos] con los ojos vendados; aquí no amenaza a nadie, descanza sobre la punta de su espada, porque no la necesita, mientras allá la tiene siempre levantada, pronto a herir a tontas y a ciegas—¡qué diferencia tan notable!<sup>35</sup>

Ecuadorean politicians would often appeal to the people to imitate the example of the United States and perhaps no Ecuadorean used the word “imitate” more than Rocafuerte. That his beloved *guayaquileños* had great economic potentiality, he did not doubt, but as they lacked political liberty he reasoned they should emulate the political spirit of the United States.<sup>36</sup>

Ecuadoreans idealistically pictured the United States as a paradise, not simply of democracy, liberty, and justice, but also as an Elysium of harmony, internal tranquility, isolation, and peace. The northern federation, unlike Europe, had not let religion tear it apart; to the contrary, it enjoyed domestic tranquility despite religious diversity. The United States government acted openly without giving preference to any one sect. Consequently it was the only government in the world which did not fear putting arms into the hands of all of its citizens. Nor did the United States government maintain itself with a great show of troops.<sup>37</sup> The United States, in the opinion of Rocafuerte in 1826,<sup>38</sup> and Francisco Andrade Marín in 1893,<sup>39</sup> enjoyed peace with considerably fewer troops than Europe. This conviction, reinforced by European revolts and wars, changed little over the nineteenth century.

Ecuadoreans fancied numerous reasons for the *realité* of such a paradise. Factors of geographical location, material wealth, superior institutions, and a special type of people, were all noted in *La Concordia's* article in 1844. The United States, it said, was like a “rock in the middle of the ocean;” it had great political and material wealth. Its people were venturous and democratic; they did not invade other countries, instead they loved peace and order, preferring to work toward the public destiny.<sup>40</sup>

It was quite natural for Ecuadoreans to give special consideration to geo-

graphical reasons in explaining the success of the United States and their own failure to progress economically and politically. Ecuador suffered four major conflicts with her neighbors, with territorial questions playing a part in each. By the end of the nineteenth century, she had suffered three major defeats, costing her over half of the territory originally claimed in her independence in 1830. In addition to the foreign conflicts, there was much political, economic, and social division within the country caused in part by geographical factors. A constant bitterness existed between the Ecuadorean *serrano* and the *costeño*. The division was most evident in the rivalry between the capital and principal city of the sierra, Quito, and the major port city, Guayaquil. Quito was larger, more isolated, and more conservative than Guayaquil; consequently, the two frequently worked at cross purposes.

Ecuadoreans could only look with envy at the United States. Its government was ideally located for its protection. Its social machinery was harmonious despite great diversities within the country. Its government was unified, energetic. The spirit of association, commerce, and agriculture all progressed in the United States. Just to think about this rich, respectable nation, "that happy, fortunate land," made even the apathetic and indolent want to emulate its development.<sup>41</sup> It seemed to some Ecuadoreans that from the very beginning almost everything had gone well for the United States. Even its struggle for independence was deemed fortunate. The success of the United States in that struggle for freedom, many maintained, was accomplished with the approval and cooperation of Spain.<sup>42</sup>

For Ecuadoreans there was little doubt but that the United States was justified in seeking its independence since it had been oppressed by the English. Perhaps no Ecuadorean expressed this more elegantly than Manuel Rodríguez de Quiroga. One finds these lines in his "Oda á la tropa":

Los Estados Unidos,  
la capital, que el Delaware baña,  
sus pueblos oprimidos  
por los rigores de la Gran Bretaña,  
son seguros testigos  
de aquestos Enemigos  
que obligaron al fiel Americano,  
a sacudir un yugo tan tirano.<sup>43</sup>

Ecuadoreans tended to de-emphasize the economic problems involved in the United States war for independence, and stressed instead the political causes for the conflict. A Cuenca newspaper concluded that it was not the amount of the tea tax nor the sum of the stamp tax that made the North Americans rebel, but "the doctrine [regarding no taxation without their own assemblies' approval] that put the arms in their hands."<sup>44</sup> And they fought in order to preserve this right.

The Declaration of Independence itself was not frequently mentioned in Ecuadorean writings after Ecuador gained its independence from Gran Colombia in 1830. The subsequent impact, direct or indirect, of this declaration is a matter of

debate and conjecture. Most modern-day Ecuadorean historians, such as Isaac J. Barrera and Lilo Linke, stress the greater importance of the French Revolution and its pronouncements.<sup>45</sup> In the light of their time-honored and oft-repeated sources they probably were correct. Yet when fresh evidence is examined, the influence of North American philosophies of the 1770s looms large. For example, when the revolution of 1845 began in Ecuador, three of its leaders, José Joaquín Olmedo, Vicente Ramón Roca, and Diego Noboa,<sup>46</sup> quoted verbatim from the Declaration of Independence in their manifesto justifying their actions to the people of Ecuador: "Si una larga serie de abusos y usurpaciones manifiesta con notoriedad el designio de oprimir y esclavizar al pueblo y someterlo al yugo del despotismo, el pueblo tiene el derecho y el deber de sacudir ese yugo, derribando ese gobierno, para establecer nuevas garantías de su seguridad."<sup>47</sup> Doubtless many other Ecuadorean revolutions were justified in this same manner without openly indicating the source of their inspiration.

More important than the Declaration of Independence as a topic for Ecuadorean writers was the United States Constitution. In his early writings, the peripatetic Rocafuerte wrote that this tremendous document contained the greatest theories and discoveries of modern philosophy of his time.<sup>48</sup> Presented to the Ecuadoreans in his book *Cartas de un verdadero Americano*, these ideas were based essentially on *The Federalist*.<sup>49</sup> If Neptalí Zúñiga, a modern-day Ecuadorean authority on Rocafuerte, is correct, then Rocafuerte's work was the first in Latin America to carry the ideas of *The Federalist* in Spanish, for no Spanish translation of it existed until 1868.

Rocafuerte's enthusiasm for the Constitution made him stress the importance of its immediate imitation. He theorized that if Ecuador would emulate this constitution and if it were given an opportunity to develop under favorable circumstances, it could reach the level of political maturity and economic prosperity enjoyed by the United States.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, the Philadelphia document was certainly better than anything England could offer.<sup>51</sup> It was the only hope of oppressed peoples everywhere, the only lighthouse which indicated to man the direction for achieving his happiness.<sup>52</sup>

Ecuadoreans apparently agreed because the influence of the Constitution was often evident. The Congress of Riobamba promulgated a constitution on 23 September 1830,<sup>53</sup> which Rocafuerte said was intended to be an imitation of the United States Constitution. He criticized the Riobamba meeting, however, because the congress was not representative; it was weak in patriotism, energy, and political experience. Also, its members did not comprehend the essence of the social theory which the document contained.<sup>54</sup>

Various sections of the Constitution served as bases for debates. When the reelection of an Ecuadorean president was at issue, as was the case in 1834 with Juan José Flores, the precedent set by Washington was invoked. José Miguel Gonzales published a book in which he supported reelection because of its successful operation in the United States (General Jackson had just been reelected president). If the people who were presented as the best model that Ecuadoreans could follow permitted reelection of their presidents, then Gonzales saw no



reason why Ecuadoreans should not do the same.<sup>55</sup> Flores, supported by the example of the United States, would have sought a second term in 1834 had he not made a satisfactory compromise with his chief opponent, Rocafuerte, whereby the latter became president in 1834, promising not to seek reelection in 1838 in order that Flores might return for another term in office.<sup>56</sup> The reelection issue was also important in 1875 when Gabriel García Moreno, Ecuador's famous conservative president, sought another term as head of the government which he had largely controlled in and out of office since 1860.<sup>57</sup> Newspapers carried articles supporting reelection since it had not hurt or impaired the United States, "the classical land of liberty."<sup>58</sup> García Moreno was assassinated on 5 August 1875, five days before he was to be declared officially and legally president of Ecuador by the National Congress.<sup>59</sup> For the moment the reelection issue died with García Moreno, but it reappeared before the end of the century.

Federalism as presented in the United States Constitution was another issue often debated in the context of Ecuadorean political life. Supporters of the doctrine were ridiculed by some and praised by others. In 1859 and 1860, when the people of Loja (a small community in the southern sierra) adopted the federalist system, they were immediately ridiculed as being monkeys, playing with a system whose adoption in Ecuador would be fatal. To pretend to imitate the political forms of the northern republic without having its national character was "not only a ridiculous act, but a dangerous and fatal absurdity."<sup>60</sup> The ridicule heaped upon the *lojanos* in the 1860s did not prevent Eloy Alfaro, a revolutionary in 1883 and Ecuador's greatest liberal president, from advocating the adoption of the federal system.<sup>61</sup> He reasoned that the benefits of the system had been proven in the United States. If Azuay wanted for its main leader a cleric, Pichincha a lawyer, and Guayas a financier, federalism made it possible for all to make their choices. The needs of the provinces would be met and the federal executive could guarantee order as he did in the United States.<sup>62</sup>

Most Ecuadoreans were unwilling to imitate the United States Constitution in its entirety. Since Ecuador and the United States were different, each needed diversified constitutions. Failure to adapt constitutions to the peculiarities of each Latin American country had been one of the factors producing revolutions which were justified solely by reasoning that constitutional modifications were necessary: "Es decir, del un cabo al otro de la América española, la constitución extranjera no pudo hacerse nacional en ninguna parte, y comenzó desde luego á recibir modificaciones, teniendo cada cuatro años, y algunas veces, en más corto período, que adoptar una reforma que no ha sido sino la causa de necesitar otra posterior."<sup>63</sup>

One *La Concordia* article expounded another opinion in an effort to explain why Latin American countries, especially Ecuador, adopted numerous constitutions while England and the United States had none or retained but one: It suggested that the people of the United States and England were lazy and basically not as creative as the Latin Americans! "Entre los países constitucionales, la Inglaterra y los Estados Unidos por ejemplo, no se advierte la fecundidad de ingenio, la variedad de ideas, la felicidad de combinaciones que nosotros ostentamos en estos climas venturosos, en que todo es vida, creación y movimiento. Allá hicieron aquellos hombres perezosos una constitución á mas no poder, y quedaron

tan cansado como si hubieran hecho un mundo, dejándose estar así en Inglaterra por siglos enteros, y en los Estados Unidos por más de medio siglo.”<sup>64</sup> Latin Americans, and Ecuadoreans in particular, however, continually changed their constitutions; Ecuador alone adopted eleven major constitutions before the turn of the century.<sup>65</sup>

None of the political institutions created by the United States Constitution received as much attention from Ecuadoreans as the presidency. They were, of course, aware of the legislative branch, but as the Ecuadorean representative bodies were never very responsive they made, by and large, only negative comments respecting the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Luís de Abrisqueta, a rather disillusioned observer resident in Washington in 1892 wrote: “En Washington he conocido Senadores muy ignorantes, sobre todo tratándose de países extranjeros; su idea sólo se fija en el Estado que tienen la honra de representar.”<sup>66</sup>

There was also recognition as early as 1839 that firm practices had developed in the process of selecting presidents in the United States: (1) The president seeking reelection was apt to win, and (2) the secretary of state had a better chance of becoming president than any other government official. The newspaper *La Balanza* editorialized that both of these trends worked to the advantage of the United States.<sup>67</sup>

More important than the office of the presidency were the presidents themselves. Nearly all received favorable ratings by the Ecuadoreans. United States presidents were held to be “amiable, sweet,” whereas the Ecuadorean presidents were all “despotic, bad and perverse.” So prevalent was this belief that *El Poder de los Principios* published an article in 1839 to correct this “mistaken” idea.<sup>68</sup> It was not the greatness of the United States presidents, the paper argued, but the morality of the people which made the difference.

Presidents of the United States remained, however, the idols of many Ecuadorean writers. As a whole, they were deemed intelligent patriots who had wide governmental experience. No political novice would dare claim the presidency of the United States. The presidents first proved themselves in Congress, in various ministries, in legations, or in other governmental posts, and in office they demonstrated irreproachable morals.<sup>69</sup> Although such idealism might well have surprised many a United States citizen, views of United States leaders were formed in large measure by the overall success of the nation rather than being based on the character of the men themselves.

Two other institutions attracted Ecuadorean attention: Political parties and the military. The most evident fact noted about United States political parties was that they differed from the Ecuadorean. One would look “in vain” for political parties such as those in Ecuador. United States politicians were not above criticism, but they certainly did not endanger the existence of the government as did the Ecuadorean parties. Individualism in North America was of such a nature that destructive parties had little chance of succeeding.<sup>70</sup>

Ecuadoreans also liked the type of military system in the United States, noting that even during the Civil War, military leaders, with few exceptions, de-

monstrated moderation and respect for law as well as talent and ability. "In all parts [of the United States] they listened to the voice of civil authority and obeyed tractably the laws."<sup>71</sup> Hoping for something similar in Ecuador, the minister of war and navy suggested establishment of a permanent military force similar to that of the United States in 1865 and requested financial support from the Ecuadorean Congress to implement his program.<sup>72</sup> West Point was also admired and two of Eloy Alfaro's sons attended the academy.<sup>73</sup> Known for its excellent engineers, the institution received numerous letters from Antonio Flores, the minister resident and head of the Ecuadorean legation in Washington. He sought information about engineers who might be interested in working in Ecuador. The academy, he said, was known as the "seedbed of distinguished engineers."<sup>74</sup>

Throughout the nineteenth century, Ecuadoreans held high opinions of the political institutions of the United States. They agreed that the United States had almost all of the things which Ecuador needed. It enjoyed peace, liberty, a practical constitution, and a system of government which had helped its progress in almost every area of endeavor. But there was one thing upon which they could not agree: Should Ecuadoreans imitate the United States, and, if so, to what degree. Rocafuerte was exuberant regarding the immediate establishment of North American institutions in Ecuador, but he eventually realized that it was impossible. In his 1835 presidential address<sup>75</sup> he stated that it was not then possible to establish pure democracy as it existed in the North American republic. Ecuador simply was too different: It was a country of varied classes and color groups; a large part of its population was living under a system of feudalism more unfortunate than that of Russia; the masses were destitute of most modern knowledge; many did not even speak Spanish, the language of the legislators. Frequently, he declared, they were insensible men controlled by ignorance and superstition. By 1839, at the conclusion of his term, Rocafuerte admitted that the institutions of the United States simply were impractical for Ecuador.<sup>76</sup>

Nor was Rocafuerte the only disillusioned patriot. Some opposition to attempts to be guided by the United States example did exist. The *Semanario Popular* in 1889, for instance, published a reprint of a statement made years earlier by the tutor of Bolívar, Simón Rodríguez, in which he ridiculed countries trying to imitate the United States. The most entertaining spectacle, he said, had been to watch a state in Latin America divide itself in order to say later, "We are [now] united and our name is The United States."<sup>77</sup>

Ecuadoreans might debate whether and to what degree United States institutions should be imitated, but as our sources have demonstrated, there seemed to be almost complete unanimity regarding at least three ideas: (1) These institutions had been positive factors in making the United States a model state which enjoyed political tranquility and an expanding economic system; (2) the political leaders as a whole were responsible and honorable men; and (3) Washington and Franklin were among the greatest men in history.

NOTES

1. Alexander H. Leighton, *Human Relations in a Changing World: Observations on the Use of the Social Sciences* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1949), p. 102.
2. "Preface," *Unesco International Social Science Bulletin* 3 (Autumn 1951): 497.
3. Henry Steele Commager, ed., *America in Perspective: The United States through Foreign Eyes* (New York: Random House, 1947) p. xiii.
4. Lengthy bibliographies of these materials are in: Frank Freidel, ed., *Harvard Guide to American History*, rev. ed., 2 vols. (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1974); Oscar Handlin, *This Was America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949); Allan Nevins, ed., *America Through British Eyes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948); Gerald Emanuel Stearn, ed., *Broken Image: Foreign Critiques of America* (New York: Random House, 1972); John Graham Brooks, *As Others See Us* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908); and Commager, ed., *America in Perspective*.
5. See J. Fred Rippy, "Literary Yankeeophobia in Hispanic America," *Journal of International Relations* 12 (January–April 1922): 350–71, 524–38; Clarence H. Haring, *South America Looks at the United States* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929); Thomas Harrison Reynolds, *As Our Neighbors See Us: Readings in the Relations of the United States and Latin America* (Nashville: Cullom & Ghertner Company, 1940); Carleton Beals, Bryce Oliver, Herschel Brickell, and Samuel G. Inman, *What South Americans Think of Us* (New York: R. M. McBride & Company, 1945); Norman D. Humphrey, "The Mexican Image of Americans," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 295 (September 1954): 116–25; Ralph L. Beals, "The Mexican Student Views the United States," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 295 (September 1954): 108–15; Franz M. Joseph, ed., *As Others See Us: The United States through Foreign Eyes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959); Don H. Radler, *El Gringo: The Yankee Image in Latin America* (Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1962); John Calhoun Merrill, *The Image of the United States Presented by Ten Mexican Daily Newspapers* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1962). For an Englishman's view of the Yankee image in Latin America see Richard West, *The Gringo in Latin America* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967).
6. José de Onís lists the most important Latin American authors in *The United States as Seen by Spanish American Writers (1776–1890)* (New York: Hispanic Institute in the United States, 1952), pp. 201–19.
7. The two best such studies are by Frederick B. Pike, *Chile and the United States, 1880–1962* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963), and Don Marquand Dozer, *Are We Good Neighbors?* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1959).
8. Lilo Linke, *Ecuador: Country of Contrasts*, 3rd ed. (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1960).
9. Few sources exist primarily because: (1) History writing in general has lagged far behind that of such countries as Argentina, Chile, and Mexico; (2) the archives in Ecuador are poorly organized—one rarely finds a card catalog or index to holdings; and (3) traditionally, family archives in Ecuador have not been opened up to the public. For further discussion of these problems see Mark J. Van Aken, "Ecuador," in Charles C. Griffen, ed., *Latin America: A Guide to the Historical Literature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971), pp. 489–90.
10. I used a Nikon camera, a macro lens, Kodak High Contrast Copy Film, and a copy-stand. I developed the film myself at a cost of less than two cents per frame. The Archivo y Biblioteca de Relaciones Exteriores del Ecuador in Quito was the only institution to require that the film be personally developed by the researcher.
11. The index grew out of my research. Before photographing any documents, I made a brief notation of subject matter. Later, when actually microfilming, I noted where the documents could be found on the roll of microfilm. This index hopefully will be published as a separate guide to U.S. documents in Ecuador.

12. [República del Ecuador], *Exposición que dirige al congreso del Ecuador en 1854, el ministro del interior y relaciones exteriores* (Quito: Imprenta del gobierno), p. 42.
13. *El Republicano* (Quito), 18 Febrero 1893, p. 99.
14. Carlos R. Tobar, "Relación de un veterano de la independencia," *Biblioteca ecuatoriana mínima: La colonia y la república, cronistas de la independencia y de la república* (Puebla, Mexico: Editorial J. M. Cajica Jr. S.A., 1960), p. 537.
15. Vicente Solano, "Advertencia," Cayo Crispo Salustio, *Guerra catilinaria ó la conjuración de Catilina* (n.p.: 1851); Antonio Borrero C. [ed.], *Obras de Fray Vicente Solano de la orden de menores en la república del Ecuador*, 4 vols. (Barcelona: "La hormiga de oro," 1892), 1: 140.
16. Juan Montalvo, "De la libertad de imprenta," *Biblioteca ecuatoriana mínima: La colonia y la república, Juan Montalvo* (Puebla, Mexico: Editorial J. M. Cajica Jr. S.A., 1960), p. 136.
17. *El Poder de los Principios* (Quito), 23 Diciembre 1839.
18. *El Foro* (Quito), 27 Abril 1888, p. 66.
19. Juan Montalvo, *Siete tratados*, 2 vols. (Besanzon: Imprenta de José Jacquin, 1882), 2: 82.
20. *Ibid.*, 2: 148–51.
21. Harold A. Bierck, Jr., *Vida Pública de Don Pedro Gual* (Traducción de Leopoldo Landaeta; Caracas: Ediciones del ministerio de educación nacional, 1947), p. 568.
22. Pedro Gual, Bogotá, 15 Febrero 1843; *La Concordia* (Quito), 8 Abril 1844.
23. *La Concordia* (Quito), 12 Mayo 1845, pp. 1–2.
24. Isaac J. Barrera, *Historia de la literatura ecuatoriana* (Quito: Edit. casa de la cultura ecuatoriana, 1960), p. 876.
25. Pedro Carbo, "Compendio de la vida de Benjamín Franklin," Benjamín Franklin, *La ciencia del buen hombre Ricardo* (Guayaquil: Imprenta de "La nación," por Fidel Montoya, 1879), pp. 1–47.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 1–2.
27. Quoted in *El Horizonte* (Portoviejo), 9 Abril 1890.
28. *La Balanza* (Guayaquil), 19 Octubre 1839, p. 4; *La Democracia* (Guayaquil), 16 Marzo 1896.
29. *La Concordia* (Quito), 21 Abril 1845, p. 2.
30. *El Quiteño Libre* (Quito), Domingo 25 de Agosto de 1833.
31. Vicente Rocafuerte, *Ideas necesarias a todo pueblo independiente que quiere ser libre* (Philadelphia: 1821), in Neptalí Zúñiga, ed., *Collección Rocafuerte*, 16 vols. (Quito: Talleres gráficos nacionales, 1947), 2: 11.
32. José Joaquín Olmedo, "Canto á Bolívar: La Victoria de Junín," *Biblioteca ecuatoriana mínima: La colonia y la república, José Joaquín Olmedo, poesía-prosa* (Puebla, Mexico: Editorial J. M. Cajica Jr. S.A., 1960), pp. 121–22.
33. Pedro Carbo, "La declaración de los derechos del hombre, su origen y sus fundamentos," *El Ecuador* (Guayaquil), 26 Septiembre 1883.
34. *La Defensa* (Quito), 23 Abril 1897.
35. Vicente Rocafuerte, *Ensayo Político* (New York: 1823), in Neptalí Zúñiga, ed., *Collección Rocafuerte*, 5: 32–33.
36. Rocafuerte, *Ideas necesarias*, 3: 15.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
38. Vicente Rocafuerte, *Cartas de un americano sobre las ventajas de los gobiernos republicanos federativos* (London: Imprenta española de M. Calero, 1826?), in Neptalí Zúñiga, ed., *Collección Rocafuerte*, 4: 118–19.
39. "El Ecuador entre las 19 repúblicas de América," *El Republicano* (Quito), 4 Marzo 1893, p. 114.
40. *La Concordia* (Quito), 8 Abril 1844, p. 6.
41. *El Republicano* (Quito), 22 Julio 1832.
42. Roberto Andrade, *Historia del Ecuador*, 7 vols. (Guayaquil: Reed y Reed, Editores [1934–37?]), 1: 206–7.
43. Quoted in Andrade, *Historia*, 2: 872.

44. El 18 de Agosto (Cuenca), 24 Septiembre 1851.
45. Isaac J. Barrera, *Literatura hispanoamericana* (Quito: Imp. de la universidad central, 1934), p. 194; Linke, *Ecuador*, p. 22.
46. Alfredo Pareja Diezcanseco, *Historia del Ecuador*, 2 vols. (Quito: Editorial casa de la cultura ecuatoriana, 1958), 2: 38ff.
47. [José Joaquín] Olmedo, [Vicente Ramón] Roca, [Diego] Noboa, "Manifiesto del gobierno provisorio del Ecuador, sobre las causas de la presente transformación a los pueblos americanos," *Biblioteca ecuatoriana mínima: Olmedo, poesía-prosa*, p. 511.
48. Rocafuerte, *Ensayo político*, p. 18.
49. Vicente Rocafuerte, "Cartas de un verdadero americano," in Neptali Zúñiga, ed., *Colección Rocafuerte*, 4: vi–vii. Zúñiga wrote that Rocafuerte studied *The Federalist* in English, or, more probably, French.
50. Rocafuerte, *Ensayo político*, p. 42.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
52. Rocafuerte, *Ideas necesarias*, p. 11.
53. Pedro Fermín Cevallos, *Resumen de la historia del Ecuador desde su orijen hasta 1845*, 5 vols. (Lima: Imprenta del estado, 1870), 5: 1ff.
54. Vicente Rocafuerte, *A la nación* (Quito: Tipografía de la escuela de artes y oficios, 1908), in Neptali Zúñiga, ed., *Colección Rocafuerte*, 14: 18–19.
55. José Miguel Gonzales, *Lijera relación de los más notables contecimientos políticos del Ecuador desde el mes de mayo de 1830 hasta el día* (Guayaquil: Imprenta de viberio, 1834).
56. Cevallos, *Resumen de la historia*, 5: 195ff; Pareja Diezcanseco, *Historia del Ecuador*, 2: 25ff; Ricardo Pattee, *Gabriel Garcia Moreno y el Ecuador de su tiempo*, 2nd ed. (Mexico: Editorial jus, 1944), p. 76ff.
57. Pattee, *Gabriel Garcia Moreno*, p. 235ff.
58. *El Ecuador* (Quito), 9 Enero 1875.
59. Pattee, *Gabriel Garcia Moreno*, p. 575ff.
60. *La Paz*, (Guayaquil), 16 Enero 1860, p. 3.
61. Eloy Alfaro, "Segundo mensaje del ciudadano encargado del mando supremo de las provincias de Manabí y Esmeraldas, a la Asamblea nacional, Portoviejo, á 9 de octubre de 1883," [República del Ecuador], *Memoria que presenta a la convención nacional de 1883 el secretario general del gobierno del Guayas* (Guayaquil: Imp. de "La nación," 1883).
62. *Ibid.*
63. *La Concordia* (Quito), 1 Enero 1844, p. 2; 8 Abril 1844, p. 9.
64. *La Concordia* (Quito), 1 Enero 1844, p. 2.
65. Pareja Diezcanseco, *Historia del Ecuador*, 2: 474–90; Linke, *Ecuador*, pp. 50–51; Ramiro Borja y Borja, *Derecho constitucional ecuatoriano*, 3 vols. (Madrid: Ediciones cultura hispanica, 1950), 3: 105–699.
66. Luis de Abrisqueta, "Mount Vernon," República del Ecuador, *Diario oficial*, Quito, 18 Agosto 1892, p. 188.
67. *La Balanza* (Guayaquil), 19 Octubre 1839, p. 7.
68. *El Poder de los Principios* (Quito), 10 Noviembre 1839.
69. Rocafuerte, *A la nación*, p. 152; J. J. Pino de Icaza, "Palabras liminares," *Biblioteca ecuatoriana mínima: Escritos políticos* (Puebla, Mexico: Editorial J. M. Cajica Jr. S.A., 1960), p. 45.
70. *La Concordia* (Quito), 23 Diciembre 1844.
71. Carbo, "La declaración."
72. [República del Ecuador], *Informe del ministro de guerra y marina dirigido a las camaras legislativas del Ecuador en 1865* (Quito: Imprenta nacional [sic], por Mariano Mosquera), p. 2.
73. E. T. Parks, "Ecuador and the United States, 1830–[?]," MSS, chap. 9, p. 6; John J. Johnson, *The Military and Society in Latin America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), p. 70.

74. A[ntonio] Flores to Ministro de relaciones exteriores del Ecuador, Nueva York, 3 Octubre 1870, "Comunicaciones recibidas de la legación del Ecuador en Estados Unidos: 1842 a 1870," MSS, Archivo del Ministerio de relaciones exteriores del Ecuador, Quito.
75. Vicente Rocafuerte, Mensaje, Junio 1835, Alejandro Noboa, ed., *Recopilación de mensajes dirigidos por los presidentes de la república, jefes supremos y gobiernos provisorios a las convenciones y congresos nacionales desde el año de 1819 hasta nuestros días*, 5 vols. (Guayaquil: Imprenta de "El Telegrafo," 1900), 1: 215–38.
76. Vicente Rocafuerte, Mensaje, 15 Enero 1839, Alejandro Noboa, ed., *Recopilación*, 1: 290.
77. *Semanario Popular* (Quito), 1 Junio 1889.

---

RESEARCH INVENTORY ON HOLDINGS OF HISTORICAL  
STATISTICS FOR LATIN AMERICA

LARR is planning to publish an extensive review devoted to Historical Statistics of Latin America. Current plans are to divide the project into two phases: A research inventory devoted to a statement of holdings of unpublished statistics for Latin America, and critical essays on some topics covered in the historical statistics inventory, for some countries. The inventory is to be completed by June, 1976. The critical essays will be solicited on the basis of the information that becomes available during the course of the inventory.

Please return this questionnaire for processing to Professor Laura Randall, 425 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10025.

-----

Country \_\_\_\_\_  
Topic \_\_\_\_\_  
Coverage \_\_\_\_\_  
Years \_\_\_\_\_  
Source of data \_\_\_\_\_  
Quality of data \_\_\_\_\_  
Form data is in (cards, tapes, ms.) \_\_\_\_\_  
Availability of data to other investigators \_\_\_\_\_  
Terms of availability (free, charge of . . .) \_\_\_\_\_  
Are you interested in writing a critical essay on data you hold  
or on early published historical data? \_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator \_\_\_\_\_  
Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_