1960

San Martín: One Hundred Years of Historiography

Katharine Ferris Nutt
Fort Hays State University

fort hays studies

history series no. 1
june 1960

The Fort Hays Studies—New Series
is published quarterly by Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays, Kansas. Application for entry as second-class matter has been made.

Katharine Ferris Nutt

San Martín: One Hundred Years of Historiography

fort hays studies—new series
history series no. 1
june 1960

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas

Library of Congress Card Catalog No. 60-62714

Dr. Katharine Ferris Nutt

Biographical Sketch of the Author

Dr. Katharine Ferris Nutt, sometime professor of history, currently serving as reference librarian and professor at Forsyth Library, Fort Hays Kansas State College, received the degrees of doctor of philosophy (1951) and master of arts (1949) at the University of New Mexico. Her major field of interest was Latin American history; her graduate research pertained to nationalism and the Mexican revolutions of the 20th century. To complete this study Miss Nutt was awarded an international fellowship by the Soroptimists of the Southwest Region. She joined the Fort Hays faculty in 1952.

Originally a New Englander, Dr. Nutt was educated in the public schools of Wakefield, Massachusetts. She completed her baccalaureate degree at Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia. She has also studied at New Mexico Western College, at Universidad Nacional de México, and in the School of Librarianship at the University of California.

In 1957-58, Dr. Nutt was located in Lucknow, India, where she served as a Fulbright lecturer at Isabella Thoburn College. Since her return, she has lectured extensively about her experiences and has published research stimulated by her year in the East.

San Martín: One Hundred Years of Historiography

I

IT IS now one hundred years since the passing of José de San Martín, liberator of southern South America and one of the greatest figures in Latin America's struggle for independence. His death occurred in the little village of Boulogne-sur-Mer, in France, where he was in voluntary exile from the country which he loved and from those lands to which he had brought freedom. He died with few to mourn him, having lived abroad from 1829 until 1850 in an obscurity bordering on oblivion. Yet his was a brilliant record in military strategy: his skillfully executed march across the Andes in the face of such obstacles as terrain, weather, and mountain sickness ranks him with some of the greatest soldiers in history. His program of propaganda and his policy of waiting until he could liberate Peru without having to conquer her attests to his innate humanity and consideration for his fellow man as well as to his intelligence in sparing the meager forces at hand rather than risking disintegration through a campaign of violence.[1]

Taking the facts at their face value without the coloration of interpreting historians, one finds little derogatory to his character. He came of good creole stock; his education was ample; his training was that of a professional soldier. The life which he led accords well with his simple background. There is little of the dash of Simon Bolívar, for example, but neither is there the free and easy

1. A bibliography has been published in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of his death by Librería del Plata, S. R. L., of Buenos Aires. Entitled *San Martín y la Emancipación Sud Americana*, the work contains "brief and concise data on over 500 books about San Martín, books some of which are rare or lost, which are for sale, in single copies at: Librería del Plata, S. R. L., y Librería Cervantes."

manner, nor the dissipation. If he lacked the magnetic qualities of Napoleon, he lacked also the bravado. Nor did he have the aristocratic bearing that was almost the "hallmark" of Washington's affluence and of his influence.

San Martín was an excellent soldier—a strategist capable in both offensive and defensive warfare, as his brilliant victories indicate. He was pledged to the cause of independence; otherwise, he would never have risked his own fortune and health to assume voluntarily the leadership of the struggle. If the occasion demanded he could be an opportunist. Witness the manner in which he legalized himself as head of his Army of the Andes. He was not necessarily pledged to the establishment of democracy. His letters and conversations reveal that regardless of what he may have thought of the principles of democracy, he recognized that the Latin American newborns were not attuned to self-rule and were in no way prepared for federalism. However sad he may have felt, he knew the wisdom of withdrawing when one's services are no longer sought or required. Aside from the instances and views cited there is little else to say about his ability and character. The framework of his life is simple and clear.

Yet—one hundred years after his death—when a man of such outstanding worth and contributions should have gained an objective evaluation that only time can bring—one hundred years of historical writing about San Martín have done little to rescue him from the cloud of mystery in which he became enveloped following the famous meeting between him and Simon Bolívar at Quayaquil. José de San Martín, historically speaking, is almost as much of an enigma in 1950 as he was in 1850. Time has done little to clarify his role in the events of the western hemisphere during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Today one looks in vain for a truly objective picture of San Martín in the biographies and other commentaries on his period. Writers are "pro" or "con" the Liberator or "on-the-fence", with no historian offering a genuine solution.

One finds San Martín depicted as inhuman, lacking in kindness toward the people with whom he was associated or in compassion for the masses whose fate he held in balance. In military affairs he is blamed for his continual delays and hesitation as though he did not have the moral courage to make a direct attack upon the enemy. Desertions from his army were a common occurrence, but they are explained because of San Martín's inability to lead men, who in turn disliked and distrusted their general. Frequently it

is stated that he used dope and consequently was weak, vacillating, and undependable in tense or difficult situations. He is further described as dishonest, incapable of keeping his word. He has been severely censured for his statements that he believed in centralized government for the liberated nations. Critics have assumed that in his arrogance and conceit he envisioned a monarchy in order that San Martín might be king.

II

IT IS the opinion of this writer that the answer to the riddle of San Martín may better be sought in his relations with Lord Cochrane than in those with Simon Bolívar and the Quayaquil controversy, an avenue which historians have for years followed without arriving at any satisfactory conclusion. It is this writer's purpose to show that the misunderstandings regarding San Martín's character and his place in history stem from a very logical and comprehensible situation.

Bartolomé Mitre once remarked that whenever anything important happened on this globe, an Englishman was always there to witness it. In the career of San Martín this was especially true. The earliest publications dealing with him and with South America's independence are a group of diaries, memoirs, and the like, written by Englishmen who were in South America during the eventful years and whose records were subsequently published in London. Because of the comparatively early dates of these works and the considerable amount of information included, they have become the chief source of material for nearly all subsequent writers dealing with the emancipation of South America.

Foremost among these English accounts are the *Diary* of Mrs. Maria Graham, the *Journal* of Captain Basil Hall, the *Travels* of John Miers, the *Memoirs* of General William Miller, and the *Memoirs* of William Bennet Stevenson. Of these five writings three were considered worthy to be translated into Spanish and included in the *Bibliotheca Ayacucho,* monumental series of sixty-three

volumes of material contemporary with the struggles for Latin American independence. These are the volumes of Mrs. Graham, Mr. Stevenson, and General Miller.

All three of these commentators were on the scene or very close to it. Mrs. Graham, who was least associated with the events, should perhaps be considered first. She had come to South America with her husband, Captain Thomas Graham of the frigate *Doris*, but Captain Graham had died in April of 1822 while on a voyage around Cape Horn. Mrs. Graham resided in Valparaíso or vicinity for the remainder of the year until she sailed for Brazil to become governess to Princess Dona Maria who later became the Queen of Portugal. Mrs. Graham was a woman of excellent background and education and had traveled widely. During her sojourn in Chile she was to a considerable degree under the protection of Lord Thomas Cochrane, then assisting San Martín in liberating Peru. Her husband had formerly served with Cochrane on the vessel *Thetis;* Cochrane therefore felt a special concern for the young widow, stranded in a foreign country.

Among the other chroniclers, General William Miller is well-known for his valiant deeds during the campaign for Peru when he led forces to the aid of San Martín.[2] An eye-witness to many of the events, he is credited with having rendered an accurate and impartial account.

Also on the scene much of the time was William Bennet Stevenson, who spent about three of his twenty years in South America in the employ of Lord Cochrane as his secretary. Stevenson had arrived in Chile in 1804 and shortly afterwards was taken to Peru as a prisoner when war was declared against England. Later he served as secretary to the President of Quito, governor of the province of Esmeralda, and then secretary to Cochrane. Barros Araña considered Mr. Stevenson's record of events fairly unbiased in view of the magnetic personality of Cochrane, but the Chilean was also of the opinion that one could scarcely know his Lordship without falling under his influence to some degree.[3]

Mr. John Miers and Captain Basil Hall, although their accounts are not included in the *Bibliotheca Ayacucho,* also present con-

2. John Miller, *Memorias del General Miller,* XXVI-XXVII, *Bibliotheca Ayacucho,* (Madrid: Editorial-América 1917?) hereafter cited as: Miller, *Memorias.* General William Miller's *Memoirs* were written in conjunction with his son John Miller soon after the former's return from South America.

3. William Bennet Stevenson, *Memorias,* XV, *Bibliotheca Ayacucho,* (Madrid: Editorial-América, 1917), p. 9. Barros Araña, translator of the work for Bibliotheca Ayacucho makes this comment in his prologue. The translator also explained that Stevenson was known as "Mr. Bennet" in South America and that some documents signed by him carry that name rather than "Stevenson."

temporary records of revolutionary events. Their books have been used again and again for source material and on the whole have probably been as popular as have the other three works. Mr. Miers, though his work ostensibly deals with Chile, did comment upon happenings in Peru and elsewhere, but his account may be somewhat biased since he had certain interests at stake. He had gone to Chile for the purpose of studying copper mining. He had even hoped to establish a mint, but arrived there, as Mrs. Graham aptly remarks, only about one hundred years ahead of time. In his work of assaying minerals and laying plans for the exportation of Chile's copper, Miers traveled about the countryside of Chile extensively.

Another chronicler, who wrote while in the service of Great Britain, was Captain Basil Hall, who published *Extracts from a Journal Written off the Coasts of Chile, Peru, and Mexico, in the Years 1820, 1821, and 1822.* Hall was directly involved in the liberation of Peru but not so much from a military standpoint as from a commercial one. His task was that of protecting legitimate English shipping while the Revolution was in progress. Captain Hall had occasion to deal directly with San Martín and with Lord Cochrane as well, although at times Lord Cochrane and Captain Hall because of a conflict of interests were at odds with each other. Hall wrote not only of what he had seen but of what he had heard—comments and opinion gathered sometimes several days after an event had occurred. He appears to have been more interested than any of the other four commentators in the reactions of the people involved in the revolution.

All five of these Englishmen were partially qualified to comment authoritatively upon the events which were taking place about them. Mrs. Graham was perhaps least informed, though even she was a woman far ahead of her time in training and education.[4] Also, it should be noted that all of these records were in the nature of diaries or memoirs. Another factor of significance is that these works constitute the earliest publications written on the Latin American independence movement and have enjoyed a wide degree of circulation. Dates of publication coincide rather closely. Mrs. Graham and Captain Hall published their works in 1824; Mr. Stevenson's writings followed in 1825; Mr. Miers published his travels in 1826; General Miller was somewhat later, his *Memoirs* being first published in 1829.

4. The diary on Chile was not Mrs. Graham's first attempt at writing. Having accompanied her husband on a voyage to India, she had published a diary about that trip in 1812. In 1820 she published two more works following a trip to Italy and continued to write extensively throughout her life.

The proximity of the publication dates of these works is not the only striking fact. One looks in vain for any solid Spanish work on the revolutionary period earlier than Vicuña Mackenna's volumes which began to appear in 1860 and after. The definitive biography of San Martín by General Mitre came out in 1887-8. Volume thirteen of Barros Araña's *Historia jeneral de Chile,* the volume which deals specifically with the revolution in Peru, appeared in 1894. These three works contain about all that is authentic and significant on San Martín that can be found in print before the twentieth century.

The fact that the English works appeared more than thirty years before the first comprehensive Spanish account has undoubtedly given them an influence out of proportion to their actual value. All of them have been listed as source material by nearly everyone who has written extensively on the Argentine or on Chile since independence.

Regardless of how objective these writers may have tried to be, the very fact of nationality has seemed to contribute a certain slant to their accounts as individuals though they had nothing at stake. There was something at stake, however; namely, the reputation of their own countryman, Lord Thomas Cochrane, who, though Scotch, had been formerly in the service of the Royal Navy. Had Cochrane and San Martín never separated their fortunes, critical accounts of their relationship might have taken a different course. His Lordship, however, and San Martín fell out; the latter dismissed the Admiral from service. The British naturally took sides with Cochrane and portrayed San Martín as the villain. One hundred years of historiography regarding San Martín show the results.

III

TO ILLUSTRATE the way in which these early writings have influenced the course of the interpretation of South America's great liberator, the writer has selected one incident, which because of its dramatic importance is recorded in nearly every study made of either San Martín or Cochrane. On August 5, 1821, shortly after San Martín had proclaimed himself Protector of Peru, Lord Thomas Cochrane requested an interview with the general to discuss the payments due the Chilean squadron.[5] It was as a result of this interview that the breach occurred between the two men. San Martín dismissed his Lordship, who shortly thereafter seized the treasury concealed at Ancon and used the funds to pay his men.[6] San Martín's demand for the return of the money was to no avail; Cochrane sailed off for Mexico and California where he acted more or less on his own against contraband shipping in that area. In

5. San Martín proclaimed himself Protector of Peru on August 3, 1831.

6. According to Mr. Miers, Mr. Stevenson, and Mrs. Graham it was an action which Cochrane executed courageously and with as much legality as possible. The funds had been secreted at Ancon because of San Martín's fear of the royalists still in the Lima area. Cochrane is said to have seized the account books which indicated where the money had come from and to have paid his men only with funds which had belonged to royalists. He claimed to have taken no share for himself. The three British chroniclers mentioned also that San Martín's private property consisted of gold, coined and uncoined, and a quantity of silver so considerable in amount that it was necessary to remove the ballast from the schooner before the gold and silver could be placed on board.

San Martín, disturbed at the seizure of such a substantial portion of the rebels' resources, tried to regain the money first by bribery, then by coercion. Unsuccessful in both measures, he finally declared the seizure to be legal. See: María Graham, *Diario de su Residencia en Chile (1822) y de su Viaje al Brasil (1823)*, X, *Bibliotheca Ayacucho*, (Madrid: Editorial-América, 1916), pp. 128-129; hereafter cited as: Graham, *Diario*. John Miers, *Travels in Chile and La Plata*, 2 vols., (London: Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1826), pp. 68-69; hereafter cited as: Miers, *Travels*; Stevenson, *Memorias*, pp. 177-179.

a few months, badly short of funds and with nearly all of his vessels in need of repair, Cochrane returned to Chile.

Almost on his heels came San Martín in the act of withdrawing from the struggle for the rest of the old viceroyalty of Peru. In Chile, the two men remained hostile, each making some effort to clear his own name from the charges made by the other. Cochrane, with the cooperation of English friends, published handbills which did much to regain the friendship of the Chileans, although his wish to remain neutral in relations between O'Higgins and San Martín made him glad to have an excuse to leave for Brazil. The general, on the other hand, was received only coolly by the people of Chile and soon left for Europe and voluntary exile.[7]

The interview which was responsible for the rupture between Lord Cochrane and San Martín occurred rather unceremoniously at the Palace in Lima. According to Cochrane, there were two other men present at the time. San Martín asked these to leave. Cochrane, however, bade them stay as he seemed to anticipate trouble. The conversation, as Stevenson tells it, was as follows:

"Are you aware, my lord, that I am Protector of Peru?"

"No, but I hope the friendship which has existed between San Martín and myself will continue to exist between the Protector of Peru and myself."

Rubbing his hands together San Martín laughed. "I have only to say that I am Protector of Peru!"

Stung by the man's insulting attitude, Cochrane replied: "Then it becomes me, as senior officer of Chile, to request the fulfillment of all the promises made to Chile and the squadron: but first—and principally—the squadron."

"Chile! . . . I will never pay a single real to Chile. As to the squadron, you may take it where you please and go where you choose." He began to pace the room in a rage, then, halting before the admiral he said in a different tone, "Forget, my lord what is past."

"I will when I can," returned Cochrane, as he turned on his heel to leave the room. San Martín caught him at the top of the stairs.

"Will you accept the post of Admiral of Peru?" [8]

Disdaining to answer, his Lordship hurried down to the street, where his secretary, William Bennet Stevenson, was awaiting him. They hastened immediately aboard ship, for, as Cochrane confided to his secretary, in view of what had just occurred, he feared for their safety.

San Martín's argument, as indicated by other details of the interview and also by subsequent correspondence, was that as Protector of Peru he was no longer an official of the government of Chile and therefore had no authority to pay the Chilean fleet. He further

7. In 1827 San Martín returned to Argentina, thinking to assist his native country in the struggles over Paraguay and Uruguay, but he was the victim of a hostile faction and was forced to leave South America in 1829. He went to England, then to the Continent, this time to remain permanently.

8. Stevenson, *Memorias*, pp. 164-165.

argued that if he did wish to pay, it would be impossible to do so since he knew of no way to obtain sufficient funds.[9] Lord Cochrane, as has already been mentioned, was in no way at a loss to meet his obligations and seized the funds at Ancon.

According to Mr. Miers and Mrs. Graham San Martín sought immediate retaliation by approaching Lord Cochrane's men in an endeavor to bribe them to enter the service of Peru. San Martín is alleged to have offered Lord Cochrane a $200,000 estate in Peru, together with the insignia of the Order of the Sun and a medal richly set in diamonds if Cochrane would become the Admiral of the fleet of Peru. According to this proposal, the Peruvian fleet would consist of the Chilean squadron simply turned over to Peru by Cochrane with no compensation whatsoever to Chile. The Protector and the Vice-Admiral would not consider each other's terms, however, and so Cochrane, virtually dismissed, departed from Peru.[10]

After refusing Cochrane permission to put his ships into repair, San Martín launched a veritable campaign of propaganda against the admiral. He spread rumors in Valparaíso and Santiago which eventually became so caustic and scathing in their implications that, says Mrs. Graham, Cochrane was obliged to answer the charges despite his desire to remain in the background.[11]

The rest of the story, as recorded by Mrs. Graham and Mr. John Miers, is essentially the same as that told by William Bennet Stevenson, though without the comparative objectivity that the secretary maintained. The implications which both Mrs. Graham and Mr. Miers make to the detriment of San Martín and in praise of Lord Cochrane are almost endless. Mrs. Graham's references are found not only in the diary proper but also in her summary of Chilean history. Obviously she wrote the latter after the diary and probably when she realized the likelihood of the diary's being published. "Bosquejo de la Historia de Chile" contains a long account of the relationship between San Martín and Cochrane. The type of information included is not usually the kind she might have gathered in Valparaíso but corresponds with what Stevenson published in his *Memorias*. Mrs. Graham surveys the colonial period and the early events of independence, bringing her summary up to the date of the initial entry in her diary. In the light of the survey, the

9. Diego Barros Araña, *Historia Jeneral de Chile*, XIII, (Santiago: Rafael Jover, Editor, 1894), pp. 288-289; hereafter cited as: Barros Araña, *Historia de Chile*.

10. Graham, *Diario*, p. 149; Miers, *Travels*, II, p. 69; Stevenson gives an account of the Order of the Sun and its activities in *Memorias*, pp. 200-201.

11. Graham, *Diario*, pp. 341 ff.

events commented upon in her diary become more comprehensible, but the reader is likely to be conscious of a lack of spontaneity in her remarks.

It is not in keeping with the purpose of this study to give a detailed picture of San Martín as traced by either Mrs. Graham or by Mr. Miers. Nevertheless, an example or two taken from the writings of each might not be without value in throwing light on the very great bias which characterizes their accounts.

One idea which has persisted through all historical accounts of San Martín concerns his attitude toward the type of government which would best serve the needs of South America following independence. Although there is some basis in the letters of San Martín for thinking that his preference was for a centralized government under the guidance of a monarch, one can readily see why San Martín has been so censured for this point of view in the light of the comments made by John Miers:

> I gathered from San Martín, previous to his expedition to Peru, his real intentions relative to the government of that country. I often represented to him the condition of the people both of Chile and Peru—the want of education among even the higher classes—the inanition of the people, their contentedness and submissiveness under almost any control, however severe; I showed how impossible it was in a society so constituted, to establish a republican form of government, and how much better it would be suited to their disposition . . . were it possible to establish among them a well-regulated despotism under a man of talent, determination, liberality, and disinterestedness. I represented to him . . . that these people must be governed by such a despot before they could be brought to a sufficient state of advancement to be trusted out of their leading strings; on these occasions the eye of the general used to glisten, and he readily assented to the truth of these observations. I then formed the idea of his ultimate determinations, notwithstanding he studiously endeavored to conceal them. No one who understands the condition of the people whom he sought to deliver would find fault with San Martín for wishing to make himself emperor of Peru; his best friends, however, cannot but confess and regret the want of candour and of good faith under which he concealed his intentions . . .[12]

Substantially the same evaluation occurs in Mrs. Graham's work with the additional opinion that San Martín's Roman Catholic upbringing was in measure responsible for what were to her limitations in his thinking and for his strange behavior.[13] As to the argu-

12. Miers, *Travels*, II, pp. 30-31. The above passage is somewhat revelatory as to the character of John Miers. Captain Hall's opinion was quite different. Cf. Captain Basil Hall, R. N., F. R. S., *Extracts from a Journal Written on the Coasts of Chile, Peru, and Mexico, 1820, 1821, 1822.* 2 parts, (London: Edward Moxon, 1840), pt. 1, pp. 44-45; hereafter cited as Hall, *Journal.* He had twice conversed with San Martín on the same subject and was impressed with the General's logic and candour in saying that he had no desire to be a monarch of Peru; yet he felt the need of a centralized government. He said he would rule with supreme authority until such time as the people might be able to govern themselves. Time has, of course, attested to the practicality of San Martín's opinions since at independence the Latin American nations were lacking in any experience in self-government.

13. Graham, *Diario*, p. 350.

ment between Cochrane and San Martín of August, 1821, Mrs. Graham's summary is as follows:

But, the term having expired for which he (Cochrane) had engaged most of his seamen, they began to clamor for their pay, and with reason since the year's recompense which had been offered them for the fall of Lima appeared to have been quite forgotten. Lord Cochrane called San Martín's attention to this fact on the very day, that the latter declared himself Protector. They say that he offered excuses, primarily with regard to lack of funds notwithstanding that the treasury of Lima had just fallen into his hands; at length he declared that he would never pay the Chilean squadron unless the pay would be considered part of the purchase price. The indignation which Cochrane manifested for this suggestion violently aroused the angry Protector; but as Callao had not yet fallen: he dismissed his passions although he was even more fortified in his determination to take possession of the squadron . . .

On the following day Cochrane wrote a letter to the Protector in which he asked "What would everybody say if the first act of the Protector were to violate the obligations contracted by San Martín? . . . What would they say if the Protector refused to pay the expenses of the expedition which has elevated him to the high position which he occupies? and what will they say if he refuses to compensate those seamen who will have contributed so materially to his fortunes?"

Despite these letters and others more pressing on the same matter, he did nothing.[14]

Similar is the account of Mr. John Miers, though he, like Mrs. Graham, was in Chile at the time that the breach occurred:

On the 4th of August, three weeks after his entry into Lima, the admiral waited on him to confer upon the most speedy means of paying the squadron their arrears, and also paying them the gratuity of twelve months' pay, which San Martín, in a proclamation, had promised would be paid upon the capture of Lima; this had been loudly called for by his seamen. San Martín attempted to evade this demand by asserting, for the first time, that he was no longer general of Chile, but protector of Peru; and, as chief of this state, he was not bound, and would not be justified, in paying debts which belonged to the government of Chile, under whom alone the seamen were engaged. Instead of complying with the request of the admiral, he had the temerity to propose to Lord Cochrane to follow his example, accept the post of admiral of Peru, and employ the ships he commanded in the service of that state. Lord Cochrane rejected the proposal to become a traitor with disdain; high words ensued, when San Martín said that he would neither pay the seamen their wages nor the gratuities which had been promised, unless the navy of Chile were passed over to the service of Peru.[15]

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 123-4. Actually these pages are part of her summary of Chilean history and not diary entries.

15. Miers, *Travels*, II, p. 66. That Miers endeavored to be unbiased is evidenced by his concluding remarks: "But for the interposition of Lord Cochrane, who first braved the authority of San Martín, and curbed as well as humbled him in power, he would probably have continued much longer in Peru . . . the acts of his government would have been glossed over in the same manner as the deeds of all fortunate conquerors have been; and thus, like other successful tyrants, he would have been represented as a great hero, a liberator of the country, and perhaps as a benefactor of mankind. But even San Martín was not destitute of merit . . . he conferred several benefits on the people over whom he tyrannized . . . and left a more tolerable appearance in the outward manners and character of the demoralized and worthless Limeños." (Miers, *Travels*, II, pp. 86-7.).

The similarity of the accounts already quoted is obvious. However, the observations of General William Miller and of Captain Basil Hall ought to be considered in our discussion since both men wrote about the same time.

Hall makes no mention of the incident. He was himself on a voyage to Chile at the time of the conference. It should be noted that Hall was quite kindly disposed toward San Martín and gives a fairly favorable picture of him. They conversed on several occasions, and Hall was more than cognizant of San Martín's desire to liberate Peru slowly. He even remarked that the latter's arguments were both logical and forceful.[16] Unlike Mr. Miers and Mrs. Graham, Captain Hall did not consider San Martín a weak man, but a man of "no ordinary stamp." Had Hall commented on the incidents which since have assumed an importance quite beyond the original proportions, he might have helped to save San Martín's reputation. Yet for all his apparent admiration of the General and appreciation for the issues at stake in Peru, Hall vacillated in his analysis and consequently did his share in making the Liberator even more of an enigma. It is a reservation such as the following that does the harm:

> How far his professions were sincere, or if insincere, his plans were wide, it is now difficult to say . . . they seemed marked with sagacity and foresight, whatever may have been his subsequent conduct.[17]

The Captain had actually evaluated the General in terms of praise; yet when Hall realized that others did not share his regard for San Martín, then Hall himself began to wonder.[18]

The fifth British chronicler, Miller, gives an actual interpretation of the disagreement between Cochrane and San Martín. This account, though in general written with considerable objectivity, serves to substantiate the biased attitudes of his countrymen despite the fact that Miller was an admirer of San Martín. The generals actually worked together in close unison in the program of Peruvian liberation. Miller had been acquainted with San Martín in Europe. Proud of the chance to serve with the Argentinian, Miller performed

16. Hall, *Journal*, pt. 1, p. 44.

17. *Loc. cit.*

18. The relationship between Hall and Cochrane is worth noting. Hall was stationed off the coast of Peru and Chile during this period together with Captain Mackenzie and Commodore Sir Thomas Hardy. Their task was to protect English trade carried on under special licenses. Cochrane's task was to prevent contraband trade: hence there were several altercations between Lord Cochrane and the British commanders of the navy in the South Seas relative to the detention of British merchant ships because of the system of license. Captain Hall was on several occasions very angry with Cochrane. Miers endeavors to clarify the situation in order to show that Cochrane acted only in accordance with the law, but knew the various practices indulged in to avoid fulfilling the law. Eventually Hall admitted that if Cochrane seemed to annoy the British, he did so only in the line of duty. (Miers, *Travels*, II, p. 50 ff.).

bravely and brilliantly. His account is exceedingly objective, but it lacks the color and the romantic elements in Miers and Graham and much of the impersonal element in Hall. Yet Miller, too, admired the exploits of Cochrane and several times worked in close co-ordination with him.

General Miller states that a misunderstanding had existed between the Admiral and San Martín for some time previous to the meeting of August, 1821, but at that time it became irreparable. According to Miller, Cochrane put forth claims:

> First: For arrears due to the squadron. Secondly: A bounty equal to one year's pay for each individual of the squadron, agreeably to the promise made before sailing from Valparaíso. Thirdly: Fifty thousand dollars, which had been promised to the seamen, in the event of their taking the Esmeralda; and Fourthly: One hundred and ten thousand dollars, the estimated value of the frigate.
>
> The Protector contended, that the Chilean government was alone responsible for the first and fourth claim. He admitted the justice of the second and third, but required to have time allowed him to liquidate them. The admiral was highly dissatisfied with this answer. In the meantime, the royalist army approached the walls of Callao, when, as a matter of precaution, the coined and uncoined treasure belonging to the government, as well as to private individuals, was removed from the Lima mint to transports lying at Ancon. The admiral sailed there, and seized the treasure to pay the squadron, and returned to the bay of Callao. His Lordship stated the treasure so seized to have belonged to the government, or to have been contraband, that is silver sent on board unaccompanied by a document to prove the embarkation duty had been paid, and that the whole amounted to two hundred and five thousand dollars. The Protector, on the other hand, asserted that a great part of it was private property, and that the sum was above four hundred thousand dollars.[19]

19. Miller, *Memorias*, pp. 363-364.

IV

THE great difference in the characters of the two men made it probable that such a disagreement would occur sooner or later. Lord Cochrane, the man of action, was from the first incompatible in temperament with San Martín, the man of thought, who weighed every venture. It was unfortunate that their breach should have been recorded by five English chroniclers, all of whom had an evident bias. It was unfortunate also that no early Spanish account or body of material comparable to that of the English was published in the same decade. In the nineteenth century among the more substantial of the works by Spaniards are those of Vicuña Mackenna, Bartolomé Mitre, and Barros Araña.

Vicuña Mackenna's work appeared in the year 1863, one volume in a series of works started earlier. This first really substantial biography of San Martín is ostensibly a history of "the Revolution in Peru." The Chilean historian was in England only a few months after Cochrane's *Memoirs* appeared. Upon reading the account, Vicuña Mackenna was much impressed not only with the information but with the considerable number of documents included. He offered to translate the volume into Spanish in order that it might be circulated widely through South America, but he suggested to Cochrane that some of his estimates of San Martín and of the people of Chile were incorrect.[20] Vicuña Mackenna entreated Cochrane to tone down his version of his relationships with

20. Benjamin Vicuña Mackenna, *San Martín, La Revolución de la Indcpendencia del Peru.* VIII, *Obras,* (Santiago de Chile: Universidad del Chile, 1938), pp. 477-480, "A Su Senoria El Conde de Dundonald"; hereafter cited as: Vicuña Mackenna, *San Martín.*

Chile and with the general, but Cochrane refused to do so. In a terse reply to the historian, Cochrane acknowledged the suggestions but ignored the offer concerning a translation.[21] As a consequence, the Chilean's volume on the Peruvian events is distorted with scathing criticism of Cochrane. Vicuña Mackenna denounces him as "always guilty of insubordination—insubordination which displaces the fidelity due historiography and the true facts." [22]

He pictures Cochrane as unruly and as incapable of taking orders from a superior. On the other hand he portrays San Martín in the role of a great hero and perfect gentleman, a character in whom there are no flaws.

Perhaps because of the dispute with Cochrane, Vicuña Mackenna preferred not to tell of the quarrel between the General and His Lordship. Instead, he enumerates the many obstacles placed in San Martín's way and summarizes thus:

> But San Martín lost the army and the squadron at same time. Discontented from the very beginning of the operations of the campaign, Cochrane actually rebelled, took possession of the government property at Ancon, and weighed anchor, denying all obedience to Peru and protesting his submission and his loyalty to Chile.[23]

In addition to his resentment towards Cochrane for the way in which he had discussed events in Peru and in Chile, Vicuña Mackenna was likewise cognizant of the influence which the writings of the other Englishmen had had in depreciating San Martín's contributions.

> . . . I cannot explain to my own satisfaction by the same principles as his Lordship the military direction of the first campaign of Peru. That man singular and noble possessed a character apart, difficult to understand. His inaction before Lima could have had for its objective precisely the result which it produced, to realize the occupation of the city through the disorganization of the royalists . . . I am far from thinking as did his Lordship that Lima was for that great soldier, who had merited the title of the Hannibal of America, the Capua of his glory and fame. Through the publications of Mrs. Graham and other travelers this opinion began to prevail in South America confirmed with evidence because of the absence, or rather, the expulsion of the Protector of Peru from the government of that country.[24]

Bartolomé Mitre's biography of San Martín contrasts somewhat with that of his fellow Chilean countryman Vicuña Mackenna, although Mitre was a San Martín enthusiast. His work is care-

21. *Ibid.*, p. 480, "Contestación."

22. *Ibid.*, p. 487.

23. Vicuña Mackenna, *San Martín*, p. 64. The Chilean historian had collected "such an abundance of authentic documents that there was no longer any doubt as to the true narrative." He was aroused against Cochrane not only because of what he said about San Martín but of the offensive remarks concerning the people of Chile whom he regarded as ungrateful for the aid given them. See Vicuña Mackenna's letter to Cochrane, written on July 4, 1859, in San Martín, pp. 477-480.

24. *Ibid.*, "A Su Senoria El Conde de Dundonald," pp. 479-480.

fully executed, a truly definitive study. Mitre handles the relations between Cochrane and San Martín with considerable skill, giving a detailed account of the opinions and actions of both men. Yet Mitre, too, writing toward the end of the century had to rely upon the accounts of the English chroniclers—a fact which he himself stated. He emphasizes the capture of the Esmeralda as an event which impaired the friendship between the two commanders, again a fact presented by the English writers. Mitre treats the final breach at Lima as a direct result of this affair.

> On the 4th of August (1821), the very day on which San Martín declared himself Protector of Peru, the Admiral presented himself at the palace of government in Lima with the objective of reviewing verbally his claims, ignoring, or affecting to ignore the new character with which the General had invested himself. The version of the Conference which ensued between them and given by Cochrane's secretary and reproduced in his *Memorias*, appears confused and contradictory, compared with the documents which he himself transcribed . . . According to the Admiral San Martín contested the claims, declaring that he would not recognize the debts owed to the squadron, but that he would accept paying them as part of the price of the sale of it to Peru. The ministers Monteagudo and Garcia del Rio, who were present at the meeting, protested this assertion as calumny, and argued that since San Martín held the squadron at his command, there was no need to buy it. One deduces from Cochrane's version that the terms with which he formulated his objection offended San Martín who, annoyed, bade his ministers to withdraw. The Admiral, alarmed, protested that "he did not understand Spanish very well" and wished the ministers to serve as interpreters lest some expression, misunderstood, might be considered offensive.
>
> San Martín then turned to him and asked: "Do you know, milord, that I am Protector of Peru?"
>
> "No, sir," he replied.
>
> "But I have ordered my secretaries to inform you of that fact."
>
> "It is useless now, since you yourself have informed me personally, but I hope that the same friendship which has existed between San Martín and I may continue to exist between San Martín and I." The General, according to Cochrane, insisted that there was nothing to be said except that he was the Protector of Peru.[25]

Mitre continues his account by describing the attitude which Cochrane affected as an "exaggerated Chileanism." The Admiral refused to recognize San Martín as anything more than a general alienated from the country which he purported to serve. As an "officer of Chile" Cochrane assumed the responsibility of representing that nation and reiterated the demands made earlier. He then insinuated that if the squadron were not to be paid in Lima, it should be taken back to Chile to receive its pay. Finally Cochrane declared himself dismissed from all obedience and withdrew the support of his naval armament from Peru.[26] Mitre's interpre-

25. Bartolomé Mitre, *Historia de San Martín*, (Buenos Aires: Editorial Juventud Argentina, S. A., n. d.), II, pp. 208-209; hereafter cited as: Mitre, *San Martín*.

26. *Loc. cit.*

tation is that Cochrane, by his insinuations and declaration, put into San Martín's mouth the words of his last angry retort:

"Having offered to the crew of the fleet of Chile a year's wages in payment, I will fulfill it. Recognizing also as a debt the fulfillment of 50,000 pesos offered to the sailors who captured the frigate Esmeralda, I am not only disposed to cover this credit, but to recompense as a debt those who have aided in the liberating of the country. The wages of the crew are not in the same category, and not having said that I would ever pay them, no such obligation exists on my part . . . As for the squadron, you can take it where you wish and do what you please with it: with a couple of brigantines, I have enough . . ."[27]

Similar treatment of the San Martín-Cochrane imbroglio is accorded by Barros Araña in his extensive history of Chile, volume thirteen of which, dealing with the revolution in Peru, appeared in 1894. The historian gives a somewhat objective version of the whole affair and seems to have benefited from the fact that he did not share the passionate partisanship of Vicuña Mackenna and was farther removed from events than was even Bartolomé Mitre. Diego Barros Araña had studied more carefully the documents available to Vicuña Mackenna, authentic documents of the revolutionary period in special archives just being established.

In most respects Barros Araña's account resembles those of his predecessors so that it is not necessary to reproduce it in detail. He does, however, differ on one or two interesting points. Although Mitre gives the date of the meeting between San Martín and Cochrane as August 4, 1821—the date which Cochrane claims it to have occurred—Barros Araña proved that it was on August 5, 1821. He proved also that Cochrane was sufficiently cognizant of San Martín's status to have written on the 4th a letter to the Protector presenting the same demands that he made in person on the following day.[28]

27. *Loc. cit.*

28. Barros Araña, *Historia de Chile*, XIII, p. 288. The Chilean historian further proved that the letter which Cochrane dated in his own *Memoirs* August 7th was the original letter in San Martín's files dated August 4th. This original letter has certain passages and lacks other passages in the version offered by his Lordship. Barros Araña's theory is that Cochrane was quoting the letter in rough draft quite different from the one which he sent to San Martín. Barros Araña's quite charitable theory suggests that since Cochrane was nearly eighty years of age at the time that he prepared his *Memoirs*, he may have forgotten that his copy was not the same as the one sent to the general. Even with this allowance, it is difficult to account for the change in date. Cochrane's copy places him in a far more favorable light than does that of San Martín, and as usual with an English version it enjoyed wider circulation upon publication than did the later Spanish ones. It came to be quite generally accepted. See: *op. cit.*, p. 288, ftn. 46.

V

ONE has to examine only a few books—histories or biographies—to observe the manner in which the English version has been perpetuated to the detriment of the South American Liberator. In the last hundred years there have been several biographies of Lord Cochrane, one by his son and H. R. Fox Bourne, published in 1869; one by the Honorable J.W. Fortescue, in 1906; and one by E. G. Twitchett, in 1931, not to mention still others of very dubious authenticity which have enjoyed popularity. These have all relied heavily on the English accounts of Cochrane's role in South America, neglecting the Spanish versions. The life of Cochrane is a superb story from the standpoint of color and romance—far more so than that of San Martín—and consequently most of the biographies of Cochrane have been widely published.

At the age of seventeen and a half Thomas Cochrane, tenth Earl of Dundonald, went to sea with his uncle.[29] When twenty-five Cochrane was in command of his own vessel, the *Speedy,* whose task it was to raid the coast of Spain and France during the early years of the Napoleonic Wars. In thirteen months he was responsible for taking or retaking fifty vessels, one hundred and twenty-two guns and more than five hundred prisoners. This success was only a forerunner of a similar series of exploits in behalf of Chile and Peru.

His ventures were characterized by daring and skill, yet by

29. Most of the information about Cochrane's life in this and the following three paragraphs was taken from Christopher Lloyd, *Lord Cochrane,* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947).

caution and regard for the welfare of his men. They were likewise characterized by disobedience to the orders given him, and though he nearly always achieved his goal, it was at the cost of insubordination. His behavior thus prevented his receiving further promotions in the navy. Meanwhile, he was elected to Commons and served several years as an outspoken member until he was embroiled in the stock-exchange scandal of 1814. Though the charges were never fully established, he was sentenced to prison and deprived of his rank. When sufficiently bored, he escaped from prison, stayed safely in his own home while search for him extended even to the continent, then threw Parliament into bedlam by casually appearing at a session of Commons.

In 1818 he went to Chile, assisted San Martín until 1821 and subsequently served both Brazil and Greece in their independence movements. At the age of fifty-three he returned to England to spend the last thirty-two years of his life still fighting, but this time in his own cause—a veritable campaign of lawsuits, petitions, and persistent propaganda to establish his innocence in the stock market scandal and to regain his former rank in the navy.[30]

Probably the most recent biography of Lord Cochrane is that of Christopher Lloyd. He devotes a chapter to the "liberation of Chile and Peru" and lists as five sources of information for that chapter; Hall's *Journal,* Mrs. Graham's *Diary,* Miller's *Memoirs,* Stevenson's *Memoirs,* and Miers' *Travels.*[31] His praise of Cochrane and his defamation of San Martín indicate no change in the status of San Martín's reputation in the English speaking world in the century which has passed.

Among recent biographies of San Martín are those of Anna Shoellkopf and Margaret Harrison, in English, and that of Ricardo Rojas in Spanish. The Harrison study is inadequate although based on most of the available sources. The biographer says little of the relations between Cochrane and San Martín, further confusing the matter of dates of the conference and of Cochrane's letter. Apparently she disdained to accept the Barros Araña solution to the problem. She speaks of San Martín's maligning Cochrane with the nickname "the metallic milord," adds that the admiral

30. Mr. Robert Delaney, while doing graduate work at the University of New Mexico, worked extensively with the *Memoirs* of General Miller. His opinion, based upon Miller's comments, is that Miller, Miers, Graham, and Stevenson, even as early as the 1820's, were propagandizing to get Cochrane reinstated in the British Navy. If this was their objective, it might explain further their building Cochrane's reputation at the expense of San Martín's. This opinion, which the writer shares, can be verified only through documents available in England.

31. Lloyd, *Lord Cochrane,* p. 215.

became the general's violent detractor and reviled him in his *Memoirs,* but makes no mention of the maligning that San Martín had already received at the hands of Stevenson, Mrs. Graham, and John Miers.[32]

Anna Shoellkopf's sketch, written in 1924, was not based upon complete sources although she states that she used Mitre and other Spanish versions. Her description of both Cochrane and San Martín is favorable, but she avoids mention of the difficulties between them.[33]

El Santo de la Espada, published by Ricardo Rojas in 1933, is the work of a distinguished and popular Argentinian scholar. The English version, *San Martín, Knight of the Andes,* was published in 1945. Unfortunately the author assumes an almost mystical approach toward his hero and depicts him as a virtual superman. His discussion of the Lima interview, dated August 5, 1821, is an adequate account, based probably upon Vicuña Mackenna, since specific reference is made to materials used by the Chilean. Mr. Bennet Stevenson's story is recounted, but some of the facts reiterated by the Spanish writers are also included. Rojas attempts to redeem the character of San Martín and to reveal the extent to which he has been defamed by English writers. He cites a judgment which appeared in *The Times* of London, on February 13, 1859, in reference to Cochrane's *Memoirs.*

> The brave admiral proves that San Martín, his companion at arms, was a monster. To say that he (San Martín) was a fraud is not enough. With the most extraordinary seriousness he told lies that were obviously absurd. He was, at the same time, a coward, a braggart, and totally incompetent, although he somehow always managed to come out all right. But what he did was worse than doing nothing at all, for he betrayed every interest except his own.[34]

Rojas calls this a "trifling echo of Cochrane's abuses" in which he indicates that the admiral was, after all, "an impressive man with a piratical soul"—incompetent to judge in history's courts. He speaks also of the "envenomed sources" from which during a period of about one hundred and twenty-five years "certain publicists have taken sustenance and have continued to attack San Martín's glory."[35]

With all his desire to clear the reputation of San Martín, Rojas made one striking error in his evaluation of the "publicists," as evidenced by the following comment:

---

32. Margaret H. Harrison, *Captain of the Andes,* (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1943).

33. Anna Shoellkopf, *Don José de San Martín,* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1924).

34. Ricardo Rojas, *San Martín, Knight of the Andes,* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1945), p. 299. Vicuña Mackenna had published this reference in his San Martín.

35. Rojas, *San Martín,* p. 300.

And as for the great London journalist who slandered San Martín in 1859 on account of the atrabilious lord, we remind him that other Englishmen such as Lord Macduff, Robertson, Haigh, Basil Hall, Miller, and Mary Graham, who knew the Argentine hero personally or who were qualified witnesses of his deeds, had a more just estimate of his merits.[36]

His reading of Mrs. Graham's work must have been cursory to have overlooked her bitter remarks about the Protector. True, upon entertaining San Martín at dinner when he returned to Chile, she spoke of his fascination and charm, his ability to speak on almost any subject. She records also that he could not look one in the eye—a factor of major importance to her—and elsewhere in the diary as well as in "el bosquejo" she made unkind remarks which have certainly contributed their share in building the San Martín enigma.[37]

Ricardo Rojas also failed to appreciate the damaging phases of Hall's and Miller's remarks despite the fact that both men were respectful, even affectionate toward the General. If nothing more, their accounts may be twisted to substantiate the biased views of Stevenson, Graham, and Miers.

Among historians writing of the revolutionary period, one finds the English view of San Martín presented again and again. General histories and textbooks have played a leading role in perpetuating the picture. Thus one finds G. F. Scott Elliot's *Chile,* a 1911 publication, following the pattern. Robertson does so in his *Rise of the Spanish American Republics as Told in the Lives of Their Liberators*: similar is the picture presented by Luis Galdames in *A History of Chile* and that of Ricardo Levene in *A History of Argentina.* Each of these men has tried to give an objective account, but as each has depended upon the usual sources, without any particular evaluation of them, he has contributed nothing new to the picture of José de San Martín.

36. *Loc. cit.*

37. Graham, *Diario,* pp. 349-350.

VI

ONE fact seems to have escaped the notice even of those historians who have worked diligently to clear the reputation of San Martín! We have referred to five versions of the relationship between San Martín—all of them English and all of them published in the 1820's. Actually there were not five versions. Perhaps there were three. Probably there were two or one. Vicuña Mackenna, Mitre, and Barros Araña nearly discovered this when each stated that he was aware of the profound influences that the English writings had had in spreading a distorted view of Cochrane's association with San Martín.

The diary of Mrs. Maria Graham presents an interesting scene. On the 19th of November, 1822, a terrible earthquake occurred in the vicinity of Santiago and Valparaíso. The latter city was very nearly destroyed. Mrs. Graham gives details of the quake which are graphic and interesting, but of more interest to students of historiography are other details which she casually included in the account. It was for instance Mr. Stevenson, whom she calls "Bennet," who hurried to her cottage to warn her to get outside while there was still time. Mrs. Graham's home was destroyed, and she had to move to a tent on the plaza of Valparaíso. She was looked after by Mr. Stevenson, and later by Lord Cochrane and by Mr. and Mrs. John Miers. The Miers' home, in the nearby suburb of Concon, was likewise ruined. Mr. and Mrs. Miers and Mrs. Graham had long been friends and saw one another frequently, as the numerous references in her diary indicate. The

quakes continued for almost a month during which time the English folk, mutually concerned, shared their possessions and resources.[38]

The fearful disaster, however, was not their only interest. Though much of the work had to be done on the very plaza, Lord Cochrane himself was engaged in preparing to lithograph his handbills concerning his departure from Chile. Mr. John Miers had managed to salvage the lithograph when his home was destroyed. Aiding Cochrane in this enterprise were John Miers and Mrs. Graham, and of course, Mr. Bennet Stevenson![39] The obvious effect of this mutual activity is sufficient to explain the sameness of narrative in the accounts of Graham, Miers, and Stevenson.

Furthermore, the work of John Miers reveals that he was acquainted with Captain Hall. In fact, Miers had read Hall's *Journal* before publishing the *Travels.*[40] Hall's own record lists at least three extensive visits to Valparaíso at the very time that the liberation of Peru was in progress. In Valparaíso when San Martín declared himself Protector, Hall heard the news upon his return to Lima on August 9th.[41] Soon afterwards, Hall returned to Chile for an extended trip that lasted until late in the autumn. Although he does not make specific mention of having talked with Miers at this time, both were in the same area, the copper districts of Concon and Coqumbo, and Miers lived at Concon.[42] As has already been mentioned, Captain Hall also had contacts with Stevenson because of the several altercations with Cochrane on the question of British shipping.[43] It is Hall also who recorded in careful detail Cochrane's daring conquest of the Spanish frigate, the *Esmeralda,* for Hall was in the vicinity when the incident occurred.[44]

Lord Cochrane, in turn, worked in close co-ordination with General Miller, especially in the campaign of the area between Callao

38. *Ibid.*, p. 376 and ff.

39. Mrs. Graham's diary entries for December 13, 1882, and days following speak of San Martín's "accusations" and of Cochrane's "reply" and of subsequent political developments. San Martín was also in Valparaíso, having gone there from Peru. The political scene was very complicated as it was only a short time before the overthrow of O'Higgins. Disfavor was falling upon anyone connected with the O'Higgins regime, so both Cochrane and San Martín were confronted with that problem as well as defending themselves against each other.

40. See Miers, *Travels,* II, chapters XXII and XXIII on "Mines and Mining." Hall had written extensive descriptions of Chilean mining and Miers uses Hall's discussion as a point of departure.

41. Hall, *Journal,* pt. 1, p. 54.

42. *Ibid.*, pt. 2, pp. 11-12.

43. See ftn. 18.

44. Hall, *Journal,* pt. 1, pp. 60-64.

and Pisco. In March of 1821, when Cochrane attacked Pisco, it was General Miller's land forces who supplied the backing, and Cochrane, upon returning to Callao, left General Miller in command of the captured places.[45]

Occasions certainly were not lacking at which these fellow Britishers might have talked over the situation of affairs in Peru, under San Martín's command. The mutual acquaintance of Stevenson and Hall with the Englishmen in Chile is also apparent. In the light of the similarity of the accounts and in view of the extent that collaboration was possible, independent value of the records of Stevenson, Miers, Graham, Hall, and Miller as portraying the real character of San Martín must be greatly discounted. One hundred years of historiography has failed to fix properly their inadequacy in interpreting the career of San Martín.[46]

To borrow again the words of Mitre, "Whenever anything important has happened on this globe an Englishman seems to have been present." Perhaps this statement should be altered to read: Englishmen have been present.[47]

45. Miers, *Travels*, II, pp. 47-49.

46. One could trace any number of incidents through the discussions of the British chroniclers thus substantiating even further the degree to which they depended upon one another for their information.

47. Discussion in this paper is based upon the following works: María Graham, *Diario de su Residencia en Chile (1822) y de su Viaje al Brasil (1823)*, X, *Bibliotheca Ayachucho*, (Madrid: Editorial-América, 1916); Captain Basil Hall, R. N., F. R. S., *Extracts from a Journal Written on the Coasts of Chili, Peru, and Mexico, 1820, 1821, 1822*, 2 pts., (London: Edward Moxon, 1840); John Miers, *Travels in Chile and La Plata*, 2 vols., (London: Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1826); John Miller, *Memorias del General Miller*, XXVI-XXVII, *Bibliotheca Ayachucho*, (Madrid: Editorial-América, 1917?); William Bennet Stevenson, *Memorias*, XV, *Bibliotheca Ayachucho*, (Madrid: Editorial-América, 1917); Benjamin Vicuña Mackenna, *San Martín, La Revolución de la Independencia del Peru*, VIII, *Obras*, (Santiago de Chile: Universidad de Chile, 1938); Bartolomé Mitre, *Historia de San Martín*, 2 vols., (Buenos Aires: Editorial Juventud Argentine, S. A., n. d.); Diego Barros Arafia, *Historia Jeneral de Chile*, XIII, (Santiago: Rafael Jover, Editor, 1894).

Fort Hays Kansas State College Studies

1939-1951

(General Series)

Education Series

No. 1. Half Hours with Choral Speech, by Pearl Giddings Cruise (General Series No. 1). 1939.

No. 2. Instrumental Music in Western Kansas Public Schools, by Harold G. Palmer (General Series No. 16). 1951.

Psychology Series

No. 1. Studies in Clinical Psychology, prepared under the direction of George A. Kelly (General Series No. 2). 1940.

Sociology Series

No. 1. A study of One Hundred Farm Security Administration Grant Families in Ellis County, Kansas, 1939, by Clair A. Bondurant (General Series No. 3). 1941

Science Series

No. 1. Some Aspects of Evolutionary Theory, by George M. Robertson (General Series No. 4). 1942.

No. 2. Municipal Water Softening in Kansas, by Roy Rankin (General Series No. 10). 1946.

No. 3. Pasture Types of Western Kansas in Relation to the Intensity of Utilization in Past Years, by Gerald W. Tomanek (General Series No. 13). 1948.

No. 4. Proper Mixtures of Ellis County Soil for Adobe Construction, and Their Physical Properties. Part I, by B. W. Read, W. G. Read, and H. A. Zinszer (General Series No. 14). 1950.

No. 5. Proper Mixtures of Ellis County Soils for Adobe Construction, and Their Physical Properties. Part II, by B. W. Read, W. G. Read, and H. A. Zinszer (General Series No. 15). 1951.

Economics Series

No. 1. Employees' Share of National Income, 1929-1941, by Vernon T. Clover (General Series No. 5). 1943.

No. 2. An Economic and Sociological Study of a Kansas Community by Vernon T. Clover (General Series No. 8). 1945.

No. 3. Trego County Real Estate Assessment Plan, by Vernon T. Clover (General Series No. 11). 1946.

Language and Literature Series

No. 1. Bat Masterson: The Dodge City Years, by George G. Thompson (General Series No. 7). 1943.

No. 2. Book-Length Fiction by Kansas Writers, 1915-1938, by Maynard Fox (General Series No. 7). 1943.

No. 3. Victoria, The Story of a Western Kansas Town, by Marjorie G. Raish (General Series No. 12). 1947.

History Series

No. 1. Isaac McCoy: His Plan of and Work for Indian Colonization, by Emory J. Lyons (General Series No. 9). 1945.

Fort Hays Studies—New Series

1960

Science Series

No. 1. Distribution of Native Mammals Among the Communities of the Mixed Prairie, by Edwin Perry Martin. March 1960.

PRINTED IN
THE STATE PRINTING PLANT
TOPEKA, KANSAS
1960

28-2273