

RUMINATION BEFORE REVOLUTION: THE NEW WORLD'S REPUBLICAN EXPERIMENTS

Johanna Mateo

“This reflection once occurred to us: How many democracies have been brought down by those who wished the governing to be done in some way other than under a democracy; how many monarchies and how many oligarchies have been overthrown by the people; and how many who have tried to establish tyrannies have, some of them, been at once brought down completely, while others, if they have continued ruling for any time at all, are admired as wise and fortunate men...human beings unite against none more than against those who they perceive attempting to rule them”
– Xenophon, *The Education of Cyrus*

Who should rule over the people? This question has served as the nursery for regime change throughout the world’s history. Dissatisfaction with rulers, not the nature of regimes has inspired countless revolutions. When the question of WHO rules consumes the minds of revolutionaries it serves as an obstacle for true contemplation to occur. There is little room for a more important question to be discussed; the question of HOW human beings ought to be ruled. What made the American republic exceptional and unique was that it concerned itself entirely with this question. The conception of the American republic was not solely consumed with who rules, but instead

Johanna Mateo, of Chelsea, MA, is a 2014 graduate of the Ashbrook Scholar Program having majored in Political Science and History.

how to best rule over human beings.

By placing the question of HOW to best rule over human beings at the center of the American experiment, the American people were able to conceive a regime, which is in harmony with their understanding of what just political rule entails. Unlike many revolutions and changes of regimes, the American experiment was not concerned with solely replacing rulers. Instead at its core it had the purpose of conceiving a regime that best exemplified a good and just relationship between the government and the people. The American republic did not create a free and equal people, but instead it was the only form of government reconcilable with the genius of the American people.

What led to the success of the American experiment was the American mind’s contemplation of key principles such as consent, liberty, and equality. For the American mind, the contemplation of these principles was focused on their influence on the proper relationship between government and people. The American mind was strengthened by its continuous discourse on these principles, and its constant questioning of how to best rule over human beings. The American understanding of these principles originated and developed during the colonial and founding periods of the United States. This allowed the American people to contemplate this important question before committing themselves to revolution and the creation of a new regime. In this way, the rumination of HOW to best rule over human beings was at the core of the American experiment from its very conception.

While the American experiment – the American republic – has inspired revolutions throughout the world; these revolutionaries misunderstood the appropriate question to ask. In pursuit of the same political success as the United States, they have adopted a false understanding of the appropriate form of government. This misunderstanding has been made specifically clear in the Latin American revolutions of the 18th and 19th century. These revolutions demonstrate the danger of focusing solely on the question of WHO received the power to rule, instead of understanding HOW to best rule over human beings.

This thesis examines the revolutions and new regimes conceived from the American and Latin American experiments. It concentrates on studying the different kinds of revolutions and regimes that stem from considering two very different questions as the foundation for republics. Both the United States and Latin America shared the same feeling of discontent towards their mother countries. The difference between the two was the source of their discontent. For the American mind, it originated in the British actions and policies and their incompatibility with the American understanding of HOW human beings ought to be ruled. The British rule over the American colonies was at tension with the American understanding of the principles of consent, liberty, and equality. Their actions helped further the American discourse on HOW human beings are best ruled, eventually leading to two irreconcilable understandings of this question. In the case of Latin American countries, their discontent originated in their dissatisfaction with how political and economic powers were distributed among the ruling classes. The discontent felt in Latin American countries was consumed by the question of WHO participated in the enjoyment of political and economic privileges shared by the ruling classes.

To examine the consequences of conceiving regimes on two different questions, I will consider both historical and ideological influences in the creation of republics in the United States and Latin America. In Chapter One, I will examine the creation of the American mind through the writing of social and political luminaires such as John Winthrop, Jonathan Mayhew, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Samuel Williams, among others. This will reveal insight into the origins of the American understanding of just government. The historical evidence will give insight into how and why the American mind diverged from the British mind on the question of HOW to best rule over human beings. This will be analyzed and studied through the various American arguments against British policies. These analyses will allow us to understand the purpose of the American experiment and its relationship with the American commitment to republicanism. Chapter Two will examine the Latin American revolutions and regimes. This chapter will focus on how the question of WHO rules and the privileges they receive influence both the revolutions and regime creations in Latin America. This understanding will come from studying the relationships and tensions that inspired the revolutions, and the main purposes of the new regimes. After analyzing both the American and Latin American approach to revolution and republicanism one will be able to understand the importance of placing the right questions at the core of new regimes.

CHAPTER ONE: The United States

The American understanding of liberty, equality, and self-government was not the product of the American Revolution. Instead this understanding was the product of the contemplation of the American mind over the 150 years of its colonial period. It was the tension between British authority, and its impact on the liberty of the American colonies that allowed the colonists the opportunity to think thoroughly about their liberties, equality, and the principle of consent. Most importantly, their discourse on these principles was the result of their contemplation on the question of how human beings ought to be ruled in a just way. It was their reflections on this very important question that would bring to light the irreconcilable differences between the American and the British mind that would eventually lead to the American Revolution. The discourse during this time shows how the question of how human beings ought to be ruled is at the very core of the American experiment from its very conception.

John Winthrop was a leading figure in the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and his sermons provide us with insight into how the colony understood a just relationship between the government and the people. His sermons and writings are a reflection of New England's discourse on the relationship between consent and liberty and how these principles apply to governing. Through the study of Winthrop's writing one is able to trace the beginning of the American understanding of how to best rule over human beings.

In his sermon, "A Model for Christian Charity," Winthrop explains how the colony of New England aims to live, and its desires to renew the corrupted world by example. According to Winthrop, this society will live in a "bond of love" and this

bond will be one founded on mutual consent and choice. This is exemplary of the Puritan's Congregationalist characteristic, the idea that by choice we can bond ourselves to love "under a form of government both civil and ecclesiastical."¹ Liberty, as understood by Puritans during their settlement, stemmed from their consent and choice to live in a society that aimed at religious perfection, justice, and harmony through this bond of love to one another. Their commitment to this bond stemmed from their shared understanding and agreement on the precepts that would guide their society. Since they submitted themselves under a form of government both civil and ecclesiastical the principle of consent was at the center of their religion, social, and civil government.

The importance of the relationship between liberty and consent is explored further in Winthrop's *Journal*, where he discusses the violation of Christian law by a man. Winthrop points out that the man violated the law by charging people more in order to make profit. This was a violation because "having promised reformation; being a member of a church and commonwealth" he had agreed to the community's condemnation of this act. Since he was part of the community he had agreed to this covenant. This points out the relationship between consenting to the shared precepts of a political community and the accountability that this brings. With consenting to share precepts come responsibilities for both the rulers and those being ruled. For Puritans, a person was free to leave their society if it did not wish to consent to their covenant of civil government and religion.

The contemplation of liberty is continued in Winthrop's exploration of civil liberty and its nature. In "On Liberty," he explains, civil liberty refers to "the covenant between God and man" and "the politic

¹ Winthrop, "A Model for Christian Charity."

covenants and constitutions, amongst men themselves.”² In order to explain this understanding of civil liberty he refers to the example of marriage, pointing out that a wife chooses her husband and she subjects to her “in a way of liberty, not bondage.”³ Liberty is measured by one’s subjection to a legitimate authority through our consent and decision to become part of a covenant in society. The distinction between subjecting oneself in a way of liberty and not bondage is key because it requires people to contemplate how absolute power in any form is incompatible with liberty. This understanding of the importance of consent is crucial to understanding the American mind. It makes a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate subjection to government. Under this interpretation of liberty, one must actively consent to the power ruling and, because it cannot be bondage, the power must be inherently limited in its nature. From the very beginning of the discourse of consent and its relationship with liberty it is made clear that the American understanding would find itself at tension with any kind of absolute and unlimited power.

The importance of consent and its relationship with liberty went beyond the public discourse and prominent sermons in congregations. It was a belief that was embraced and reflected in the policies of the colony of New England. From the very beginning, New England seemed to be aware of the threat of becoming vulnerable to royal control, even after decades of enjoying self-government. The Act of the General Court served to demonstrate the fear of New England colonists concerning their liberties and self-government during the restoration period. It was written in June 1661, and it defined limits of royal authority by separating the colonists’ liberties from their duties of allegiance to the king. The liberties

stressed in this document where does of self-government as they best embodied their understanding of consent and liberty. The Act of General Court points out that New England colonists have the “power to choose annually a governor, deputy governor, assistant, and their select representatives or deputies” and “this government also has power to set up all sorts of officers, as well superior as inferior, and point out their power and places.”⁴ For New England colonists, their most important liberty was still directly connected to the idea of consenting through election to those who would rule over them. This was extremely important because the people they chose had “full power and authority, both legislative and executive, concerning ecclesiastics and in civils.”⁵ Since they understood the relationship between government and the people as a covenant it was important that both the rulers and the ruled had the same common understanding of the Puritan society. Their liberty stemmed from consenting to submit themselves to a body of people that they thought best understood how to properly rule over them, thus making them self-governed by a legitimate authority.

For the American mind, consent and its essential role in preserving their liberty had become key to any form of legitimate power that attempted to ruled over them. This understanding of consent was not limited to the domestic affairs of the colony for it also included their relationship with the British Empire. In the colonists’ mind any form of government that attempted to legitimately rule over human beings ought to do so in harmony with liberty through the presence of consent.

Jonathan Mayhew, another prominent minister in Massachusetts, gives us insight into the development of the colonists’ mind on the question of how to best

² Winthrop, "On Liberty."

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Act of the General Court.

⁵ *Ibid.*

rule over human beings. He does this by furthering exploring the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate submissions to government. Mayhew's sermon, "Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission," is a clear example of how the American mind had drifted from the British mind on their understanding of how human beings ought to be ruled. Mayhew begins his sermon by explaining how biblical passages concerning submission of the people to their rulers have been misunderstood through history. He describes the key differences between a ruler that is entitled to the submission of the people and one that is tyrannical and underserving of their obedience. He explains that biblical passages such as "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; the power that be are ordained of God"⁶ have been misunderstood to mean an unchallenged submission to civil rulers regardless of possible tyrannical and oppressive actions. Mayhew, makes it clear that the "submission" biblical passages talk about are such that "conclude only in favor of submissions to such rulers as he himself describes, such rule for the good of society, which is the only end of their institution."⁷ In order for one ruler to be entitled to the obedience of the people they must rule in accordance with the end of civil government, which is the good of society. At the core of this understanding of a just government is the question of how to best rule over people in a way that will benefit them.

For this reason, if the end and duty of government is not executed properly, then a people are not divinely bound to have an unchallenged submission to tyrannical rulers. Mayhew continues his argument by explaining that absolute submission to a government that is not fulfilling the purpose of being good to society is contrary to the

end of civil government. This kind of mindless and unchallenged submission would result in "a contrary end which is brought about, and the ruin and misery of society affected by it" by promoting "slavery and misery" for that society.⁸ For government to fulfill its end rulers must rule for the good of society, but the people must also be guards of their rights and liberties. If they neglect and practice complete submission, then they run the risk of becoming a slavish society. Even during British rule, the American discourse reflected on the necessity of the people to be proactive about protecting their rights and liberties. This understanding of consent required the people to contemplate and judge whether or not they are being ruled justly.

This does not mean that the governed have a right to rebel against their rulers by "acting so in a few particular instances, which the best of rulers may do through mistake" instead they must only act when the rulers "aim at making themselves great by the ruin of their subjects."⁹ For the American mind, simple passions and dissatisfaction with rulers was not enough to deem them illegitimate. Just like rulers are required to rule in accordance with the good of society in order to be entitled to obedience, the people must also act prudently in order to resist and object to actions taken by rulers. Again, for the American mind the covenant between the people and the government held both sides accountable to their shared precepts. Mayhew makes it clear that only when the intentions of a ruler are to harm society and his subjects can the people act against him.

According to Mayhew, this is what made the resistance to Charles I a "most righteous and glorious stand" because it was a "defense of the natural and legal rights of the people, against the unnatural and illegal

⁶ Romans 13:1, King James Version.

⁷ Mayhew, "Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission."

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

encroachments of arbitrary power.”¹⁰ In this instance, Mayhew stresses that the resistance was necessary because the people had suffered patiently under “the oppressions of the crown, for a course of many years.”¹¹ Again, Mayhew justifies this resistance by explaining that it was a stand against a train of abuses exerted by Charles I, and it was necessary to prevent the nation from becoming slavish. This understanding of the English Civil War is not solely concerned with *who* used arbitrary power. Instead it concerns itself with *how* the use of arbitrary power is incompatible with how human beings ought to be ruled in a just manner.

This glorious and righteous stand against absolute power, tyranny, and oppression was viewed by Mayhew as a “standing memento, that Britons will not be slaves; and a warning to all corrupt councilors and ministers, not to go too far in advising to arbitrary, despotic measures.”¹² For Mayhew and the American colonists, this was a lesson to be taken to oppose all advancements from any civil ruler that attempted to exercise arbitrary and absolute power over a people. It was this understanding of how not to rule over human beings that would inspire the opposition against a despotic British Parliament.

Natural limitations on all civil rulers were embraced by the American mind during the years to follow Mayhew’s sermon. For the American colonists unlimited and absolute power, in any form, was destructive to liberty. Unlike the British, Americans were willing to resist signs of a Parliament that believed they had the right and authority to serve as an absolute and unchallenged ruler over the people in the American colonies. This key difference between the American and the British minds became clear during the debates over the Stamp Act

of 1765. It marked the divergence between the American and British understanding of how to best rule over human beings. The differences on this question were greatly influenced by their different and irreconcilable understanding of the English Civil War. Whereas for the Americans, it was a lesson to be used against any form of absolute and unlimited power, for the British mind this only applied to the King, not Parliament.

In the British mind, Parliament’s success over the divine right of kings and Charles I meant that Parliament had the authority to do “everything that is not naturally impossible” and its jurisdiction “is so transcendent and absolute, that it cannot be confined, either for causes or persons with any bounds.”¹³ It is this political belief that seems to best explain Britons’ view on the Stamp Act. The British Parliament’s authority to tax the colonies was not a question, in fact Jared Ingersoll points out that “the Authority of Parliament to impose such tax here was so fully and Universally yielded that there was not the least hopes of making any impressions that way.”¹⁴ This meant that the debate from the British point of view was not whether limitations on the rights and powers of Parliament over the American colonies existed, but simply a question of prudence and policy. According to the British, Parliament was the supreme legislative authority and had the power to tax, and “if they have not that power over America, they have none, & then America is at once a Kingdom of itself.”¹⁵ In the British mind there existed no limitations to the supreme power of Parliament and the dependence and inferiority of the colonies equaled absolute obedience and submission to the actions taken by Parliament.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Blackstone, William. *Commentaries on the Laws of England*.

¹⁴ Jared Ingersoll to Thomas Fitch, February 11, 1765.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Since Parliament is the “supreme and unlimited power of the Nation” it has the power to tax the colonies directly, because even though they do not elect members this “supreme legislature is supposed to represent, or rather to stand in the place of the Commons, who are below the dignity of peers.” (The Debate in Parliament 30) This characterization of Parliament that allows for the British to claim that the colonists are in fact virtually represented in Parliament, and as part of the Kingdom have to accept Parliament as the ultimate and supreme authority.

For the American colonists the debate on the Stamp Act was not about prudence or policymaking, but instead it was an encroachment upon their rights and liberties. This was something that very few people within Parliament recognized but the rest did not take their opinions of American colonists seriously. This is shown when one of the members states that he “the people I believe are as truly Loyal as any Subjects the King has, but a people Jealous of their Liberties and who will vindicate them, if ever they should be violated.” (The Debate in Parliament 32) He recognizes that for the American people the problem with the Stamp Act is that it is a violation of their liberties, and in this extent they seem to be very much like the people Mayhew talked about in his sermon. They will be loyal and obedient towards their rulers as long as their liberties are not threaten by arbitrary and despotic measures. In this manner, the idea of consent and indispensable for the protection of liberty had become clear in the mind of the colonists.

The discourse on the Stamp Act gave American colonists the opportunity to further contemplate the principle of liberty and natural rights. In his *Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law*, John Adams argues that as human beings the colonists have “rights, for such they have, undoubtedly,

antecedent to all earthly government, – rights, that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws – rights, derived from the great legislator of the universe.” (Dissertation) In this way, the American mind viewed liberty and natural rights as separate entities from government. Their source was the Creator and thus earthly governments could not violate these rights. These rights have been threatened throughout history by a system of tyranny known as the canon and the feudal law. These laws together have reduced the people’s “minds to a state of sordid ignorance and staring timidity, and by infusing them a religious horror of letters and knowledge.” (Dissertation) In order for this canon law to prevail the people must be kept in darkness. In their state of ignorance they were persuaded to “believe, faithfully and undoubtingly, that God Almighty had entrusted them with the keys to heaven”, and this was soon adopted by “all the princes of Europe” (Dissertation). These tyrants then used the ignorance of the people and to implement a feudal law that was validated by canon law, the belief that “the general was invested with the sovereign propriety of all the lands within the territory.” (Dissertation) These canon and feudal laws can only exist among people that do not contemplate how they ought to be ruled and instead mindlessly submit themselves to an absolute and unchallenged power.

Since the basis for these two tyrannical laws is the darkness of ignorance among a people, Adams pointed out that it was essential that the people educated themselves. In this way, a proper understanding of liberty and rights is absolutely necessary to preserve them against absolute power from any kind of government. Adams thoughts on these tyrannical laws gives us insight into how the American mind had began to clearly see that in order to prevent tyranny and despotism human beings ought to be properly educated. They must be

educated to constantly contemplate if they are being ruled in a just manner. As Mayhew's sermon pointed out, in order for people to be good and just protectors of their liberties and rights they must be active and capable of understanding how they ought to be ruled in a just and legitimate way. This requires them to fully understand their rights, but also the responsibilities and limits of those ruling over them. This is something that cannot occur when absolute and unchallenged submission is expected from the people to any form of power.

Adams reminded the colonists that "we have a right to it (liberty), derived from our Maker" but "liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people." (Dissertation) In order for the people to preserve their rights they must be properly educated so they become self-aware of their liberties and rights. Only if they have a proper understanding of these will they be able to defend them against possible tyrannical powers. This is why Adams recognizes the importance of knowledge, and believes is the most important protection of liberty the founders of New England left. According to him they (puritans) "were convinced by their knowledge of human nature, derived from history and their own experience, that nothing could preserve their posterity from encroachments of the two system tyranny...but knowledge diffused generally through the whole body of the people" (Dissertation). It was this that allowed the puritans to create a government that resisted feudalism, they "were contented to hold their lands of their king, and to him they were willing to render homage, but to no mesne or subordinate lords." (Dissertation) According to Adams, from the very beginning the puritans were able to protect themselves and their future generations against encroachments upon their liberty by educating themselves. This was something that they took very seriously, for

they were aware that their liberty depended on it.

Great Britain was well aware of the importance of knowledge in preserving liberty and the stopping of feudal law to propagate New England, for this reason they implemented a "direct and formal design on foot, to enslave all America." (Dissertation) The introduction of feudal law was witnessed during the restoration and the dominion of New England in which king's charters of land were challenged and land was treated like a proprietary colony. One in which quit rents had to be paid in order to pay for officers that were loyal to the crown. Feudal law was extremely dangerous to the American understanding of liberty, because the submission it required was one in bondage not liberty. Under feudal law the king owns the land making him superior and absolute in power. The claims made by feudal law were inherently at tension with the American understanding of liberty, and its influence on how to best rule over human beings.

Through the Stamp Act, Parliament and Great Britain as a whole attempted to use their authority as a mother country to "strip us in great measure of the means of knowledge, by loading the press, the colleges...to introduce the inequalities and dependencies of the feudal system, by taking from the poorer sort of the people, and conferring in a set of stamp officers, distributors, and their deputies." (Dissertation) In this way the Stamp Act was a violation of the colonists' liberties because its main purpose is to "aim at making themselves great, by the ruin of their subjects" (Mayhew).

In the same way Adam's identified a conspiracy against liberty in America by making it hard for people to remain educated, Thomas Jefferson also noticed Parliament's design. According to Jefferson, in his *Summary Review of the Rights of British America*, Parliament has engaged in "many

unwarrantable encroachments and usurpations.” (Summary View) He begins with the description of the Hat Act in the early 1730s, this was a Parliament act that prohibited the making of hats in American colonies. (Summary View) This was an example of England exercising protective tariffs over the colonies, in order to protect their domestic industries instead of promoting the commonwealth of the colonies. Jefferson points out that these were not single Acts of tyranny, but in fact formed part of a plan. Acts such as the Hat Act, Sugar Act, Stamp Act, Declaratory Act, and Townshend Act were projects to make the colonists poor while enriching the domestic industries of Britain. In this way, for the British the purpose of ruling over the American colonies was self-interest and not an attempt to rule justly. The purpose behind these acts was not to benefit the colony, but simply to protect English business and to assert the supreme authority of the mother country over the colonies. In addition, these acts have been unfolding for the past decade. Jefferson points out “single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of the day; but a series of oppressions begun at a distinguished period, and pursued, unalterably through every change of ministers, too plainly to prove a deliberation and systematical plan of reducing us to slavery.” (Summary View) The repetitive nature and intentions of these acts gave the colonists insight into how the British believed the colonists ought to be ruled. For the British the American colonies had to be ruled over in a way that was most beneficial to the British Empire, even when the ruling was detrimental to the principles and interests held by the American colonists.

From the very beginning of the colonies’ settlements their contemplation of consent, liberty, and their relationship with how human beings ought to be ruled was at the center of the American discourse. Their

domestic policies, and their interactions with the British Empire were all qualified and judged based on their understanding of how human beings ought to be justly ruled over. It is on this question, that the diversion from the British mind becomes most clear. In this way, the American understanding of liberty and consent was guided by the contemplation of how it applies to ruling in a just and legitimate manner.

A clear understanding of equality is also necessary to properly contemplate the question of how human beings ought to be ruled in a just way. The American discourse on equality was focused on the contemplation of how the understanding of it can best strengthen and promote good virtues among the citizens. Unlike the British mind, Americans rejected the socio-political system of feudalism. The premise of feudalism is the belief in human inequality. This is the belief that there is a socio-political hierarchy and some men are born above all the rest. The American understanding of equality consists of “a free and equal enjoyment of the primary rights, which are, the intellectual rights, and the right which men have of using their powers and faculties, under certain reciprocal modifications, for their own convenience and happiness.” (Nathaniel Chipman, *Of the Nature of Equality in Republics*) The American understanding of equality is one that is most concerned with an equality of primary rights. This requires an understanding that rejects the belief that some men are born above all the rest. This understanding of equality is most in harmony with the republican form of government in which there is no political hierarchy.

The discourse on equality in America took place in pamphlets, newspapers, and a number of political books. Among these books was *The Natural and Civil History of Vermont* by Samuel Williams. In this book Williams contemplates different aspects of

the settlements in New England. One of his sections is concerned with the presence of a natural equality in a new country. Williams argues, "the nearest equality that ever can take place among men will also be found among the inhabitants of a new country." (American Political Writing During Founding Era, 954) This was the case for the American colonists, for when they settled in America they were placed in a situation that resembled a society in a state of nature. In this situation American colonists

were placed in a situation nearly similar, the employments, views, and pursuits of the people, become nearly the same. The distinctions derived from birth, blood, hereditary titles and honours, and a difference of rights and privileges, are either unknown or resolve themselves into nothing, among a people in such situation...they all feel that nature has made them equal in respect to their rights; or rather that nature has given to them a common and an equal right to liberty, to property, and to safety; to justice, government, laws, religion, and freedom. (American Political Writing During Founding Era, 954)

This understanding of equality is fully concerned with an equality of natural rights such as those of liberty, property, safety, and justice. The American understanding of equality is one that is most concerned with the relationship between all man and their natural rights. It is committed to the belief that all men have the same natural rights given to them by nature and in this way there is no hierarchy of political rights. Since this equality is most concerned with natural rights it allows them to acknowledge and see that nature has made them unequal in respects to "their original powers, capacities, and talents." (American Political

Writing During the Founding Era, 955) When their natural equality is protected they are able to benefit from their inequalities in capacities and talents.

The colonists enjoyed this state of equality during the beginning of their settlements, but it was eventually corrupted by the British regime's influence and corruption. In "A Summary View of the Rights of British America," Jefferson makes a similar argument on the colonists' understanding of equality before the introduction of British feudalism. He states that America had "been acquired by the lives, the labours, and the fortunes, of individual adventurers." (107) What colonists had acquired in the American colonies were a product of their natural talents and the natural equality of rights they enjoyed when they first settled their communities. Jefferson argues that this was taken away by the British regime. He says that what they had acquired "was by these princes, at several times, parted out and distributed among the favourites and followers of their fortunes, and, by an assumed right of the crown alone, were erected into distinct and independent governments." (108) These acts by British princes were attempts at introducing feudalism and the inequality that is at its foundation. Feudalism exists under the premise that there is a natural inequality and hierarchy. It is this socio-political system that allows for the princes to take ownership of all lands and distribute them among their favorites.

Jefferson's argument was most clear when studying one of the most monstrous attempts to exercise British authority in the American colonies, the Dominion of New England. During this time period the British crown attempted to establish a sudden change in New England. This was very similar to the aims of proprietary colonies such as those of Pennsylvania and the Carolinas, where the crown gave private individuals colonies. This was an attempt to

establish feudalism and reward loyal subjects that advanced the interests of the crown in America. The attempt to try to apply these aims in New England was made by granting lands as private property and granting the council and a royal appointed governor the power to “grant unto any person or persons for such terms and under such moderate Quit Rents.” (Commission of Sir Edmund Andros) The money raised from this quit rents were used to pay for various officials, and undermined the belief many colonists in New England had about owning their own land. In this way, the Dominion of New England was a clear attempt by the Crown to establish feudal principles in New England. Like with proprietary aims they tried to reward loyal subjects with revenues raised by quit rents and navigation acts. During this time period, no one man could claim ownership of land, but was imposed feudalism by a king appointed “Captain general and governor in chief.” (Commission of Sir Edmund Andros) This British policy was at tension with the colonists’ understanding of natural equality, in which royal titles could not violate their equal right to property.

The introduction of this artificial and institutionalized inequality to the colonies was of great harm to the natural equality they had enjoyed during the settlement periods. According to Jefferson the introduction of feudalism to the American colonies was unjust for “Our Saxon ancestors held their lands, as they did their personal property in absolute dominion, disencumbered with any superior, answering nearly to the nature of those possessions which the feudalists term allodial.” (118) The belief that as human beings have a natural right to property disencumbered from rulers and their favorites greatly influenced how the American regime and society thought about how human beings ought to be ruled in a just manner.

The importance of the correct understanding of equality and its vital role in the American regime is further explore when discussing the kind of civic and republic virtue that the Founding Fathers desired to promote. The Founders were concerned with establishing a government that was in harmony with the American understanding of liberty, consent, and equality. At the same time, they understood that the purpose of regimes and governments was beyond the question of who rules. They understood that the type of regime they chose had to be in harmony with what is best for human beings and how human beings are best ruled. This is why the Founder Fathers were concerned with introducing a regime that ruled justly and was good for the character of the people it ruled over. Regimes are meant to inspire certain virtues and character in a people. The virtues and character desired for the American people could only flourish and be in harmony with a regime that had a just understanding of liberty and equality at its core. The Founders believed that republicanism was the best and most just regime to spread, cultivate, and flourish these principles.

John Adams argues that republicanism produces “strength, hardiness, activity, courage, fortitude and enterprise; the manly noble and sublime qualities in human nature, in abundance.” (Letter to Mercy Warren) Republicanism requires and depends on the people it governs over. It inspires all citizens to take responsibility in the happiness of the people. Adams says, “under a well regulated Commonwealth, the People must be wise, virtuous and cannot be otherwise.” (Letter to Mercy) In order for the regime to inspire such virtues it must be one that is founded on just principles. This is not the case for monarchies or other regimes with self-interest at their foundation. These regimes, he argues, can “make me rich, but it would produce so much taste and politeness so

much elegance in dress, furniture, equipage ... under monarchy (people) may be as vicious and foolish as they please, nay, they cannot but be vicious and foolish.” (Letter to Mercy Warren) Regimes not founded on just principles are incapable of inspiring virtue, justice, and good character among their people, thus making it impossible for them to rule in the most just manner.

The character shaped by regimes that lack principles are unjust aristocracies based on man made inequalities, and not natural inequalities that produce greatness based on natural talents. This proper understanding of equality was vital for the Founding Fathers. Benjamin Franklin states that the United States is not interested in someone that “has no other quality to recommend him but his birth...in Europe it has indeed its value, but it is a commodity that cannot be carried to a worse market than that of America.” (Information to Those Who Would Remove to America) The kind of citizens that are in harmony with the principles of the American people are those who want to enjoy and take advantage of a natural equality in which their talents can allow them the enjoyment of the profits of their industry. This is why Franklin argues that unlike in Europe, Americans are not concerned with “what he is?” but instead “what can he do?” (Information to Those Who Would Remove to America)

The man-made inequality praised by Europe was not in harmony with the principle of equality that laid the foundation for the American regime. Thus the bad habits and dangerous precedents left in American society after the revolution were dangerous and harmful to the republicanization of the American people. In Virginia, for example:

transmission of this property (fee-tail) from generation to generation in the same name raised up a distinct set of families, who being privileged by law in their perpetuation of their

wealth were thus formed into a Patrician order, distinguished by the splendor and luxury of their establishments. From this order too the king habitually selected his Counsellors of State, the hope of which distinction devoted the whole corps to the interests and will of the crown. (Jefferson Autobiography, 32)

This habit developed during the rule of the British regime over the colonies was seeing as detrimental and dangerous to the character the American regime sought to promote. It promoted an aristocracy of wealth that could not be in harmony with the republicanization of the American people. It was meant to promote and spread the artificial inequality Europe was infatuated with. Jefferson believed that this aristocracy of wealth had to be replaced with “the aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided the direction of the interest of society, & scattered with equal hand through all it’s conditions, was deemed essential to a well ordered republic.” (Jefferson Autobiography, 32) For Jefferson, a good republic valued and defended a natural aristocracy, which would only be the product of natural equality. In regime founded with a just understanding of natural equality one is able to find greatness and virtue. It is this quality that will allow the American people to find good leadership. In his “A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge,” Jefferson argues that a good education is best to fight corruption and protect natural rights. He argues that a natural aristocracy can be beneficial to protecting the rights and liberties of all the citizens. Jefferson states, “whence it becomes expedient for promoting the publick that those persons, whom nature hath endowed with genius and virtue, should be rendered by liberal education worthy to receive” because they are vital in the

defense of the people's liberty. A good education will prepare those who are naturally endowed with greatness to "guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens" and for this reason it is important that natural equality be the guide. The protection of these liberties cannot be qualified by wealth, birth, or other accidental and superficial circumstances.

The American discourse on equality is similar to the discourse on consent and liberty; both are guided by the question of how human beings ought to be ruled in a just and good way. For this reason, the American mind thinks of equality in relationship to how it shapes certain virtues, character, and relationship among the people. This is what inspires the divergence and disapproval of the British understanding of equality, for their understanding is dangerous for the people. It is a dangerous understanding because when a natural inequality is the premise of a system of government then there is no room for discourse and a true devotion for the protection of natural rights. For the American mind, this understanding of equality was unacceptable for it was both permissive of tyranny, mindless submission, and a promoter of vices instead of virtues among the people.

After studying the importance of placing the question of how human beings ought to be ruled at the core of the American experiment, one must consider what happens when this question is absent from the discourse leading up to revolution and the creation of a new regime. The absence of this question, and its replacement by the question of who rules is most evident in the case of the Latin American revolutions. For this reason, it is necessary to turn our attention to how the question of who rules influenced the Latin American revolutions and their experiments with republicanism and self-government.

CHAPTER TWO: Latin America

The Latin American countries' struggles towards becoming stable, free, and independent republics seems to have begun with the unclear purposes of their revolutions towards independence, and the tensions between the different ethnic and social groups within the countries. In addition, the inherent disorder and instability of young nations with no clear purposes for their revolutions led to a tension between self-discovery accompanied by young attempts to self-government and the desire for stability and order. It was the desire for stability and order for economic purposes that would be behind the constant abandoning of constitutions, misunderstanding of the ends of government, and many times subordination to absolute authorities. The lack of clear political principles resulted in a dangerous desire from the elite to imitate and bring to life the examples seen in the political life of Europe in Latin American countries. This obsession was not accompanied by an understanding of how the very different culture and circumstances in Latin America could make these ideas own, but instead expected Latin America to be changed and shaped by European ways. In this way, only the elites would truly completely understand and engage in the new governments. These struggles were the result of the wrong questions being placed at the core of the Latin American revolutions and regimes. The minds behind these revolutions were not consumed by the question of how human beings ought to be ruled in a good and just way, but instead were consumed by the question of WHO ought to rule over the people.

The unclear and changing nature of the revolutions towards independence in Latin American countries was very much influenced by the different groups, which

desired to gain independence from the Spanish empire, but also from other groups within the countries. This was especially the case of the struggle between the peninsulares, creoles, mestizos, and the Indians. The struggle for power was most clear in the relationship between the peninsulares and the creoles. This struggle was inspired and guided by the question of who gets to rule and the privileges that come with this power. While the creoles enjoyed great economic advantages by owning “most of the rural estates, providing nearly all parish priests, and dominating the lower reaches of the imperial government” they were denied the highest positions within the empire because they were served for the peninsulares. (Latin America, 67) In this way, the peninsulares had become an unbreachable layer of power between the crown and the creoles. This inequality in power between two parts of the elites within Latin American countries gave the creoles a special place in the attempts for independence in Latin America.

The status of creoles in the Spanish empire was not clear they were described as, “an enigma: they are neither foreigners nor nationals...and are honorable but hopeless, loyal but disinherited.” (Latin America, 67) The frustration of the creoles with their unique status in the empire, and the lack of political power they were given was also accompanied by economic frustrations. Creoles resented “the flow of wealth into the pockets of the peninsulares and reinois who came to the Americas to exploit the wealth and return to Iberia to spend their hastily gained riches.” (Latin America, 67) Even though they resented the lack of political power within the empire the creoles were still part of the elite, and their only motivation towards independence and revolution was a selfish one. They did not desire to social and economic changes within the New World, but instead they simply wished to substitute themselves for the peninsulares

as the receivers of the highest political powers, and economic advantages.

Their desire to simply substitute themselves for the peninsulares in positions of power became clear during the political vacuum in Spain in 1808. During this time the creoles were able to “form a local junta to govern the viceroyalty” this political maneuver had the purpose of shifting the political power from the Spanish elite (peninsulares) to the Mexican elite (creoles). (Latin America, 70) This provoked a hurried response from the peninsulares who feared the permanent loss of their especial, traditional, and advantageous positions in government, for this reason they created their own junta and put down the creoles attempts to seize power. Even though, the creoles attempts to shift power from the peninsulares to themselves had been stopped by the peninsulares, the influence of Father Miguel Hidalgo continued. Hidalgo had enlisted his help to the creoles’ cause until the peninsulares discovered the plan and jailed the leaders. (Latin America, 70) Unlike the creoles, Hidalgo was concern with social change that involved the Indians too. He believed that “the Church had a social mission to perform and a duty to improve the lot of the downtrodden Indians.” (Latin America, 70)

It was Hidalgo and his advanced social ideas that ultimately influenced and unleashed the mestizos and Indians to unite in their desire for social, and economic changes. This movement would soon turn to be part of an unsuccessful popular revolution in Mexico. Since the mestizos and Indians formed the majority of the population they were able to gather a large mass of people. By the time they arrived to Guanajuato they had reached 25,000 people and “the intendant, local militia, peninsulares, and some creoles barricaded themselves in the granary, leaving the city defenseless.” (Latin America, 70) It was around this time that the popular revolution

of the masses had turned into an angry mob, for they were joined by insurgents and burned down the city. This only escalated by the time they arrived to Mexico City where they reached almost 80,000 people. The nature of their popular revolution had also changed. Whereas in the beginning it desired social and economic changes, the mob in Mexico City simply sought destruction and revenge. This was made clear when “they made no distinctions between creoles and peninsulares” and instead “with energies released after three centuries of repression the Indians and mestizos struck out all they hated.” (Latin America, 71) It was as the result of the threat the irrational and angered mob rule posed to both peninsulares and creoles that led to their unification in defense against the hatred of the masses.

The hopes of popular revolutions led by true social, economic, and political change came to an end when the plan of Jose Maria Morelos failed. Jose Maria Morelos was another parish priest that had been influenced by Hidalgo. Morelos had managed to “trimmed the forces, organized them into more disciplined force, and tried to appeal to creoles while still carrying Hidalgo’s banner of social reform.” (Latin America, 71) Morelos wished to gain independence from Spain to create a

Republican government in which the Mexican people would participate with the exclusion of the formerly wealthy, nobility, and entrenched officeholders; abolish slavery; affirm the equality of all people; terminate the special privileges of the Church as well as the compulsory tithe; and partition the large estates so that all farmers could own land. (Latin America, 71)

This was one of the few attempts made to place the important question of how to best rule of the people at the core of the revolution. It was an attempt to open a discourse on the principles of equality, and self-government. Morelos tried to appeal to the creoles and persuade them to contemplate these questions as they considered revolutions. Unfortunately, creoles rejected his principles because they were contrary to the interest of the Mexican elite. Affirming the equality of all people and giving everyone participation in government would challenge the political and economic interests of creoles who simply desired to substitute the peninsulares with themselves in their positions of power. It was for this reason that both peninsulares and creoles were equally repulsed and threatened by the goals of the revolution desired by Morelos. When the Spanish forces were able to capture and execute Morelos the hopes of a revolution favorable to the majority of the people was also destroyed. After this incident the royalist took over and when independence finally came to Mexico “it was under conservative leadership.” (Latin America, 71)

The independence of Mexico being under conservative leadership was crucial to the obstacles republican principles would face after the revolution. The independence under the conservative leadership was meant to permanently reject liberalism in Mexico. In this way it was a revolution for the preservation of social, economic, and political power of the peninsulares and creoles in Mexico. After Ferdinand was restored to the Spanish throne in 1814, he intended to continue his rule as an absolute monarch, but was faced with a revolt in 1820 that forced him to adhere to the constitution and its limitations. The peninsulares and creoles rejected this because due to the deep divisions between the elites (creoles and peninsulares) and the populous (Indians and

mestizos) they were aware that absolute power was necessary to defend their privileges and powers in Mexico. Spain's turn to liberalism and the King Ferdinand's adherence to the constitution were seen as weakness in the empire and in their colonies. It was their rejection of liberalism that drove them to free themselves from the rule of Spain. Their purpose was only to preserve and if possible to enhance the privileges they enjoyed during the absolute monarchy of Spain, and rejected social and economic changes. The only true beneficiaries of this revolution were the Mexican elites who now had the doors open to high political offices that had once been reserved for peninsulares. In this way, the social, economic, and political revolutions that pointed towards the possible creation of a republic was halted by the self-interest of the elites who simply sought to replace one despotic regime with their own. From this it seemed clear that the elites would continue to enjoy and enhance on their privileges and advantages during the formation of the new nations.

Even though the purpose of the revolutions that successfully achieved independence was to preserve and enhance the interests, privileges and powers of the elites the questions of what time of regime and who would be in power were still unanswered in Latin American countries. During their colonial period they had been ruled by an absolute monarchy that provided an "ancient body of laws and customs and by 'divine right'" (Latin America, 85). This meant that Latin American countries had never experienced any kind of self-government, and all their political experience derived from their interactions with the absolute monarchy of Spain. Their inexperience with any kind of self-government during their colonial period led to the declarations of independence to create novel political vacuums that were characterized by chaos, instability, and disorder.

Influenced by the repudiation of Spain, the successful example of the United States and the infatuation of the elites with the Enlightenment strengthened the argument for republicanism in the new nations. Mexico was the only country to attempt to have a monarchy when "the creoles crowned of their own, Augustin de Iturbide" (Latin America, 88). His reign was very brief, for it only lasted for a little over a year. His failure was due to the economic struggles that came after the wars of independence, and the necessity to satisfy and conform to conflicting groups. Since the purpose of the revolution had been largely based on self-interest and economic reasons he was forced to keep merchants and capitalist happy by cutting taxes, "which led to a decline in the revenue needed to maintain the army... which was crucial to uphold a government that had not yet achieved hegemony." (Latin America, 88) It is clear from the struggle of the monarchy of Iturbide that a government based on self-interest cannot sustain itself because it lacks the attachment of the people beyond their material gains. In this way, when the government fails to fuel their interest they will become unhappy and fail the test of tough economic times. This was shown when Mexican force's commander Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna led a coup against Iturbide. Many claimed that this marked the triumphed of republicanism, but it simply marked a change in regime. The purpose of government was still benefitting and preserving the elites and the basis of government was still self-interest.

The lack of principles beyond self-interest were shown in the failure of the new nations to find replacements for the independence heroes who were turned out of office as their popularity faded. Once again, the tensions resided among elite factions. These tensions and their struggle for power were often conducive to despotism. They did not desire to rule for the good of the

people as a whole, but simply to best serve their own interest. All too often they

sought simply to seize, hold, and exercise power for its own sake and its own reward. Only secondarily did the leaders cloak their power with some cloth of legality, a cloth usually of exotic and impractical fabric. During the early decades of independence, elections seldom were held and even more rarely were honest. Consequently the various factions resorted to violence as the path to power. Once in office, they usually exerted more violence to maintain power. (Latin America, 89)

These despotic and tyrannical actions in supposedly republican governments were the same used during the elites' struggle towards independence. The idea that only sovereign, strength, and power can secure their interest and advantages had not changed from the independence movement to the time of the development of the new nations. In this way, they still understood that in order for their interest to be secure they had to be in power even if this meant engaging in despotism.

In addition to the poisonous self-interested embedded in the way the new nations governed themselves there was also a key misunderstanding between the people and the elites that reflected in the way the elites governed. This misunderstanding was led by the elites' infatuation with the Enlightenment and the latest ideas coming from Europe. This was a superficial infatuation to simply try to imitate Europe. A clear example of this was the elites' inspiration to create written constitutions. They were "imbued with a long legalistic tradition, desired a written constitution, even though in most cases the document proved to be more theoretical than practical. (Latin

America, 90) From this it seems clear that the elites simply desire to imitate institutions set by Europe, but they failed to truly understand and put into effect their political ideals. Most importantly their infatuation with Europe often led them to be removed from the realities of the New World and the unique adaptations that would have to be made in order for these ideas to be successful. This was made clear in their "compulsive writing and rewriting of their constitutions, they repeatedly eschewed local experience to import the latest ideas from abroad." (Latin America, 90) This shows that no attention was particularly paid to what kind of measures and principles needed to be applied and adapted to be successful in Latin America, but the naïve faith that simply because it came out of Europe and it was a novel idea it had to be successful.

The elites' infatuation with the Enlightenment resulted in Latin American countries deregulating their commerce and experimenting with free trade that allowed them to enter commercial relations with other nations. This was greatly influenced by the political ideas of the Enlightenment that "encouraged the urge for independence and nationhood...affirming that each people should enjoy its own right to self-governments" and "the notion that each people should enjoy the fruits of its own resources and labor." (Latin America, 107) The influence of the Enlightenment in Latin America was not only in terms of political principles such as free trade and self-government, but was much deeper than that. In Argentina, the elites or "intellectuals" as they called themselves wanted to create a copy of Europe. They saw European tendencies as civilized while the folk culture of the masses as barbarism. In this way, European culture "would serve, according to their blueprint as a funnel through which European culture would pass on its civilizing mission." (Latin

America, 108) In the eyes of the intellectual elites the only way to be a civilized society was to be Europeanized therefore the countryside and folk culture were seen as barbaric. This influenced them when the elites decided that it was best to govern Argentina by means of a highly restrictive democracy because the majority of the people could not be trusted with self-government due to their barbaric tendencies. Intellectuals such as Esteban Echeverria argued, “men of reason should govern rationally to avoid the despotism of the masses.” (Latin America, 108) This meant that self-government had to be restricted and the civilization of and progress of Argentina relied heavily on the use of authority and power to guide progress and civilization. From this it becomes clear that one of the biggest struggles towards the ability of Latin American countries to engage in true republican regimes and self-government is the belief that the people were not capable of moving towards “civilization” without the guidance and authority of the few Enlightenment intellectual elites. This also caused a key misunderstanding from the part of the elites, for they often seemed to confuse their well-being, aspirations, and desires with those of the nations at large. Since they did not rule in the interest of the people but guided by their own interest and infatuation with Europe it is hard to argue that Latin American countries such as Argentina were in fact self-governing, for those governing represented only minority of the people.

It was clear that independence had left various political vacuums in Latin America, and the elites did not trust the people with self-government. There were various approaches to limiting the extent to which people were allowed to self-government such as the ones previously discussed in Argentina. In many Latin American countries that were affected by the violence, tension, and economic instability after the independence there was a desire for the

order that absolute power once secured for them under the Spanish dominion. This desire for order and security gave rise to the rule of caudillos. These strong leaders “rose in the vacuum of power left by the departure of Spanish authority...they ruled by virtue of their personal authority, not by institutional legitimacy.” (Latin America, 112) Again, it seems like the integrity of the republican regimes or governments in general did not really matter as long as someone with enough authority and power could bring order and security to the elites. They were allowed to rule because they were representatives of the oligarchy that was the source of power in the new nations. They “faithfully represented the elites and thus at least paid lip service to the ideology of progress...they often spouted language drawn from the ideology of the Enlightenment.” (Latin America, 112) Their power was absolute and in many ways surpassed that the Spanish king once enjoyed, for he did not have to share power with anyone. In addition, they were not influenced by the majority of the people and in this way did not have to seek the approval of the public. Instead they only cared about the approval of the various elites, which consisted of the rural aristocracy, the Roman Catholic Church, and the army. For this reason caudillos always advocated in the interest of the landed aristocracy and represented their interests while also opposing various economic, social and political reforms. The Catholic Church often influenced their opposition to reforms since, as an institution the Church was a conservative “force suspicious of reforms and usually in open conflict with the liberals.” (Latin America, 113) Due to the power possessed by the Church it was necessary for the caudillos to have their approval. Self-interest and the constant benefiting and defense of the powerful elites characterized the rule of caudillos. They rule for the good of the elites because they were

the ultimate source of his power and authority, not the people.

Even though Latin American countries were able to gain their independence from Spain the early decades of their new nations were characterized by an attempt from the part of the elites to preserve and enhance their powers and privileges at any cost. The elites were consumed and solely guided by the question of who rules and the privileges they could expand to them. The important question of how to best rule over the people in Latin America was never placed at the center of the revolutions or the conception of new regimes. In this way, a republican government in which those in powers rule for the good of the people and have the people as the source of their power and authority was not achieved. Instead attempts were made by the elites to imitate European cities without a realistic understanding of the people they were trying to rule. Attempts that only managed to deepen the divisions created during the Spanish dominion, and deepen the instability of the new nations. This led to despotism and absolute rule by a minority of the people driven purely by self-interest and ambition of economic advantages instead of a government dedicated to the good and well being of the people as a whole.

CONCLUSION

It is important we attempt to qualify whether or not these revolutions and settlements of new regimes were just and good. In order to make this evaluation one must consider the four reasons for the existence of these revolutions and new regimes. First, we must consider the reasons that caused the revolution to come together. Secondly, the genius and character of those who put the revolution and new regimes together must also be judged. Thirdly, the form these

revolutions and new regimes take. Finally, the most important cause, the reason and purpose as to why the revolution and new regimes exist.

On the first account, the revolutions and creations of new regimes in the United States and in Latin America are very different. Though both experienced abuses and violations of their rights by their mother countries the motives inspiring the creation of new regimes were opposites. For the United States the cause of the revolution and creation of the American regime was the tension and threat to liberty, equality, and natural rights as understood by the American people. The American people's understanding of these principles was no longer compatible with how Britain thought it was best to rule over people. Thus their shared understanding of how it is best and most beneficial to rule over human beings inspired Americans. For Latin America the motivation was guided by self-interest and a desire from certain groups to expand on their power and privileges. It was a struggle from the creoles to substitute the peninsulares in these positions of privilege. For this very reason, these revolutions often rejected a shared principle of equality among all men and where concerned with who the ruling authority was instead of how to best rule.

Secondly, the genius and character of those who inspired and carried out these revolutions and the settlement of new regimes was also very different. The genius and character of the American Founders was guided by their desire to answer how to best protect and promote the principles the American people had agreed on. They were guided by their desire to consent to a government that best protected their understanding of just liberty, equality, and other natural rights. For this reason their genius inspired and conceived a republican regime that was in harmony with their agreed precepts even when the adoption of this

republican regime, as described by Adams, did not benefit their wealth and fortunes immediately. More importantly, the genius of the American people as a whole played a vital role in the American Revolution and establishment of a republic. As Calvin Coolidge explains,

we are obliged to conclude that the Declaration of Independence represented the movement of a people. It was not, of course a movement from the top. Revolutions do not come from that direction. It was not without the support of many of the most respectable people in the Colonies, who were entitled to all the consideration that is given to breeding, education, and possession ... the preponderance of all those who occupied a position which took on the aspect of aristocracy did not approve of the Revolution ... It was in no sense a rising of the oppressed and downtrodden. It brought no scum to the surface, for the reason that colonial society had developed no scum.

This is crucial to the understanding of what genius and character put the revolution and establishment of the republic in motion. It is cleared that it was the desire of the American people and expression of the American mind. Due to their shared understanding of liberty and equality they had enjoyed a natural equality that was not able to be fully corrupt by the aristocratic tendencies the British tried to cultivate. In this way, the genius in charge of setting it in motion was republic at its very core.

This was not the case for the revolutions in Latin America. The character of those in charge of the successful revolutions was questionable, and there were no shared principles between those leading the revolutions and creations of regimes and the

people. In Latin America the creoles, which carried out the successful revolutions, rejected key just and republican principles such as that of equality of all people. They wished to protect past aristocratic measures and refused to end feudalism because it was against the interested of the social and economic elite. In this way, those in charge of the successful revolutions in Latin America avoided giving the revolutions and new regimes a liberal approach, which is necessary for natural and just republics to flourish.

Thirdly, in the American Revolution and the establishment of the republic the shape it took was guided by the agreed precepts and shared understanding of principles. These principles provided direction and guidance as to what is just and unjust and how to best rule. The shape of the revolution is most clearly seen by the kind of character and virtues the Founders wanted to promote, and the kind of harmful and dangerous aristocratic legislation they wished to overturn. The question of how to best and most justly rule over themselves is what help shape the natural and character of the American republic. Unfortunately, Latin American revolutions could not provide any just guidance to their actions and forms of government. This was the result of the vital role self-interest and the expansion of privilege and power took in the revolution. In this way, at the core of the Latin American regimes one could often find the desire to perpetuate unjust aristocratic tendencies and guidance only in what most benefited the ruling class.

Finally one must consider the purpose and reason as to why the revolution and new regimes exist. In the case of the United States the reason for their existence was to best answer the questions why and how human beings are best ruled over? Its reason for existence was the desire of one people to create a regime that best protected and promoted their shared principles and natural

rights. In this way, they wished to establish a regime that was most in harmony with the good nature of human beings, their dignity, and their rights. The purpose and dominant end of the American mind remains the same from the Revolution to the creation of the American Republic. It is for this reason that the American regime is concerned with teaching and educating its citizens. It aims to create a certain republican character and virtues. From the Revolution to the creation of the republic this was promoted by republican legislation that aimed to correct the attempts of aristocracy and feudalism introduced during the colonial period. It was also evident in the kind of virtues and citizenship the Founders argued the American republic would create, and its desire to have a proper natural aristocracy to defend the rights and liberties of all the people.

At the core of the Latin American revolution and creation of regimes was no guiding principles and understanding of how to most justly rule over people. The reason and purpose for the revolution and regime changes in this case were simply, which group ruled and enjoyed the most privileges. It was the nature of these revolutions that did the most harm to the creation of republics. When revolutions are only concerned with who rules and not how to best rule they are perfect nurseries for future revolutions. These new regimes become susceptible to self-interest guiding change, and not moral truths or principles. In this way, it is hard and almost impossible for these revolutions and establishments of new regimes to have the common good as a dominant end because they are not concerned with what is best for the people they rule over.

The inherent problem with Latin America's revolutions and establishment of regimes is that they have failed to be just in these four reasons. Yes, the motives have been justifiable as they have suffered great abuses and despotic tyrants, but they have not

concerned themselves with contemplating on how to most justly rule over themselves. In order to create good, stable, benevolent, and just republics Latin America will have to come to an understanding of shared principles that are required for successful republics. There will need to be a shared understanding of what a natural equality is and how this benefits and is in harmony with the happiness of the people. At the core of institutions there must be a shared understanding of liberty, equality, and natural rights. These must provide the guidance, limitations, and aims of regimes. The passions of suffering unjust acts, and self-interest cannot provide a proper and just foundation to regimes, and this is something Latin America has yet to contemplate. Until Latin American countries engage in reflection and attempt to answer how and which regimes most justly rule over a free and equal people they will continue to fall prey to petty and tyrannical rulers disguise in petty republics.