

27155

CLASIFICACION DECIMAL .....

TOPOGRAFICA .....



# SECRETARIA DE RELACIONES EXTERIORES

(NOMBRE DE LA DEPENDENCIA)

AÑO DE 1896

EXPEDIENTE ..... LEGAJO .....

Estados Unidos

(TITULO DE LA MATERIA TRATADA)

ASUNTO Publicación de Artículos sobre México

escritos por Matias Romero

FOLIOS 48

15-6-116(I)

15-6-116

(I)





# SECRETARIA DE RELACIONES EXTERIORES

SECRETARIA DE RELACIONES EXTERIORES  
MEXICO  
SECCION DE ARCHIVO GENERAL  
101  
CLASIFICACION DECIMAL  
TOPONIMICA 15-6-116v

1<sup>a</sup> Parte

EXPEDIENTE

AÑO DE 1896.

Estados Unidos.  
Publicación de artículos  
sobre México, escritos por Don  
Matias Romero.

Clasificación Decimal  
(Clasif. Topográfica)  
Sección 15  
Caja 6  
Expediente 116  
Núm. de folios

15-6-116



1

[ 1

Washington. Septiembre 30 de 1889.  
Señor don Victoriano Agüeros,  
Editor de "El Tiempo".  
México.

Muy estimado Señor mío:

Fortunamente llegó a mis manos su carta de 9 de Julio último, en la que se sirvió Ud. decirme que "El Pabellón Nacional" de esa fecha, publicó una carta mía dirigida al Señor don Luis G. Bossero, en la cual manifesté que no habían llegado a mi poder todos los artículos publicados por el periódico de Ud. respecto del mío, sobre anexión de México a los Estados Unidos, que salió a luz en la "North American Review" de Nueva York, correspondiente a Mayo de este año, y con ese motivo me hizo Ud. <sup>el</sup> favor de remitirme la colección completa de aquellos artículos, ofreciendo hacer otro tanto con los que después salieran a luz en su periódico.

Con la carta expresada de Ud. recibí me-  
re números de "El Tiempo" publicados del 29 de Mayo citado al 29 de Junio siguiente, con otros tantos artículos referentes al asunto expresado, y después no he recibido ninguno otro, aunque entiendo que "El Tiempo" se ha ocupado nuevamente de este asunto.

No



No me fue posible contestar con oportunidad la carta de Ud, porque al recibirla estaba yo en Europa, y no queria limitarme a' acusar recibo de ella, sino hacer algunas observaciones a los articulos citados, y no tenia entonces tiempo ni facilidades de verificarlo

Me apresuro a' expresar a Ud. mi agradecimiento por su bondad en remitirme dichos articulos, y hago un esfuerzo para conseguir algunas observaciones a los mismos, sintiendo mucho que lo limitado del tiempo de que puedo disponer para este trabajo, no me permita tratar este asunto con la extension que su importancia requiere.

Comenzare por manifestar que, como Ud comprendera facilmente, la posicion oficial que tengo aqui no me permite hablar, especialmente tratandose de asuntos que se relacionan con este pais, con la libertad de que gozara yo de otro modo respecto de lo cual guarda "El Tiempo" una posicion mucho mas ventajosa que la mia; y que solamente por tratarse de una cuestion de grande interes para nuestra patria, me decidiendo a' entrar en discusion por medio de la prensa de esa capital, pues creo que asi esclareceran puntos de suma importancia y trascendencia



trascendencia para México.

He visto con positiva complacencia no solamente la moderación con que el periódico de Ud. como órgano del partido conservador de México, trata este asunto, sino también la declaración contenida en el artículo setavo, publicado en "El Tiempo" correspondiente al 28 de junio último, en que se rectifican algunos de mis conceptos, expresándose que el partido conservador no aboga por una política de aislamiento y clausura comercial con los Estados Unidos, porque esa sería, en concepto de "El Tiempo" una política imposible que favorece relaciones políticas, industriales, sociales, comerciales; pero sin que ellos (los Estados Unidos) predominen; mas aun: con las reservas que justifica la historia de sus relaciones con las potencias europeas, la historia de sus relaciones con nosotros -

Considero esta declaración como un gran paso dado en el camino de popularizar en México una política liberal, patriótica y conveniente respecto de los Estados Unidos, y me felicito sinceramente de que hayamos llegado a este resultado -

Suplico a Ud. me permita manifestarle que no usé en mi artículo el calificativo clerical para designar al partido conservador de México en



en sentido ofensivo a' ese partido, como parece haberlo entendido el "Tiempo"; sino que me valí de él, por ser la única manera de designar con exactitud su organización y tendencias. Como mi artículo fue escrito en inglés, se resiente en este y otros puntos de los inconvenientes de una traducción al español, la cual quedó por haber sido hecha con precipitación, con muchos errores e incorrecciones. En inglés la frase partido conservador no indica que ese partido tenga relación ninguna con la cuestión religiosa, ni tampoco que tenga tendencias reaccionarias. Si se hubiera puesto en inglés el adjetivo conservador, no se comprendería aquí lo que se quería decir; hay que llamar clerical, en inglés, a' ese partido, sin que esto implique ofensa ninguna para él.

En mi carta de 25 de junio último, que publicó el "Pabellón Nacional" de 9 de julio siguiente, y a <sup>la cual</sup> ~~que~~ Ud. se refiere en la suya citada, procuré contestar la principal de las objeciones en contra de mi artículo, que encontré en los dos del "Tiempo" que hasta aquella fecha habían llegado a mis manos, y que veo sigue figurando en todos los siguientes como argumento capital y concluyente de la réplica; esto es, que

si



si la anexión total de México a los Estados Unidos se consideraba como una cosa improbable, no pasaba otro tanto con las anexiones parciales, que a juicio de "El Tiempo" podrían procurarse por parte de este país. Me parece haber demostrado en aquella carta que no son posibles las anexiones parciales sin venir a dar en la total o casi total, y por lo mismo, no me ocuparé mas de esta objeción.

Encuentro también en todos los artículos publicados por "El Tiempo" sobre este asunto, que, al paso que se apoyan grandemente las razones que hay para creer improbable<sup>el</sup> que este país promueva nuevas anexiones de nuestro territorio, se exageran en mucho, ~~por el contrario~~, todas las consideraciones que, a los ojos de un observador poco profundo, parecen indicar que existe ese peligro y hasta con el carácter de inmediato.

Reconozco que el engrandecimiento es en las naciones, como en los individuos, un deseo casi innato, y que muy pocos pueblos tienen la previsión suficiente para prescindir de una anexión, cuando se les presente oportunidad plausible de realizarla. Es, pues, natural que en esta, lo mismo



misimo que en cualquiera otra nacion, pueda  
éxitarse el sentimiento popular en favor de to-  
da anexion; pero debe tenerse presente que  
a' los hombres de Estado que tienen a' su  
cargo la direccion de los negocios públicos  
de un pais, corresponde examinar si  
la anexion les será provechosa ó inconvenien-  
te, y decidir, en consecuencia, si deben ó no  
procurarla. Para llevarla a' cabo se necesita,  
en todo caso, que haya motivos mas ó me-  
nos fundados de promoverla, y los mo-  
tivos que decidieron las anexiones anterio-  
res realizadas por los Estados Unidos, son  
los que yo sostengo que han desaparecido  
ahora, principalmente con la abolicion de  
la esclavitud - Citá 'El Tiempo' en apoyo de  
sus teorías las anexiones de la Luisiana,  
primero, la de la Florida despues, y por úl-  
timo la de Texas y California. Pero debe  
tenerse presente que para todas estas ha  
habido motivos especiales que, si no las  
podian justificar bajo el punto de vista  
de la razon y la justicia, y del respeto  
al derecho ajeno, si las presentaban has-  
ta como una necesidad política para  
este pais -

La Luisiana comprende la desembo-

cadura



desembocadura del Mississippi, que es uno de los rios navegables por mayor extension en el mundo, y se halla en el corazon de este pais. Se comprende desde luego que era de suma importancia para dicho Estado la adquisicion del territorio que contiene la desembocadura de ese rio - En virtud de los conflictos europeos podia pasar la posesion de aquel territorio de la Francia, que se consideraba nacion aliada y amiga de los Estados Unidos, por haberlos auxiliado a hacer su independencia de Inglaterra, a alguna otra que no tuviera ese caracter, y esta circunstancia hacia doblemente conveniente para ellos la adquisicion de la Luisiana.

La adquisicion de la Florida, comprada a la España en 1819 tiene una explicacion semejante, esto es la conveniencia de impedir que pasara al poder de otra nacion europea aquella península, que tan importante posicion ocupa en el Golfo de México.

Por el tratado que los Estados Unidos celebraron el 30 de abril de 1803, con Napoleon Bonaparte como primer Cónsul de la República Francesa, compraron la Luisiana; y como sus límites no estaban claramente demarcados, ni fueron precisados en aquel tratado, entendieron que comprendia todo el territorio situado al Oriente del Rio Mississippi haciéndolo llegar hasta el Oceano Pacifico al Norte del territorio mexicano. En esta virtud



en  
se despertó, ~~de parte de~~ personas animadas  
de un espíritu aventurero, el deseo de adquirir  
la Alta California para regularizar, por decir-  
lo así, el area de esta Nacion, y ellas se apro-  
vecharon de la guerra de 1846 y 1847 para  
llevar a' cabo sus proyectos, presentándolos como  
una necesidad imperiosa; y esto explica tam-  
bien por qué la guerra de Texas no se re-  
dujo a' la anexión de aquel Estado sino que  
a' su sombra se extendió hasta California y  
los territorios adyacentes. Para esta última  
guerra habia la circunstancia que indiqué  
en mi artículo anterior, de que el partido po-  
lítico favorable a' la esclavitud, necesitaba  
para conservar su preponderancia, extender  
su territorio al Sur de este pais.

A esta anexión siguió la de la Mesilla  
vendida a' los Estados Unidos por un Gobierno  
mexicano de triste recuerdo, mediante un tratado  
en el cual no solamente se estipuló la venta  
de una parte considerable de nuestro territo-  
rio por la suma mequetruca de \$10.000.000, sino  
que se les relevó de la obligación que tenían  
de impedir las incursiones de los bárbaros a'  
los Estados fronterizos, obligación que por sí  
sola valia muchas veces el importe de a-  
quella cantidad.



Ha tenido lugar la adquisición de Alaska comprada á la Rusia, más que con otro objeto, para evitar que pasara á poder de otra nación extranjera, y cuyo territorio está casi despoblado.

Debo advertir que no me propongo justificar esas anexiones, sino explicarlas solamente. Creo además conveniente manifestar que todas ellas, exceptuándose la primera y la última, se verificaron en interés de la esclavitud y para conservar la preponderancia del partido que sostenía esa institución, y que ese interés no existe ya, por lo cual el partido democrático ha cambiado también de principios y tendencias.

Todas las razones que determinaron las anexiones anteriores han cesado ya. Los Estados Unidos tienen ahora dentro de su territorio la boca del río Mississippi; tienen en el Pacífico una costa mas larga, con Alaska, que la del Atlántico y del Golfo de México, y la esclavitud ha cesado de existir entre ellos. La anexión, pues, de México, ó de una parte de su territorio, lejos de venir á robustecer á un partido, sería ahora un peligro para los dos, en que este país se divide, y un amago para la integridad de esta nación. De manera que no hay razón, motivo, pretexto



ni objeto que a los ojos de la gente sensata y de los hombres de Estado, justifiquen por ahora el proyecto de nuevas anexiones.

Tengase, ademias, presente que todas las anexiones que hasta ahora ha llevado a cabo este pais, han revestido el carácter de compra, y que, aunque la de Texas y California, tuvo mas bien el de conquista, la debilidad de nuestro Gobierno en 1848, ó acaso las dificultades de la situacion en que entonces se encontraba, hicieron que se le diera tambien el carácter de compra. Tengo la impresion, sin que signifique un juicio maduro sobre este asunto, de que habia sido preferible y mas decoroso para nosotros, no recibir indemnizacion pecuniaria por la perdida de territorio en nuestra guerra con este pais, por mucho que la nacion hubiera podido necesitar el importe de aquella indemnizacion.

Las mencionadas cinco anexiones de territorio extranjero a los Estados Unidos, así como la adquisicion de varios territorios ocupados por los indios de Norte América, se han hecho por medio de compra, y como no puede haber comprador sin que haya vendedor, resulta que, si no hay en México un



un Gobierno que esté dispuesto a vender el territorio nacional, como lo hizo injustificadamente el de 1853, no es probable que se verifique una nueva anexión de él a este país. De manera que, en último resultado, el remedio contra la anexión viene a estar en nuestras propias manos. Declamamos contra la desmembración de nuestro territorio por los Estados Unidos, y no recordamos que una de las pérdidas que hemos sufrido, la de la Mejilla, lo fué por un acto espontáneo de nuestra parte y sin coacción ninguna de ellos. Por no dar a esta discusión el carácter de personal, no hago presente, que partido político de México fué el que hizo esa venta injustificada; pero sí debo hacer notar que no me parece propio quejarnos del mal que nosotros mismos nos hemos hecho y atribuir a otros toda su responsabilidad.

Creo que no me explique suficientemente, o que no fué bien comprendido por el Tiempo al decir que la Constitución de los Estados Unidos prohíbe la conquista. No hay prevención alguna en aquella Constitución que se refiera expresamente a este asunto. Lo que quise decir es que conforme a aquel código no se puede tener subyugados a los pueblos conquistados privándolos



privándolos de los derechos políticos, sino que hay que concederles estos en toda su amplitud; y que, por lo mismo, si se anexaren los Estados Unidos territorios poblados por un número considerable de habitantes, con educación, lengua e intereses diferentes de los suyos, correrían el peligro de verse si no dominados, cuando menos influenciados, y con inminente riesgo para sus instituciones por el espíritu tan heterogéneo de esa mera población.

El que conozca bien a este país y esté al tanto de la organización e importancia de los partidos políticos que hay en él, comprenderá la fuerza de esta consideración -

Las inexactas apreciaciones contenidas en los artículos del "Tiempo", demuestran el conocimiento superficial que tiene de este país, falta que por desgracia no es poco común en la República y que ha sido causa de males serios. Tengo la convicción de que nuestra guerra con los Estados Unidos de 1846 y 1847, se pudo haber evitado y sus tristes consecuencias moderado muy considerablemente, si nuestros hombres públicos de entonces hubieran conocido los Estados Unidos, como ahora los conocemos

Abrego



Abrigo la convicción de que, si los gobiernos que rigieron los destinos de México en la década de 1836 a 1846, hubieran podido apreciar la inmensa superioridad de los elementos de fuerza y riqueza de este país, respecto del nuestro y la buena organización de su ejército, habrían comprendido que una guerra con él era una lucha desigual para nosotros y procurado evitarla en cuanto esto fuese compatible con el honor nacional, trabajando porque los Estados Unidos no aceptaran la anexión de Texas; y que si a pesar de sus esfuerzos en ese sentido, la anexión se llevaba a cabo, la habrían reconocido como un hecho consumado que no estaba a su alcance remediar y de esa manera nos habríamos evitado la pérdida de todo o la mayor parte del territorio que, además de Texas, pasó a los Estados Unidos como consecuencia de aquella guerra. Para llegar a esta convicción me ha servido el conocimiento que tengo de los elementos que en favor de nosotros había en aquella época en este país; del interés que tomaban en la cuestión los partidos existentes en él por la manera como los afectaba la anexión de Texas, y de otros incidentes que en aquella época no se conocían o no se apreciaban debidamente en México.

Varios de los elementos en favor de la



la anexión que existían entonces, han desaparecido por completo; la importancia de otros ha disminuido muy considerablemente, y por el contrario, los elementos hostiles a la anexión han aumentado y se han robustecido muy considerablemente. Esto hace que en cualquiera dificultad futura estemos en mucha mejor posición que la que guardábamos hace 45 años; y por estas consideraciones que apenas puedo apuntar, creo que de nosotros mas que de nadie depende el evitar la desmembración de nuestro territorio, y que por lo mismo, esta cuestión puede decirse que está enteramente en nuestras manos.

En mi artículo publicado en la "North American Review," no indiqué, por motivos obvios, otra consideración poderosísima que aquí se tiene en contra de la anexión, pero que no tengo inconveniente en hacerla presente aquí. Consiste ésta en el gran incremento que pudiera tener el elemento católico de este país, que ha hecho rápidos progresos en los años transcurridos del presente siglo, los cuales alarman muy seriamente al elemento protestante que forma la gran mayoría de la nación



nación <sup>y no</sup> ~~este elemento~~ no podría menos que ver con gran repugnancia la anexión de un pueblo católico, que vendría a' engrasar las filas de los católicos de los Estados Unidos.

Desgraciadamente la historia del clero católico de nuestra que siempre ha tenido la tendencia de sobreponerse a' la autoridad civil. Su intolerancia es vista con gran recelo por parte de un gobierno fundado esencialmente en la mas absoluta libertad religiosa; lo mismo que por los habitantes de este pais que no son católicos; y esta consideración seria sin duda una de las mas poderosas que pudieran presentarse para que una gran mayoria del pueblo de este pais resistiera la anexión de México, aun en caso de que nosotros mismos llegáramos a' solicitarla.

En el artículo sétimo de "El Tiempo" se presenta como una prueba de la política y tendencias de este pais, el tratado de anexión celebrado por el gobierno del General Grant con el gobierno de Santo Domingo. Este es uno de aquellos casos en que el diferente criterio hace que un mismo hecho histórico se entienda en sentido opuesto. Yo creo que



que ese incidente prueba que actualmente no hay política anexionista en los Estados Unidos. "El Tiempo" sostiene que él demuestra lo contrario. Siendo el General Grant, Presidente de los Estados Unidos, se le informó que Santo Domingo deseaba anexarse a este país: mandó comisionados especiales a aquella isla que averiguaran cuales eran los deseos de sus habitantes, y creyendo sus comisionados que eran favorables a la anexión, celebró un tratado de anexión con el gobierno existente en Santo Domingo, que se creía representaba el sentimiento nacional de aquella Republica. Si este país tuviera las tendencias anexionistas que le supone "El Tiempo", no podia habersele presentado ocasion mas oportuna para acrecentar su territorio, que la de aceptar la oferta que le hacian el Gobierno y el pueblo de una nacion independiente, de unir a él sus destinos, sobre todo cuando esta oferta habia sido aceptada ya, y era aprobada por un hombre tan prominente de este país como el General Grant, que estaba entonces a la cabeza de su Gobierno. El tratado no  
fue



fue, sin embargo, aprobado, y la anexión por lo mismo, no se llevo a cabo, lo cual a mi juicio, demuestra de la manera mas clara no solo que no hay tendencias anexionistas en la parte sensata de este pais y entre los hombres que deciden sus destinos, sino repugnancia por aceptar anexiones.

Con el mismo objeto se refiere "El Tiempo" en su artículo sexto, a lo que llama una "nota de la Casa Blanca" al Gobierno frances respecto de la intervencion en México - Considero a este incidente como al anterior; esto es, un hecho histórico apreciado de dos modos, no solo diferentes sino opuestos, por juzgarlo bajo diferente criterio público. A mi juicio, él demuestra que los Estados Unidos quisieron entonces hasta cerrarse la puerta a toda tentación de adquirir mas territorio de México, y "El Tiempo" lo entiende de otro modo. Con el mismo o con mejor derecho que la Francia tuvo para derrocar a un Gobierno nacional, y sustituirlo con un imperio extranjero, pudieron los Estados Unidos haber intervenido en favor de la República, y con el mismo o con mejor derecho que



el Emperador Napoleon exigió centenares de millares de pesos de indemnización por su intervención (que a mi juicio hubiera terminado si el éxito hubiera coronado sus planes, con la adquisición, a título de colonia o' alguno otro, de una parte mas o' menos considerable del territorio mexicano) hubieran podido los Estados Unidos hacer otro tanto. Lejos de seguir esa conducta y cuando tenían muchas tentaciones para hacerlo así, esto es, un ejército numerosísimo que era necesario licenciar, lo que se temía pudiera provocar algunos trastornos, y al que se daría amplia ocupación en una guerra contra los franceses en México, y conciliar así las pasiones desarrolladas aquí con motivo de la guerra civil, se limitaron a escribir notas diplomáticas al Gobierno francés, en las que le hacían presente que, si no retiraba sus fuerzas de México, se verían obligados a tomar una participación activa en la contienda. No comprendo como, de este hecho, que, a mi juicio, demuestra hasta la evidencia que se quería cerrar la puerta a toda anexión, infiera "El Tiempo" que él demuestra el espíritu



espíritu y tendencias anexionistas de este país.

A propósito de la intervención extranjera en México, me parece conveniente hacer notar, que en el artículo octavo de "El Tiempo" se presenta a algunas naciones extranjeras como auxiliares de México. A mi juicio esta es una ilusión de que deberíamos estar curados a esta fecha. Las naciones no proceden por sentimentalismo, sino en defensa de sus intereses; y la prudencia exige que no se tomen como cuestiones propias, aquellas que no pueden afectar a mi país sino de una manera muy indirecta. Por este motivo, cuando los Estados Unidos hicieron a México una guerra de conquista, en los años de 1846 y 1847, no hubo ninguna nación que tomara nuestra parte para evitar la desmembración de nuestro territorio. Esa ilusión ha sido funesta a nuestro país, porque desde que se consumó la independencia se han tenido grandes esperanzas en ese auxilio extranjero, que ha alimentado sublevaciones y trastornos políticos, y determinaron al partido conservador a solicitar el apoyo de la Francia para establecer



establecer un imperio en México, y ese apoyo trajo a nuestra patria males incalculables. Ni el prestigio de las armas francesas, ni los compromisos contraídos por el Emperador Napoleon III para con el Archiduque Maximiliano, ni ninguno otro género de consideraciones, fue suficiente para que el gobierno imperial de Francia sostuviera en México el orden de cosas que habia establecido, sino que, por el contrario, en el momento mas crítico, lo dejó abandonado a su propia suerte, a ciencia cierta de que las consecuencias serian fatales para el Archiduque Maximiliano y para los mexicanos comprometidos con él. Sin embargo de esta leccion que nos demuestra que en la defensa de nuestros derechos e intereses tenemos que atenernos a nuestras propias esfuerzos, es muy triste ver que hay quien sueñe todavía con el auxilio de naciones extranjeras!

Todo el artículo cuarto de "El Tiempo" publicado en su número de 12 de junio último, está consagrado al estudio de la doctrina Monroe, y las apreciaciones que en él se hacen son tan inexactas y tan notoriamente injustas que me parece conveniente demostrarlo así, no solo



solo para rectificar la verdad historica, sino porque así se pone en claro el conocimiento mas que superficial de la situacion de este pais, de su historia, de sus hombres y de su política, que demuestran los artículos de "El Tiempo".

Antes de hacer esta demostracion, me parece conveniente manifestar que la doctrina Monroe debe juzgarse por lo que ella es, es decir, por los hechos históricos que la promovieron, por los terminos en que ella está concebida y por las declaraciones oficiales que hicieron sus autores al promulgarla, y no por las interpretaciones exageradas o absurdas que le hayan dado personas desautorizadas, ya sean de este pais o de fuera de él. Para juzgar esta doctrina cita "El Tiempo" conceptos de John Quincy Adams, que era Secretario de Estado del Presidente Monroe, cuando se promulgó la doctrina que lleva este nombre, y quien fue después Presidente de los Estados Unidos, y cita tambien conceptos contenidos en la Memoria sobre las negociaciones entre España y los Estados Unidos de América que dieron motivo al tratado de 1819 hecho por



por don Luis de Onís, plenipotenciario español, y atribuye a John Quincy Adams miras anexionistas y, bajo este concepto, hostiles a México, por querer adquirir desde entonces el territorio que le quedó después de la guerra de 1846 y 1847.

Este es el tercer caso en que un hecho histórico es interpretado de dos maneras opuestas por diferente criterio político; pero se puede demostrar con toda evidencia, lo infundado de la interpretación de "El Tiempo".

Negociaban John Quincy Adams, como Secretario de Estado de los Estados Unidos y don Luis de Onís, como representante de España, un tratado de límites entre aquel país y las posesiones españolas en América, cuyas negociaciones terminaron con el tratado que se firmó en Washington el 22 de Febrero de 1819. En ellas, como sucede en casos semejantes, cada negociador deseaba sacar el mayor provecho posible en beneficio de su país. John Quincy Adams pretendía que los límites de Texas se extendían hasta el Río Bravo, mientras que don Luis de Onís sostenía que llegaban hasta el Nueces. don Luis de Onís tenía en este caso la razón, y ella fue al fin reconocida por John Quincy Adams



Adams, como lo demuestran las estipulaciones de aquel tratado. No puedo alcanzar como se apoye en este incidente la especie de "El Tiempo" de que John Quincy Adams fue se anexionista, cuando reconoció el derecho de España al territorio en disputa, y obligó a su país a respetarlo como tal.

Tampoco creo deba darse mucha importancia a los conceptos del negociador español, que cedió las Floridas a los Estados Unidos, aunque obligado tal vez por motivos graves.

El artículo expresado de "El Tiempo" desconoce de la manera mas completa las altas cualidades personales de John Quincy Adams, uno de los ciudadanos mas distinguidos de este país, y a la vez ~~como~~ amigo de México. Este es uno de los pocos casos en que un hombre ilustre tiene hijos ilustres. Su padre fue el segundo Presidente de los Estados Unidos, y él a su vez fue Presidente de 1825 a 1829, y se distinguió siempre por la rectitud de su carácter, por la justificación de su conducta y por la firmeza de sus convicciones. "El Tiempo" lo presenta como anexionista y enemigo de México. Una  
relacion



relación sucinta de hechos históricos demostrará cuán infundadas son esas aseveraciones.

Desde 1836 se presentó aquí la cuestión de la anexión de Texas, y en un discurso que pronunció el 25 de Mayo de ese año Mr Adams, diputado entonces por el Estado de Massachusetts al Congreso de los Estados Unidos, se opuso a esa anexión, fundándose en objeciones constitucionales. El 18 de Septiembre de 1837 presentó en la Cámara de Diputados, una proposición del tenor siguiente:

"La facultad de anexar a esta Unión el pueblo de cualquiera nación independiente, no está delegada por la Constitución de los Estados Unidos a su Congreso ni a ningún poder de su Gobierno sino reservada al pueblo" - (American Statesmen - John Quincy Adams - by John F. Moore, Jr. Boston 1882, pag 267)

Fueron el partido esclavista una mayoría considerable en aquel Congreso, no se admitió la proposición de Mr Adams.

En Junio de 1838 presentó otra proposición en que se decía que "cualquiera intentona por medio de una ley del Congreso o por un tratado, para anexar la República de Texas a esta Unión, sería una usurpación de facultades, que el pueblo de los Estados Unidos



"Unidos tendría el derecho y el deber de re-  
sistir y anular" (American Statesmen - John  
Quincy Adams by John F. Moore Jr - Boston  
1882 - pag 264).

En una alocucion dirigida a  
sus conitentes en Septiembre de 1842, explico  
su conducta respecto de la cuestion de  
Texas - Despues de mencionar la respuesta de  
Mr Van Buren desechando la proposicion  
formal que se le hizo en 1837 por la Re-  
publica de Texas, para anexarse a los  
Estados Unidos, dijo lo que sigue:

"Pero la pasion de los procreadores de  
"esclavos por la anexion no fué abandonada.  
"Al comenzar las sesiones del siguiente Con-  
"greso se presentaron a la Cámara muchas  
"peticiones y memoriales en pró y en contra  
"de la anexion \* \* \* \* \* y se mandaron  
"a la Comision de Negocio Extranjeros, la cual,  
"sin haberlos tomado jamas en consideracion,  
"pidio al fin ~~de~~ <sup>en</sup> aquel periodo de sesiones  
"que se le relevara de dictaminar respecto  
"de ellos. Con motivo de este dictamen se  
"suscito un debate en el cual descubri el sis-  
"tema completo de duplicidad y perfidia  
"hacia México que marco a la admi-  
"nistracion de Jackson desde su principio  
hasta



"hasta su fin. Ese debate hizo callar los  
"clamores por la anexión de Texas a esta  
"Unión, por espacio de tres años, hasta la  
"catástrofe de la administración Van Buren.  
"El <sup>pueblo</sup> ~~gobierno~~ de los Estados libres llegó a  
"creer que se había abandonado por com-  
"pleto ese proyecto y que no volvería a oír  
"el deseo de los traficantes de esclavos por  
"la anexión de Texas. Si Harrison hubie-  
"ra vivido, ciertamente no hubieran oído  
"nada más hasta hoy respecto de esto;  
"pero apenas se instaló John Tyler, en la  
"casa del Presidente, cuando la nulificación,  
"y Texas, y la guerra con México se pre-  
"sentaron de nuevo sobre la superficie, con  
"la vista fija en la Estrella Polar de  
"la supremacía en el Gobierno de la Unión  
"del poder esclavista del Sur." (American  
Statesmen - John Quincy Adams by John  
F Morse, Jr. Boston 1882. Pag 267 y 268)  
Esto basta para demostrar lo  
poco que conoce "El Tiempo" los varios in-  
cidentes relacionados con el asunto de que  
se ha ocupado y lo infundados e injustos  
<sup>que son</sup> ~~los~~ sus conceptos respecto de John Quincy  
Adams.

En mi artículo citado dije que  
las leyes mexicanas sobre inmigración se



se habian modificado en sentido liberal, en beneficio de todos los extranjeros, del que eran naturalmente partícipes los ciudadanos de los Estados Unidos, y en el artículo octavo de "El Tiempo" se presenta este concepto como una demostración de que el Gobierno de México ha hecho concesiones indebidas a los ciudadanos de este país.

Oreo de mi deber explicar aquí que, sin haber tenido a la vista al escribir aquel artículo el texto de las leyes últimas sobre colonización, entendía yo que la restricción decretada desde el año de 1842 para que los ciudadanos de un país vecino no puedan sin permiso del Presidente de la República, adquirir terrenos baldíos en una zona determinada de la frontera con su país respectivo, habia sido derogada por aquellas leyes; pero habiendo examinado estas atentamente encuentro, que esa derogación no es clara, y que nuestra Secretaría de Fomento sostiene que está vigente aquella disposición.

Convenzo con "El Tiempo" en que fue un grave error de nuestro Gobierno haber



haber hecho el contrato de colonización con Austin, y sus resultados son la prueba mas clara de este acerto. Es claro que no debemos olvidar aquella lección en lo futuro.

Siento profundamente que mis explicaciones no hayan sido suficientes para modificar en manera alguna la opinion de los editores de 'el Tiempo', sobre el asunto a que se refirió mi artículo publicado en la "North American Review", aunque por otra parte veo con placer que en el fondo de la cuestion nos acercamos mucho mas de lo que yo esperaba a una solucion conveniente.

Suplicando a Ud me disimule el tiempo que lo ocupe con la lectura de esta carta, reciba Ud la seguridad de la atenta consideracion con que me suscribo de Ud,

atento y seguro servidor.  
M. Romero.



Artículos de D.  
Matias Romero.

1896 — Asuntos Var<sub>os</sub>



RESERVADA.

Méjico, Diciembre 28 de 1896.

Artículo del Señor

Romero sobre las re-  
voluciones en Méji-  
co.

Con motivo de la publicación que algunos  
periódicos de esta capital han hecho de un artícu-  
lo de carácter político, sobre las revoluciones en

Méjico y su filosofía, suscrito con el nombre de Usted, ha lla-  
mado la atención que, si efectivamente ese artículo fué escrito  
por Usted, se haya publicado sin la licencia previa de esta Se-  
cretaría que requiere el artículo 18 de la Ley Orgánica del Cuer-  
po Diplomático, del 3 de Junio del corriente año.

Además de algunas inexactitudes que dicho artículo  
contiene, se ha notado que está incompleto, porque en él no se  
comprende la revolución de Tuxtepec; y esta omisión ha hecho su-  
poner que el Gobierno hubiese dado a Usted instrucciones para  
que suprimiera la parte correspondiente a dicha revolución.

Al hacer a Usted las anteriores observaciones, por  
acuerdo expreso del Señor Presidente, me es grato reiterarle el  
testimonio de mi distinguida consideración y particular aprecio.

Mariscal.

Señor Ministro de Méjico.

Washington.



Washington, Enero 7, de 1897.

Número 4.

Artículo sobre  
las revoluciones  
en México.

Hoy recibí la nota reservada de esa Secretaría, número 3, de 28 de Diciembre próximo pasado,

en la que refiriéndose á un artículo titulado "Filoso-

fía de las Revoluciones en México" que ha sido publica-

do por algunos periódicos de esa capital, suscrito con

mi nombre, me pide usted informes, primero, sobre si

efectivamente ese artículo fué escrito por mi; segundo,

porque se publicó sin la licencia previa de esa Secre-

taria que requiere el artículo 18 de la Ley Orgánica

del Cuerpo Diplomático, del 3 de Junio de 1896, y ter-

cero, porqué dejó incompleto el artículo, sin compren-

der en él la revolucion de Tuxtepec.

Tengo la honra de informar á usted, en respuesta,

que el artículo expresado se originó, segun he informa-

do en varias comunicaciones á esa Secretaría, en una

alocucion que tuve que pronunciar inesperadamente en

la reunion de la Seccion de Jurisprudencia de la So-

ciudad Americana de Ciencia Social, que tuvo lugar en

Saratoga el 5 de Septiembre de 1895, á la que fuí in-

vitado por Mr. Walter S. Logan, para oír su conferencia

*Enero 15*  
*Dígame en*  
*contestación:*  
*en cuanto*  
*a la con-*  
*sulta que*  
*hace: que*  
*la facultad*  
*obrigada*  
*en el art.*  
*18 de la*  
*ley org.*  
*del Cpo. Dip.*  
*a los jefes*  
*de misión*  
*para auto-*  
*rizar pu-*  
*blicaciones*  
*de sus su-*  
*baternos,*  
*expresamente*  
*excluye la*  
*inteligencia*  
*de que pue-*  
*dan hacer*



sobre "Un litigio Mexicano" y en la que, por súplica

suya y del Profesor Weylan, Presidente de la Sección

de Jurisprudencia de esa Sociedad, hablé después de

Mr. Logan, principalmente para rectificar algunos de

sus conceptos respecto de México. Sin que yo lo procu-

rara, y mas bien con resistencia de mi parte, la So-

ciudad publicó en sus procedimientos lo que yo dije,

y después Mr. Logan hizo otro tanto en un cuaderno es-

pecial. De ambos documentos mandé en su oportunidad

un ejemplar á esa Secretaria.

Como lo que yo habia dicho en esa ocasion sobre

las revoluciones en México y sobre la comparacion de

los sistemas de jurisprudencia criminal anglo-sajon y

romano, lo hice sin preparacion alguna, adolecia de o-

misiones, y me pareció conveniente formar de ello dos

artículos, uno sobre cada uno de esos asuntos, que

fueron publicados respectivamente en los números de la

"North American Review" de Enero y Julio de 1896, de

los cuales tambien envié en su oportunidad ejemplares

á esa Secretaria.

El relativo á las revoluciones en México fué, a-

demás, reproducido con adiciones en el número del "Mo-

Los mismos

publica-

ciones sin

permiso

previo de

esta Sra.:

que por lo

minimo, y

en consi-

deracion

a la urgen-

cia que en

casos excep-

cionales fue-

da haber

para hacer

rectifica-

ciones por la

prensa, etc.

Sra. le da

licencia pa-

ra hacerlas

solo cuando

la oportuni-

dad de pu-

blicar ~~sea~~

rectifica-

ciones in-

dispensa-

bles no per-



mita re- dern Mexico" de Topeka, Kansas, correspondiente á Mar-  
currir a - zado de 1896 y el editor del "Internacional" periódico  
esta obra. de Cincinnati hizo una traduccion del mismo que publicó  
por telé- en sus números de 14, 21, 28 de Mayo y 4 de Junio de  
grafo pa- 1896.  
ra obtener Como despues de su publicacion en la "North Ame-  
el permiso rican Review", el artículo fué adicionado, y el Señor  
previo, y Garcia Mérou, Ministro Argentino en Washington, me pi-  
esté segu- dió algun artículo sobre México para un periódico li-  
ro de in- terario de Buenos Aires llamado "La Biblioteca", le di  
terpretar una traduccion al español con las adiciones que le ha-  
fielmente bia hecho desde su publicacion en la North American  
las ideas Review, y á la vez mandé un ejemplar de esa traduccion  
del Gob- á esa capital, para su publicacion, que fué publicada  
aerica del en "El Universal" de 4, 5 y 6 de Diciembre próximo pa-  
punto de sado, sin que yo hubiera designado ese periódico.  
que se Respecto del segundo punto, debo informar á esa  
frate; pero Secretaria que la publicacion de ese artículo tanto en  
no enca- ingles como en español, se hizo antes de la promulga-  
riendo esta- cion de la Ley Orgánica del Cuerpo Diplomático Mexicano  
dos condi- del 3 de Junio de 1896, por lo cual no creo haber in-  
ciones, de- fringido esa ley con la publicacion expresada.  
berá afe- Y en cuanto



Ademas, he estado bajo la impresion, - probable-

mente equivocada, - de que hay ciertas publicaciones  
de caracter urgente ó de otro género, que al representan

en sus números de 14, 15, 16 de Mayo y 4 de Junio de  
te de México en Washington puede y debe hacer, sin so-

licitar el permiso correspondiente de la Secretaria de

Relaciones Exteriores. Me parece que la misma ley pre-

vé este caso cuando faculta al Jefe de la Legacion para

autorizar á los empleados diplomáticos á hacer publica-

ciones; pues no se comprende que él no pueda hacer por

si mismo lo que sus subordinados pueden hacer con su

autorizacion.

Antes de que se promulgara esa ley, cuando he

creido conveniente escribir sobre algun punto de impor-

tancia política ó diplomática relacionado con el Go-

bierno de los Estados Unidos, he sometido siempre mi

trabajo á esa Secretaria, para su revision y aprobacion;

pero cuando se ha tratado de algun asunto historico, ó

que no se relaciona en manera alguna con nuestras cues-

tionas pendientes en este pais, me ha creido autorizado

para hacer esas publicaciones. A esta categoria per-

tenece el artículo descriptivo y estadístico respecto

de México que se publicó en el número del presente mes

a las insu-

titudes

que se le in-

dicaron, le

le simulan

específicamente

en sus no-

lables: 1ª,

la de que

las leyes de

Reforma

que desu-

monitaron

los bienes

la franquicia

perpetuantes

a corpora-

ciones lo-

lo afectan

la propie-

dad de la

religiosa,

por no

existir en

la Repu-

blica otras

corporaciones;

puesto que

los ayunta-

mientos, co-

legios de edu-



del Boletín de la Sociedad Americana de Geografía,

de Nueva York, que remití á usted con mi nota número

637 de 1º del corriente. Por la precipitación con que

ese artículo se escribió para que pudiera salir en ese

número, á fin de conseguir los objetos indicados en

dicha nota, y por no contener mas que descripciones

geográficas y datos estadísticos respecto de México,

no consideré necesario someterlo previamente á la apro-

bación de esa Secretaria.

En el artículo sobre nuestras revoluciones consig-

né solamente lo que he estado repitiendo en este país

desde que por primera vez tuve la honra de representar

á México en 1860; esto es, que nuestras revoluciones

no se debían á que el pueblo mexicano fuera de un ca-

racter ingobernable, sino á las tendencias absorbentes

del partido conservador, apoyado principalmente en el

clero, y que una vez dominado ese partido, era seguro

que se cimentaría la paz y se desarrollaría el país.

Me he tomado el trabajo de presentar esos razonamien-

tos de una manera mas detallada y á mi inicio mas cla-

ra, á fin de ponerlos al alcance de todos y con el pro-

pósito, que yo he estimado loable, de disipar la mala

caución e ins-  
trucción las  
cas, institu-  
ciones de be-  
neficio  
y otras, per-  
tenecientes  
a la Nación,  
a los Estados,  
y a los Munici-  
pios, son las  
corrupciones  
civiles de  
que habla  
el artículo  
27 de la  
Constitu-  
ción ya  
las que  
se sosten-  
dieron las  
leyes de  
desamort-  
ización,  
en cuya  
virtud se  
les prohibió  
la conser-  
vación, ad-  
ministración



impresión que en este país y en el extranjero en general, han dejado muestras largas revoluciones. Si en ese trabajo he cometido algún error, además de que celebraré enmendarlo, no creo que pueda desvirtuar los resultados favorables al país que me he propuesto alcanzar.

Cuando hace poco, esa Secretaria me llamó la atención en su nota número 482, de 15 de Diciembre próximo pasado, hacia el artículo 18 de la Ley citada del Cuerpo Diplomático, la consulté respecto de la inteligencia que debe darse á ese artículo, para normar mi conducta en lo futuro; y con este motivo, reitero á usted aquella recomendación, á fin de que sepa yo exactamente á qué atenerme en lo adelante.

Respecto del tercer punto, debo manifestar á usted que mi trabajo no tiene la pretensión de ser un ensayo histórico de las revoluciones de México, pues eso le habría dado dimensiones que no habrían permitido que se leyera en lo general, y por este motivo he dejado de hablar de muchas revoluciones y de muchos incidentes históricos de grande importancia en el país.

Si se ha supuesto que el Gobierno me hubiera dado

y adyunción de  
bienvenidas;  
2.ª la de  
anverar  
que el Em-  
perador de  
Austria ha-  
bía repuesto  
a Maximilian  
en  
los derechos  
de sucesión  
a la corona  
imperial,  
cuando este  
príncipe se  
dispusiera  
salir de  
el exilio en  
por el  
ejército fran-  
cés; cuando  
se bien sa-  
bido que  
Francisco  
José, por  
el contrario,  
le mandó  
notificar



*por medio de su ministro el barón Sago, que baselau podía tener la seguridad de ser recibido en Viena de la misma manera más afuera; pero que las cláusulas del pacto de familia firmado en el Virreinato el 10 de Abril de 1864 serían estrictamente observadas.*

instrucciones para suprimir la parte correspondiente á la revolucion de Tuxtepec, no tengo inconveniente en declarar de la manera que se considere necesario, que escribí el artículo por mi propia inspiracion, sin consultar al Gobierno y sin recibir indicacion ninguna de él.

No me extraña que haya usted encontrado inexactitudes en ese artículo, pues aunque procuré que no las contuviera, no estoy seguro de haberlo logrado, y agradeceré á usted que, si lo tuviere á bien, se sirva indicármelas, porque en todo caso querria yo purgarlo de las que tenga, especialmente si él ha de figurar en la edicion en un volumen de algunos de los artículos que he publicado en este pais.

Reitero á usted mi muy distinguida consideracion.

*M. Romero*

Al Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores.

México.



Reservada  
 México, Enero 19 de 1897.

Artículo sobre las revoluciones en México

Me he impuesto de la nota reservada de Usted, número 4, de 7 del actual, en que da los informes que le pedí en la mía, también reservada, número 3, de 28 de Diciembre último, con motivo de haber publicado algunos periódicos de esta capital un artículo intitulado: "Filosofía de las revoluciones de México", suscrito con el nombre de Usted.

Hechas las explicaciones del caso, manifiesta Usted, que ha estado bajo la impresión <sup>de</sup> que hay ciertas publicaciones de carácter urgente ó de otro género, que el representante de México en Washington puede y debe hacer sin solicitar el permiso de la Secretaría de Relaciones, y que le parece que la misma Ley Orgánica del Cuerpo Diplomático Mexicano prevé este caso cuando faculta al Jefe de la Legación para autorizar á los empleados diplomá-



tuas <sup>para</sup> a hacer publicaciones, pues dice Us-  
ted que no se comprende que el Minis-  
tro no pueda hacer lo que sus subor-  
dinados con su autorización de él

Termina Usted su nota pidiendo  
se le indiquen las inexactitudes de  
que adolece el artículo para purgarlo  
de las que tenga.

En contestación, manifiesto á Us-  
ted, en lo que se refiere á la interpre-  
tación que ha dado al artículo 18  
de la Ley Orgánica del Cuerpo Di-  
plomático Mexicano, que la faul-  
dad otorgada por ese artículo á los  
jefes de misión para autorizar pu-  
blicaciones de sus subalternos, ex-  
presamente excluye la intencionalidad  
de que puedan hacer los mismos  
jefes de misión publicaciones sin  
permiso previo de esta Secretaría.

Por esto mismo, y en consideración  
á la urgencia que en casos excepcio-  
nales pueda haber para hacer testi-  
ficaciones por la prensa, esta Secreta-  
ria da á Usted licencia para hacer.



las sólo cuando la oportunidad de publicar rectificaciones indispensables no le permita recurrir á la misma Secretaría por telégrafo para obtener el permiso previo, y esté seguro de interpretar fielmente las ideas del Gobierno acerca del punto de que se trate. No concurriendo estos dos condiciones, deberá Usted esperar la licencia, que pedirá por correo ó telégrafo, según las circunstancias.

Cuanto á las inexactitudes que se han <sup>observado</sup> ~~notado~~ en el artículo, y que pide Usted se le indiquen, <sup>son</sup> ~~serán~~ especialmente notables estas: 1<sup>a</sup>: la de que las leyes de Reforma, que desamortizaron los bienes pertenecientes á corporaciones, sólo afectan la propiedad eclesiástica, por no existir en la República otras corporaciones; puesto que los Ayuntamientos, Colegios de educación é instrucción laicas, instituciones de beneficencia y otras, pertenecientes á la Nación, á los Estados y á los Municipios, son las corporaciones cívicas.



les de que habla el artículo 27 de la Constitución y á las <sup>Las ley de Desamortización</sup> que se extendieron ~~las leyes~~ de ~~desamortización~~ en cuya virtud se les prohibió la conservación, administración y adquisición de bienes raíces; y 2<sup>a</sup>, la de aseverar que el Emperador de Austria había reponído á Maximiliano en los derechos de sucesión á la corona imperial, cuando este príncipe se disponía á salir de México <sup>después de haberse resultado la ratificación</sup> ~~en favor~~ del ejército francés; siendo bien sabido que Francisco José, por el contrario, le mandó notificar <sup>por medio de</sup> ~~por~~ su ministro el barón Lago, que podía tener la seguridad de ser recibido en Viena de la manera más afectuosa; pero que las cláusulas del pacto de familia, firmado en Miramar el 10 de Abril de 1864, serían estrictamente observadas.

Remeto á Usted en atenta consideración

Mariscal



Señor Ministro de México.

Washington



Washington, Enero 7 de 1897.

Número 655.

Publicaciones de  
artículos.

Los conceptos contenidos en la nota reser-

vada de esa Secretaria, número 3 de 28 de Diciembre

próximo pasado, me hacen detenerme en la publicacion

que he estado preparando de varios de los artículos

publicados por mi en este pais, con la aprobacion de

esa Secretaria, y por cuenta de la de Hacienda, Habia

convenido ya en las cláusulas del contrato respectivo

con la casa editorial de G. P. Putnam's Sons, de Nueva

York, pero me parece mas prudente suspender su firma,

mientras recibo instrucciones de esa Secretaria res-

pecto de este asunto.

No intentaba yo comprender en el volumen mas que

los artículos publicados hasta ahora, aunque creyendo

conveniente que se insertaran algunos que aun no han

visto la luz pública, como el referente á nuestras re-

laciones comerciales con los Estados Unidos y á la im-

portacion de mineral de plomo, he estado alistándolos

para remitirlos á esa Secretaria, con el objeto de ver

si cree conveniente que se publiquen en algun periódico

mensual de este pais, para pasarlos de alli al volumen

expresado.



Ademas, he creido necesario revisar y adicionar

los artículos que han salido ya, bien para contestar

los comentarios contenidos en la nota trans-  
mitida al señor Secretario, número 3 de 28 de Diciembre.  
Vaya de esa Secretaría, número 3 de 28 de Diciembre.  
también en referir incidentes posteriores tam-

bién. Para que esto se entienda mejor, diré, por ejem-

plo, que con posterioridad al artículo sobre la aso-

nada de Garza y sus enseñanzas, publicado en la North

American Review en Septiembre de 1892, han tenido lugar

otras incursiones en nuestro territorio; la Suprema

Corte de los Estados Unidos revocó la sentencia del

Juez Maxey que concedió el recurso de habeas corpus á

Ines Ruiz, Jesus Guerra y Juan Duque, y han ocurrido

otros incidentes que me ha parecido conveniente mencio-

nar, adicionando en consecuencia el artículo expresado.

En el referente á la zona libre, publicado en el

número de Abril de 1892 de la North American Review,

he creido también conveniente mencionar incidentes o-

curridos con posterioridad á la publicacion, como la

expedicion de la ley que prohíbe el tránsito por este

país de mercancías extranjeras con destino á aquella

zona, y llamar la atencion hacia el cambio favorable

que ha habido en la opinion de los Estados Unidos sobre

expedición.



el asunto; y poco mas ó menos estoy haciendo lo mismo  
con todos los demas artículos, lo cual ocasiona una  
labor considerable sobre mis ocupaciones ordinarias y  
requiere que le consagre yo horas extraordinarias de  
trabajo.

Algunos de esos artículos, que he considerado de  
caracter meramente económico, como el que se refiere  
al talon de plata y el que se ocupa de los jornales en  
México, los he mandado, en forma confidencial, al Se-  
cretario de Hacienda, para su examen.

Si debo entender el artículo 18 de la Ley Orgánica  
del Cuerpo Diplomático Mexicano del 3 de Junio de 1896  
y las instrucciones de esa Secretaria en el sentido de  
que no puedo publicar esos artículos con algunas modi-  
ficaciones, sin someterlas previamente á su aprobacion,  
no seria posible terminar la publicacion proyectada en  
el plazo que yo esperaba, pues creia poder mandar la  
mitad del material, que seran probablemente seis artí-  
culos, antes del 1º de Marzo próximo y el resto antes  
del 30 de Junio siguiente.

Con objeto de no dar un paso que pueda entenderse

como infraccion de mi parte de una ley vigente, suplico  
México.



á usted se sirva decirme si me he de considerar autori-

zado para hacer la publicacion expresada en los termi-

nos que yo lo habia pensado, ó si debo someter todo el

material á esa Secretaria para su examen y revision,

lo cual probablemente ocasionaria que se aplazara inde-

finidamente la publicacion.

Respecto de los artículos que he escrito hasta

ahora y que aun no han salido á luz, me parecia que la

difficultad con que tropezara yo consistiria en que es-

te Gobierno pudiera tomarlos á mal por las apreciaciones

que hago respecto de la política de este pais, y por

este motivo he procurado obtener su acquiescencia

antes de publicar algun artículo. No me habia imaginado

que de parte del Gobierno de México hubiera dificultad,

porque el objeto de esos artículos ha sido siempre

desvanecer errores que prevalecen aqui respecto de Mé-

xico y defender los derechos de la República, objetos

en mi concepto loables, aunque en su desarrollo puedan

encontrarse imperfecciones.

Reitero á usted mi muy distinguida consideracion.

*A. Romero*

Al Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores.

México.



Washington, Enero 30 de 1897.

Número 7.

He tenido la honra de recibir la nota re-

Artículo sobre  
las revoluciones servada de esa Secretaria, número 5, de 20 del actual,  
en México.

en la que refiriéndose á la publicacion del artículo

intitulado "Filosofia de las revoluciones de México" y

á la interpretacion del Artículo 18 de la Ley Orgánica

del Cuerpo Diplomático Mexicano de 3 de Junio de 1896,

se sirve usted darme sus instrucciones respecto de la

publicacion de rectificaciones urgentes, concediéndome

autorizacion para hacerlas sin la previa aprobacion

de esa Secretaria solo cuando la oportunidad de publi-

car rectificaciones indispensables no permita ocurrir

á esa Secretaria por telégrafo para obtener el permiso

previo y cuando esté yo seguro de interpretar fielmente

las ideas del Gobierno acerca del punto de que se tra-

te.

Temiendo que mi criterio no esté de acuerdo en

algun caso con el de esa Secretaria tanto por lo que

hace á la calificacion de ser indispensable una rec-

tificacion, cuanto por lo que hace á la fiel interpre-

tacion de las ideas del Gobierno, seré lo mas parco

posible



posible en el uso de la autorizacion que se me concede, prefiriendo, siempre que las circunstancias lo permitan, que esa Secretaria haga la rectificacion conveniente, comunicándomela por el telégrafo cuando la urgencia del caso lo requiera, para darle yo aqui publicidad.

Agradezco á usted mucho las indicaciones que me hace respecto de las principales inexactitudes encontradas en el artículo intitulado: "Filosofia de las revoluciones en México" que fué publicado en esa ciudad. Yo estaba en la inteligencia de que el Emperador de Austria habia repuesto el Archiduque Maximiliano en sus derechos eventuales á la corona de aquel Imperio; pero veo que estaba mal informado respecto de ese incidente, y haré la corrección respectiva en aquel artículo.

Agradeceré á usted se sirva decirme si rectificadas las dos inexactitudes á que se refiere la nota que contesto y las demas que tenga á bien manifestarme esa Secretaria, pulsare inconveniente en que ese artículo figure entre los que estoy autorizado para publicar en un volumen, ó si debo mandárselo de nuevo á esa Secretaria para su revision y aprobacion despues de

hechas



hechas aquellas correcciones, Para subsanar la dificultad que se sirvió usted indicar en su nota reservada, número 3, de 28 de Diciembre próximo pasado, he escrito el apunte adjunto que contiene una alusion pasajera á la revolucion de Tuxtepec, por si usted creyere que fuere esto necesario, aunque en mi concepto es preferible no hacerle esta adicion.

Reitero á usted mi muy distinguida consideracion.

*M. Romero.*

Al Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores.

México.



Restablecida la República, ocurrieron  
varios movimientos armados contra la Administracion  
del Presidente Juarez, promovidos por miembros pro-  
minentes del partido liberal que no estaban satis-  
fechos con la politica de aquel hombre de Estado que  
contrariaron su reeleccion en 1871; ~~todos los cuales~~  
~~fueron sometidos.~~ *La muerte de Juarez, lo sustituyó*  
*a esos movimientos, y sus autores se sometieron al gobierno provi-*  
*sional del* ~~Señor Lerdo de Tejada,~~ *quien,* como Presidente de la Suprema  
Corte de Justicia, *era jure* ~~y de facto~~ Vice-presidente de la  
República. *Lerdo* Convocada una eleccion popular, resultó  
electo Presidente constitucional en 1872. Al ~~terminar~~  
~~su periodo~~ *En* 1876, ~~fué~~ candidato para la reeleccion,  
lo cual ocasionó la revolucion de Tuxtepec, promovida  
también por ~~candillos~~ del partido liberal, que pro-  
clamó los principios de no-reeleccion y libertad del  
sufragio popular, *con invocando* ~~y fué encabezada con~~ el nombre  
prestigioso del General Don Porfirio Diaz.

La batalla de Tecoac, que tuvo lugar el 16 de  
Noviembre de 1876, decidió el triunfo de la revolu-  
cion de Tuxtepec, y el General Diaz fué declarado  
Jefe del Poder Ejecutivo. *En Abril de 1877,*  
~~Convocada una eleccion,~~  
resultó electo Presidente constitucional, ~~en Abril de~~



~~1877~~, y desde entonces ha ocupado la ~~Presidencia~~ de  
la República, con excepcion del cuatrienio de 1880 á  
1884, en que la desempeñó el General Don Manuel Gon-  
zalez. El notable progreso que la ~~Nación~~ ha al-  
canzado se debe en <sup>su mayor</sup> ~~gran~~ parte á la política y es-  
fuerzos del General Diaz.



411  
2828-1

Washington, Octubre 22 de 1896

43

Señor Lic. Don Ignacio Mariscal,  
Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores.  
México.

Muy estimado amigo:

Hece tiempo escribí un artículo respecto de la conducta de Mr. Blaine en nuestra cuestion de limites con Guatemala, con el objeto de hacer patente la ligereza con que procedió en ese asunto, y en su oportunidad lo mandé oficialmente á esa Secretaria, solicitando su permiso para publicarlo. Este es el único trabajo respecto de Guatemala que no ha visto la luz pública y desearia yo publicarlo aqui antes de que termine esta administracion, porque creo que no pulsaré dificultad ninguna de parte de ella. No creo que el Gobierno de México pueda hacerle objecion porque, como dije ya, se limita á examinar la conducta de Mr. Blaine en aquella cuestion, y si alguna objecion hubiera, seria de parte de este Gobierno; pero yo no lo publicaré sin estar antes seguro de que no encontraré dificultad por parte de la administracion. Si deseara usted un nuevo ejemplar del artículo, se lo mandaré desde luego.

Me repito de usted afectisimo amigo y seguro servidor.

*M. Romero*

*Oct. 31*

*Con el artículo que se cita y la  
nota de resumen, vuelva al asunto*



3132  
2823-1

Washington, Septiembre 30 de 1894.

44

Número 306.

Artículo sobre pre-  
liminares del trata-  
do de límites con  
Guatemala.

Como esa Secretaría sabe, el Abogado

de Guatemala en la Comisión de Reclamaciones

Anexo:

Borrador del artícu-  
lo.

reunida en esa ciudad expresó en su alegato re-

ferente á mi reclamación contra aquel Gobierno por no haber-

*Nov. 6* me puesto en posesión de un terreno que legítimamente me

*Contes* correspondía, conceptos ofensivos para mí, que son el re-

*lande*

*que el* sultado de la impresión que se ha tenido en Guatemala

*Dr. Pais*

de que soy agitador constante contra ese país y que pro-

*deute no*

*consider* curo hacerle todo el mal que puedo. Cuando tenga tiempo,

*conve*

me propongo contestar esos conceptos; pero antes deseo

*ni ante*

*era fu* hacer constar como una prueba de lo infundado de semejan-

*bl'cción,*

tes opiniones, hechos históricos conocidos ya en globo,

*supuestos*

*el estu* pero no en sus detalles, que demuestran con toda clari-

*de muer*

dad que carece de fundamento aquella exposición.

*tras rela*

*civis con*

La prueba más clara que se puede presentar con este

*Guatemala,*

objeto es la conducta que seguí cuando vino á esta ca-

pital el General Don J. Rufino Barrios con objeto de ter-

minar



minar la cuestión de límites pendiente entónces entre los dos países. Si hubiera yo estado animado del odio y mala voluntad que se me suponen tanto respecto del General como de su país, ni lo habría visto, ni me habría empeñado en que se terminara de una manera conveniente la cuestión, porque mientras estuviera pendiente habría posibilidad de un conflicto entre los dos países, del que saldría muy mal parada Guatemala.

Para hacer constar, pues, con algunos detalles mi conducta en ese incidente y por tratarse tambien de sucesos históricos que es conveniente dejar consignados de una manera auténtica, he escrito un trabajo sobre el término de la cuestión en la parte que tomamos aquí el General Barrios, en representación de Guatemala, y yo, en la de México, con el objeto de publicarlo como un artículo histórico, y con el propósito de referirme á él más adelante en mi respuesta á las nuevas inculpaciones que se me han hecho por el Agente oficial de Guatemala.

He terminado ya el primer borrador de ese artículo que remito á Usted para su conocimiento, y con la súplica



de que , si no encontrare inconveniente, me autorice para publicarlo. No tiene este artículo el inconveniente de los otros dos que he enviado recientemente á Usted, porque no se censura en él á ningun funcionario de los Estados Unidos. Tampoco se ataca á ningun funcionario guatemalteco, pues se reduce á referir suscita y claramente las negociaciones que tuvieron lugar en Washington y en Nueva York, y que dieron por resultado la firma de los preliminares para un tratado definitivo de límites el 12 de Agosto de 1882.

Reitero á Usted mi muy distinguida consideración.

*M. Romero.*

Al Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores.

México.



# Settlement of the Boundary dispute between Mexico and Guatemala.

1882.

The office of Secretary of the Treasury of Mexico, was until quite recently the <sup>most burdensome</sup> ~~hardest one~~ in Mexico, because ~~being~~ the federal Treasury <sup>a being</sup> in a state of chronic bankruptcy, it was impossible to pay all its obligations, and the Secretary had to distribute the receipts in the best way he could, which caused everybody having a claim against the Treasury to appeal to him, thus leaving upon him almost all the details of that office, besides several other causes, <sup>which it would</sup> ~~that~~ it will be too long to mention, and which increased considerably the Secretary's <sup>task.</sup> ~~labor.~~ Therefore <sup>a</sup> hardworking and conscientious man, holding that office, had to work 18 hours every day as long as he was able to do so, ~~and~~ at a place nearly 8000 feet upon the level of the sea, where the atmosphere <sup>is</sup> ~~pressure~~, being <sup>less</sup> ~~smaller~~ than lower down, affects severely the nervous system, and does not permit a prolonged and constant mental labor.

I remember that Emperor Napoleon, believing during the French intervention, and while Maximilian was in Mexico, that there was not any Mexican competent to arrange the finances of the country, sent two French officials, who I suppose were <sup>ists</sup> ~~specialties~~ as financiers, and being, naturally, very anxious to please Napoleon, expecting promotion at home if successful, worked hard to satisfy him, and after a few months one of them died, and his successor returned insane. I have had occasion to notice, that <sup>even</sup> ~~every~~ young and strong men, suffer severely after a few months of a constant mental work, from



what Mexican doctors call brain anemia, and, if the patient does not stop working or leave the city, <sup>he</sup> dies soon afterwards.

After having worked <sup>a</sup> great deal in Washington during the French intervention in Mexico (from 1861 to 1867), as official representative of my country, I was called by President Juarez, on my return home, to the Treasury Department, in *May* ~~August~~ 1867, and remained in that office up to December 1872, working as hard, if not more so, <sup>as</sup> ~~than~~ any of my predecessors, and I am <sup>astonished that</sup> ~~surprised how~~ I could stand such hard work without breaking down. <sup>It is true that</sup> ~~To be sure~~, I was then young, and my <sup>orderly</sup> ~~good~~ habits gave me strength, but my work was enough to kill anybody. Towards the latter part of 1872, I could not sleep, could not assimilate food, and not even digest it, and I was in such <sup>a</sup> condition that a few months more of such work, would certainly have <sup>put an end to</sup> ~~ended~~ my life; and I had to leave the Cabinet, availing myself of the <sup>circumstance</sup> ~~opportunity~~, that the President <sup>was going</sup> ~~in-~~ <sup>to inaugurate</sup> ~~augurated~~ <sup>and being</sup> ~~commenced~~ a new term on the 1st of December of that year, when it <sup>on such occasions</sup> ~~is~~ customary, to make a total or partial change of Cabinet.

I understood well that, to restore my health, I had <sup>exercise</sup> ~~to~~ lead a life of physical <sup>exercise</sup> ~~development~~ (for some years), and to avoid as much as possible all intellectual efforts, and as that could not have been possible had I remain <sup>ed</sup> in the City of Mexico, I made up my mind to live in the country and follow agricultural pursuits, because, having no fortune, I had to work to earn my living. I visited several desirable places in Mexico, and finally <sup>chose</sup> ~~selected~~ to settle at the most remote one from the Capital, because I did not desire to return to public life for which I never had any liking. I selected that <sup>also</sup> ~~place~~ ~~too~~, because it was one of fine agricultural resources



and of great promise, and I therefore settled in Soconusco, a District of the State of Chiapas bordering with Guatemala, bought some public land there and started a coffee plantation in the high lands, and one of india rubber in the low ones, and did some commercial business, <sup>ing</sup> buying coffee for export, and import <sup>ing</sup> agricultural implements and ~~other~~ commodities.

While Mexico had been in possession of Chiapas for over fifty years, and it was as much a Mexican State as any <sup>other</sup> in ~~this~~ <sup>that</sup> Union, Guatemala claimed that <sup>it</sup> ~~Chiapas~~ rightfully belonged to her.

Public men in Guatemala are very suspicious and more specially so about Mexico, and when they saw me as a farmer in a very humble frontier town, adjoining their country, they thought that I must have some designs against ~~their~~ Guatemala and that my farming was only <sup>to conceal them</sup> sham. General J. Rufino Barrios became President very soon after I settled in Soconusco, and he as well as most of the persons surrounding him, thought that I had gone there either to work with a view to declare myself Dictator or ruler of Guatemala, or to work for the annexation of that country to Mexico, which has been for some time their bug bear, because, judging by what they generally <sup>imagined</sup> do, they ~~thought~~ that a man who had been Secretary of the Treasury of Mexico for five years, ~~they imagined~~ ought to be a millionaire, and could not really try to earn his living by honest labor.

Although then I did not fully realize that, I tried to allay their fears by going myself to the City of Guatemala to make the acquaintance of its public men and to <sup>inform</sup> ~~acquaint~~ them <sup>of</sup> with my reasons for having gone to Soconusco and <sup>of</sup> my purposes for the future, but, very likely, judging me by their own



*way of acting,*

~~criticism~~<sup>will</sup>, as it is natural that every one ~~judges~~ of the others by his own views and principles, that act of mine only confirmed them in their fears.

General Barrios treated me with the greatest duplicity, because, while he pretended to be a friend of mine and in some things acted as such to deceive me, <sup>and to</sup> inspiring ~~me~~<sup>with</sup> confidence in his sincerity, he actually thought, that I was his rival and therefore <sup>his</sup> worst enemy, and he did all he could to get rid of me. It would be too long to state here what then took place, and I will only say, that, while acting towards me as a friend, he instructed his official representative at the City of Mexico <sup>early in 1875</sup> to accuse me before the Mexican Government of several of the worst crimes which he claimed I had committed against Guatemala, and to demand that I <sup>be</sup> removed from the frontier, because my presence there, he said, was a menace to the peace of ~~Guatemala~~ *that country*.

When ~~in 1875~~, the Mexican Government informed me of the charges made against me by the Guatemalan Minister, I fully realized the position in which I was, and understood that I could not possibly remain in Soconusco any longer, without danger of certain assassination, and <sup>if</sup> had to give up and lose a fortune I had accumulated there after three years of work, ~~and~~ at the same time I thought it my duty to state in self defense, all <sup>that what had</sup> ~~that~~ happened between General Barrios and myself while I was on the frontier, and I had to present him as he really was, a false, unscrupulous and disloyal man. I wrote <sup>in August 1876</sup> almost a book in answer to the charges made against me, corroborating, with ample proof, every statement I made, and my answer was printed by the Mexican Government. General Barrios had the good sense of not trying to contradict any



thing I had said and, of course, after that I had nothing more to do with him.

Such was the condition of my relations with General Barrios, when the Mexican Government sent me for the second time to Washington, as official representative, ~~from Mexico~~ in February 1882, and when the events I propose to narrate <sup>in this paper</sup> here took place. // In the meanwhile General Barrios had succeeded, during President Garfield's administration, in obtaining the assistance of the Government of the United States in the then pending boundary question between ~~that Republic~~ <sup>and Guatemala</sup> and Mexico, in the shape of an offer of its mediation made in a very irregular manner, since this Government offered to act as an arbitrator, in a way which was far from being friendly and with the peculiarity that, in making such offer, an opinion <sup>in regard to</sup> of the pending question was officially expressed, <sup>being</sup> which was entirely favorable to Guatemala's contention. I had stated in another paper entitled "Mr. Blaine and the boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala", what was then the condition of that question, and that statement shows that the conduct of this Government was most extraordinary. I can only say, that the partiality it then showed was enough to upset any Guatemalan having <sup>a</sup> great deal more sense and experience in international affairs than General Barrios, who naturally thought, that the Government of the United States was entirely on his side <sup>in</sup> ~~on~~ the boundary question with Mexico, and that he could have its moral influence to force Mexico to submit that question to the arbitration of <sup>said</sup> ~~a~~ Government, which began by stating that Guatemala was right; namely, that Chiapas lawfully belonged to her, <sup>while</sup> ~~when~~ it was an integral part of Mexican territory, <sup>which</sup> ~~when~~ we had held <sup>at</sup> ~~it~~ quite <sup>et</sup> and in peace for over



half a century.

As President Arthur's administration, which succeeded that of General Garfield, did not pursue the policy of its predecessors in regard to this contention between the two countries, ~~on this subject~~, General Barrios, who could not understand the change of policy, which he imagined ~~it~~ might <sup>only</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>signify</sup> an unexpected delay, became quite impatient, and, being naturally distrustful and impressionable, ~~he~~ probably thought, that it was due to neglect on the part of his diplomatic representative in Washington.

Doctor Don Lorenzo Montufar, who was then the Diplomatic representative of Guatemala in Washington, and one of the most distinguished and best known public men in Central America, made all kinds of efforts to induce the Government of the United States to continue the policy begun by President Garfield, that is, to obtain <sup>the consent of</sup> ~~an agreement~~ that the Mexican Government to submit to the arbitration of the United States ~~its~~ pending boundary question with Guatemala, ~~but~~ <sup>and</sup> that this Government should lend its moral influence to Guatemala in her efforts to <sup>annex to</sup> Guatemala <sup>four</sup> the other Central American States, or the accomplishment of the Central American Union, as it was then called.

Such was the condition of things ~~which~~ I found on my arrival at Washington, in February 1882.

Señor Montufar's ~~family~~ <sup>(with his family)</sup> was then living in New York, ~~and~~ <sup>he used to come</sup> he spent all the week there, but came to Washington every Thursday, which was then, ~~as it is now~~, <sup>fixed</sup> the day set apart by the Secretary of State, <sup>for the reception of</sup> ~~to receive the members of~~ the Diplomatic Corps, and he did not fail to see that official on Thursday of every week. Immediately after my arrival at



Washington, Señor Montufar called on me to propose that we should agree upon some basis for a boundary treaty, under the condition that Mexico should accept the arbitration of the United States; his interest in the matter being so earnest that he appeared exceedingly impatient and even nervous. I informed him, that I had no instructions from my Government to treat on this subject and that without such authority I could not even open negotiations with him; that <sup>since</sup> ~~when~~ he first suggested it, I had asked for such authority, but it had not been <sup>given</sup> ~~sent~~ to me, and that under such circumstances I could not treat with him officially on the subject.

Señor Montufar, however, continued <sup>by</sup> asking ~~me for~~ my personal opinion <sup>about</sup> ~~on~~ the <sup>question</sup> subject, and as he appeared ready to recognize the rights which Mexico had to Chiapas and Soconusco, a recognition which the Guatemalan Government had withheld up to that time, and ~~that he~~ <sup>that</sup> did not propose ~~the arbitration~~ <sup>an arbitration</sup> of ~~the~~ United States should decide upon such rights, but ~~a~~ <sup>have a</sup> very limited arbitration, which I thought would not affect the rights of Mexico, <sup>to that territory, I expressed</sup> ~~I gave it~~ to him as my personal opinion, that an agreement might be made upon such a basis, provided that the boundaries between Chiapas and Guatemala should be those <sup>which had been</sup> ~~that were~~ recognized at the time of their independence from Spain, and, ~~that~~ when such boundaries could not be identified, to accept such as were actually recognized between Mexico and Guatemala. <sup>being once</sup> ~~Once~~ this principle accepted, there was nothing <sup>left</sup> to be decided by arbitration, ~~of the United~~ <sup>only</sup> States; but occasional disputes about ~~which were~~ <sup>special</sup> the actual boundaries of some locations <sup>in case of disagreement</sup> if the interested parties did <sup>of the parties interested</sup> not agree upon that subject among themselves.

If Mexico had declined with a great deal of reason to



accept the arbitration in the form proposed by Mr. Blaine, Señor Montufar did not suggest that kind of arbitration, and I thought it would ~~not~~<sup>not</sup> be advisable for us to refuse arbitration point blank, because the new administration, <sup>established at</sup> ~~in~~ Washington, far from sharing the views of its predecessor upon this question, was disposed to act as a friend of both parties, and not to take the side of either of them, and because I thought it was not convenient for Mexico to refuse unconditionally the arbitration of the United States, especially when I was sure that under the existing administration we did not risk any rights, since we would only submit to the decision of this Government, questions which were really of a very secondary importance upon which arbitration was proper and reasonable.

In a special article that I have written on the boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala, I reviewed at some length the attitude of the Garfield-Blaine Administration upon this subject. President Arthur's administration did not share the views of his predecessor, and he followed a dignified and sensible policy which consisted in expressing to both nations concerned, his good will to co-operate for the settlement of the pending question, in case that both nations should ask him to do so, since he thought ~~that~~ if he acted at the request of only one country, it might appear that he took her side to the disadvantage of the other. The efforts, which were many and urgent of both Señor Montufar and later on of General Barrios himself, were not enough to make President Arthur deviate a single step from that prudent and wise policy.

Señor Montufar asked me to reduce to writing my views on



that subject. I did so on the 17th of April 1882, without knowing that <sup>Don Manuel</sup> Señor Herrera, the Guatemalan Minister in Mexico had proposed similar conditions to Señor Mariscal, the Mexican Secretary of State, and that he had been instructed by his Government to open negotiations for that purpose at the City of Mexico. I informed Señor Montufar that my draft contained only my personal views, which did not commit my Government in any way, but that I had communicated it to my Government for its examination and decision.

When I advised the Mexican Government of my action on this matter, I was told that the Guatemalan Government had instructed Señor Herrera, ~~its Minister to Mexico~~, to negotiate a boundary treaty, and that this gentleman had proposed conditions a great deal more favorable to Mexico than those suggested by Señor Montufar, as this gentleman had proposed to omit from my draft the word "Soconusco", where I said that Guatemala recognized that both the State of Chiapas and the Department of Soconusco belonged to Mexico, which showed that he intended to leave pending the question of boundaries, so far as Soconusco was concerned.

When I informed Señor Montufar of the answer of my Government, he sent me officially a copy of a communication of the Department of State of Guatemala, dated on the 13th of May 1882, in which he was advised that Señor Herrera had been instructed "to leave things in the same condition in which they were then, until he should receive further instructions". This decision, which very likely had been taken in view of the intended trip of General Barrios to the United States, was understood by Señor Montufar as conferring to him special authority to continue the boundary negotiations in Washington.



His hallucination was so great that, in a letter which he published in "Las Novedades" of New York, of the 27th of May of that year, which I knew had been written by him, although it was not signed, he went so far as to assert that Mr. Frelinghuysen, the Secretary of State of President Arthur, had renewed to Mexico the offer of arbitration made previously by Mr. Blaine, <sup>an</sup> ~~which~~ <sup>that</sup> assertion was not correct.

Señor Montufar sent the original of my draft of basis for an agreement to the Secretary of State of the United States, with an official letter, dated May 2, 1882, and in another official letter, dated on the 25th of the same month, he informed the Secretary of State that there was danger that my proposals might be withdrawn, and that this fact would make inevitable a war between Guatemala and Mexico. I took special pains to inform the Secretary of State that there was not any such danger, and to point out the many inaccuracies contained in Señor Montufar's letters; and this explains the <sup>following</sup> ~~foregoing~~ sentences of Mr. Frelinghuysen's answer to both of Señor Montufar's letters, (dated June 5, 1882.)

"I beg leave to renew the official assurance that the President will gladly lend his good offices to bring about a solution of this unfortunate question if a basis can be found that is acceptable to both Guatemala and Mexico".

When Señor Montufar received the foregoing letter, he came at once from New York to Washington to tell Mr. Frelinghuysen that he, (Montufar), authorized the Secretary of State to settle the boundary question with Mexico in behalf of Guatemala, on such basis as he thought convenient, with the understanding that whatever the Secretary of State might decide on this point, should be signed by Señor Montufar as Guatemala's Minister. Of course Mr. Frelinghuysen could not



accept any such commission.

General Barrios had asked and obtained leave from the Guatemalan Congress to go out of the country for one year. Before using that leave he addressed a message to the Guatemalan Congress, dated ~~on~~ April 24, 1882, in which he stated that his country was, in his opinion, in a dangerous condition on account of the boundary question with Mexico then pending, and he requested that ample authority should be conferred upon him to settle that question in such manner as he might think most conducive to the interests of Guatemala. The Guatemalan Congress appointed a special committee to examine this subject, and that committee presented on the 25th of April a report, authorizing General Barrios in a special and ample manner, to settle definitely and in such a way as he might think most convenient for Guatemala, the boundary question with Mexico. That report was adopted unanimously by the Guatemalan Congress.

On the 24th of June 1882, just before leaving Guatemala, General Barrios published an address to his fellow citizens in which he repeated substantially what he had stated to the Guatemalan Congress in asking leave to come to the United States, and authority to settle the boundary question.

Señor Montufar sent me, with a letter dated at New York on the 3d of June 1882, copies of the papers relating to the intended trip of General Barrios to Washington for the purpose of settling the boundary question with Mexico, which had been published in "El Guatemalteco", the official paper of Guatemala of May 8, 1882; and believing that General Barrios would come at once to the United States to settle this question, he urged me again, to come with him to a definitive agreement, before President Barrios should reach Washington, as he



seemed to have the greatest interest in settling himself that important question.

On the 4th of June of that year, Señor Montufar addressed me a letter informing me that he had just received one from Señor Herrera, dated at the City of Mexico, in which he was told, that Señor Mariscal had written to Señor Herrera on the 17th of May, "that he desired to know if Señor Montufar was instructed and authorized by his Government to settle the boundary question, as in that case the Mexican Government would accept the basis proposed in Washington", and on this account he again urged me to settle finally this question.

Far from having received myself any such instructions from my Government, I had been instructed to suspend all negotiations with Señor Montufar, while the Mexican Government were carrying on negotiations on this very subject with Señor Herrera in the City of Mexico, and for this reason I answered Señor Montufar that I could do nothing more on the subject. Señor Montufar, however, wrote me again on the 10th of June, suggesting once more the settlement of the boundary question by the arbitration of the United States, and on the 27th of June he called on me again, in company with his son, Don Manuel, who was then Secretary of the Guatemalan Legation in the City of Mexico, and who was on his way to his country, on leave, and informed me that Don Manuel had stated to him that the Mexican Secretary of State had rejected the draft of a treaty proposed by Señor Herrera on the 14th of January, <sup>of that year</sup> and Señor Montufar thought, that that fact removed the only obstacle that, in his opinion, was in the way to make the boundary treaty in Washington, and that therefore we ought to lose no time to negotiating it.



President Barrios left Guatemala for Washington on the 1st of July, 1882, accompanied by Señor Don Fernando Cruz, his Secretary of State, <sup>and Father Arroyo as a United Councillor</sup> and sailed from Izabal on the Steamer "City of Dallas", arriving in New Orleans on the 10th of that month. After spending one or two days at that City, he came to New York, <sup>to join</sup> ~~where~~ <sup>which</sup> his family had already arrived by the way of San Francisco.

On July 17, Señor Montufar informed me, that General Barrios had instructed him to announce officially to the Diplomatic Corps in Washington, his arrival in the United States, and <sup>that</sup> he had inquired <sup>of</sup> ~~from~~ him, if he should include me among the gentlemen to whom he had to make that notification, and, being answered in the affirmative by a telegram, Señor Montufar sent me on the 19th of that month a copy of the circular letter, with no other address than the one on the envelope, in which he informed me, that General Barrios had arrived in this city, and that he had taken lodgings at the Arlington Hotel.

Had I been in Washington without any official position and guided only by my personal feelings of propriety, I would <sup>of course,</sup> not have thought of calling on General Barrios, because the condition which our personal relations had reached, would not allow me to take that step, but, as I represented the Mexican Government, and as he came to this country with the object of settling with my Government a question highly important to <sup>both of</sup> our respective countries, I thought that it was my duty to put aside all personal feelings, and to act as if I ~~had~~ never had any reason to complain of General Barrios. I concluded, therefore, that I ought to answer the letter of the Guatemalan Minister, by calling on General Barrios at his lodgings and,



leaving my card, I did so at five o'clock in the afternoon of the day of his arrival in Washington. (July 19<sup>th</sup>). Probably General Barrios did not expect that I would act in that way, and so promptly, since as soon as he received my card, he requested Señor Montufar to pay me a visit, and to express to me the satisfaction he had in my having called upon him.

On the same day, (July 19) Mr. Frelinghuysen called on General Barrios, and notwithstanding that his call was only a ceremonious one, and for the purpose of making his acquaintance, General Barrios spoke to him of the business which had brought him to Washington, telling him that he had the purpose to settle in any manner that was possible, the pending boundary question with Mexico, and that he desired the intervention of the United States in that case, and expressed his willingness to accept the basis I had proposed to Señor Montufar on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April. The same statement was made by General Barrios in a subsequent interview which he had with the Secretary of State, at his office, on the following day. Mr. Frelinghuysen answered General Barrios, that the United States, as a friend of both interested countries had the greatest desire to see the difficulty existing between them amicably settled, and on this account, if both of them should ask for the arbitration of the United States Government, it would be readily granted; but that they could not propose to any of them, at the suggestion of the other, to accept such arbitration.

At nine o'clock in the evening of the 20<sup>th</sup> of July, General Barrios was received by the President of the United States, and on that occasion he was very earnest, as he had been at the first interview which he had with the Secretary of



State, in asking President Arthur to offer his mediation in the boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala.

On the 21st of July, Señor Montufar and Señor Cruz called on me, and the former informed me that the Government of Guatemala was anxious to settle as soon as possible the pending boundary question with Mexico and that it had approved the bases presented by me to Señor Montufar on the 17th of April of that year, believing that they would be acceptable to the Mexican Government, and that Señor Montufar had communicated to the United States Government, Guatemala's acceptance of such bases.

I answered Señor Cruz that I had just received instructions from the Mexican Government dated on the 1st of July, in which I <sup>was</sup> informed that Mexico could not consider Señor Montufar's proposals, so long as the Guatemalan Government would not officially notify the Mexican Government through Señor Herrera, that Señor Montufar was authorized to negotiate a settlement of the boundary question at Washington, and that in case that the Guatemalan Minister in this city informed me in writing that his Government had approved of the bases proposed by me, I would communicate such information to my Government and I would ask again their instructions on this subject. *That notification was never made to me in a direct* ~~I never received such notification from the~~ *Guatemalan Government. and official manner.*

Señor Cruz informed me then, that General Barrios had called Señor Herrera from Mexico to assist him in the negotiations which he had come to make in this capital, with the view to end the pending boundary question.

On that day <sup>21<sup>st</sup></sup> (July 21) I received an invitation from the Department of State, to ~~go to~~ join in an excursion to visit



Washington's tomb at Mount Vernon, Virginia, <sup>made by</sup> ~~that~~ the Government of the United States ~~made~~ in honor of President Barrios, and to which all Members of the Diplomatic Corps had been invited. As that was not an official act, and as I did not desire to appear officious in a demonstration of regard to the President of Guatemala, it <sup>politely</sup> declined the invitation.

President Arthur gave a dinner party in honor of General Barrios on the evening of the 22d of July, and he invited on that occasion, the Diplomatic Corps in Washington, and some Members of his Cabinet. I hesitated about accepting my invitation, but finally I thought that, by putting aside my personal feelings and my experiences with General Barrios, as Mexico maintained friendly relations with Guatemala, although both countries had <sup>pending</sup> ~~pending~~ serious and disagreeable questions between them, it became me as the Diplomatic Representative of Mexico, to attend an official demonstration made in honor of the President of Guatemala. However, as that was the first time that I was going to meet General Barrios after the serious difficulties that I had with him, and not knowing how he would act towards me in our first interview, he having a passionate and quick temper, I decided to be at the White House a few seconds before the appointed time, with a view of being there present when General Barrios should arrive, as in that manner he had to make the first demonstration of recognition, which I desired on my part to avoid, for fear that mine might not be reciprocated by him if I made any, and that omitting it would be improper of the occasion.

I arrived, therefore, at the Executive Mansion <sup>seconds, a few minutes</sup> before General Barrios, and there were several guests <sup>assembled</sup> already ~~collected~~ ~~ed~~ when General Barrios came in with Señor Cruz, Señor Montu-



far and Father Arroyo. All the ~~guests~~<sup>gentlemen</sup> present, excepting myself, were entire strangers to him, and he spoke to me in the same way that he had saluted them, that is, as if he had never met me before, using the same phrases that he had used with the others. I was seated at the table in a place nearly opposite the one occupied by General Barrios, who as the guest of honor was at the right of President Arthur, and during the whole dinner he acted towards me as if he had never met me before. ~~He acted in that way~~<sup>the same</sup> when we parted, his conduct being ~~very~~<sup>rather</sup> satisfactory to me, because it ~~avoided~~<sup>prevented</sup> unpleasant explanations on my part, at a ~~place~~<sup>time and</sup> where it was ~~not~~<sup>not</sup> best to have any.

General Barrios was under the impression that I was the worst enemy he ever had, and that my enmity was not only to him personally but to his country, and that consequently all my efforts were directed to do both himself and Guatemala as much harm as I possibly could, and he ~~went so far as to~~<sup>harshly</sup> censured Señor Montufar because he had seen me with the purpose I have stated. When he found out that he could not rely upon the assistance of the Government of the United States in a way hostile to Mexico, which he had enjoyed during President Garfield's administration, and that I had gone further than any other Mexican official, in the bases proposed for the settlement of the question, notwithstanding the serious offences which I had received from him, he ~~saw~~<sup>probably thought</sup> that it was better for him not to ignore me in this matter, and very likely my calling upon him on his arrival in Washington and my attending the dinner given in his honor by President Arthur, contributed to make him come to that conclusion.

The next day after that dinner, that is on the 23d of



July, General Barrios came to see me at my house, with Señor Cruz, Señor Montufar and Dr. Arroyo. He began his conversation with me as if no unpleasantness had ever occurred between us. He showed much cordiality and good will towards me and he complained, that the sympathy he always had for Mexico, had not been understood in my country. As I had not seen him since we parted in September 1874, and since that time serious difficulties had occurred between us, I thought it my duty, before renewing my relations with him and speaking to him on official business, to state that the offenses which he had made me, were of such a nature that, if I was not the official representative *of* Mexico, I would not have called on him nor passed ~~ed~~ a single word with him, nor have anything to do with him; but that, representing Mexico, and he coming as the President of a friendly nation, with the purpose of settling peaceably a serious question between our respective countries, I thought it was my duty to see him and to try, so far as I could, to reach a settlement of that question, ignoring completely my personal sentiments, and acting as if I had never been offended by him. He answered me that the offenses made to me by *Señor Don Ramon Uriarte*, his diplomatic representative at the City of Mexico, had not been authorized by him, which I *know well* ~~was sure~~ was not so, and without my pressing more ~~this~~ point, he began to talk on the pending boundary question.

He told me <sup>that</sup> all the former Governments ~~that~~ *of* Guatemala having contended, that Chiapas and Soconusco belonged to that country, he could not, without failing to comply with his duties as a public man, acknowledge the annexation of that territory to Mexico, and that such were the views of Señor Montufar, Señor Herrera and all the Guatemalan statesmen who



surrounded him, and that for such reason he had refused so far to make that recognition; but, as he was convinced that it was not possible for Guatemala to recover that territory and that this would be a source of constant difficulties and dangers to his country, he was ready to recognize the fact that Chiapas and Soconusco belonged to Mexico. During this interview, the gentlemen who accompanied General Barrios did not say a single word, and I only gave general answers. // In taking leave of me, General Barrios informed me, that on the following day he would return to New York, where he would remain for two or three weeks, and would sail for Europe soon afterwards.

Wishing to pay him his call before he left Washington, I called upon him at his hotel during the evening of that day. He sent away all the gentlemen who were in his parlor when I arrived, and gave instructions that nobody should come in, and he then repeated to me more at length, what he had said in the morning of that day, about his friendship and regard for Mexico and his sincere desire to adjust the boundary question under conditions which would be satisfactory to the Mexican Government. He told me besides, that he desired to go to the City of Mexico and settle there that question, in case that his visit should be agreeable to the Mexican Government. *had said to me all he wanted,* After he ~~was through~~, he called Señor Montufar, and asked him to give me a copy of a letter which under his directions had been addressed to the Department of State of the United States on the 21st of July, which had been written by Señor Cruz, in whose ability and loyalty General Barrios had more faith than in anybody else, and signed by Señor Montufar as the official representative of Guatemala. In that letter it was



stated, that Guatemala would, in the settlement of that question, accept the fact that Chiapas and Soconusco belonged to Mexico.

That letter expressed in fact such idea, but on condition that the United States Government should act as arbitrator and proposed to the Mexican Government to submit the question to the arbitration of <sup>the U. S.</sup> ~~this~~ Government. The Secretary of State answered that letter on the 24th of July, stating that it was understood that the recognition by Guatemala, that Chiapas and Soconusco belonged to Mexico, would materially contribute to facilitate an amicable settlement of the question, and that the Government of the United States would willingly act as mediator or arbitrator between the interested parties, if both should ask it to do so.

The courteous manner in which I received General Barrios and my having paid him a call on the same day that he had called on me, very likely contributed to change somewhat his <sup>which had been unfavorable,</sup> ~~views~~ <sup>opinion</sup> about me, because he thought I was unreasonably hostile to him and his country, as Señor Montufar intimated to me in a conversation I had with him on the 24th of July.

I communicated at once to the Mexican Government by cablegram, the acceptance of General Barrios of the annexation to Mexico of Chiapas and Soconusco, on condition that the United States Government should have some interference in the final settlement of the case, and the desire of General Barrios to go personally to the City of Mexico to arrange this question. <sup>To my regret,</sup> Unfortunately the Mexican Government did not think it convenient that General Barrios should go to the Mexican capital; <sup>because</sup> as in my opinion, his visit there would have made him change somewhat, the bad impressions he had about



Mexico, derived from the fact that <sup>he knowing</sup> only ~~knew~~ the frontier towns; <sup>a better acquaintance</sup> and that ~~such knowledge~~ would assist very materially in the final settlement of the difficulties. The Mexican Government thought <sup>that</sup> we could not accept in any case the interference of the Government of the United States <sup>in</sup> of this question, and that, as the Guatemalan Government had not notified Mexico that the negotiations should be transferred from the City of Mexico to Washington, it was not proper to open them here. Such were the instructions communicated to me by cable on the 22d of July.

Señor Montufar notified me officially on the 25th of July, that the Guatemalan Government had decided to transfer the negotiations to Washington, during the absence from the City of Mexico ~~for~~ <sup>of</sup> Señor Herrera, the accredited Guatemalan Minister, and that, if in the meanwhile both countries should come to an agreement the question could be ended here. On the same day, and <sup>by</sup> ~~through~~ an official letter, Señor Montufar informed me that Guatemalan recognized the fact, that Chiapas and Soconusco lawfully belonged to Mexico, and I at once transmitted this acknowledgment by cable to the Mexican Government.

On the 27th of July I received a cablegram from the Mexican Government, in answer to mine communicating Señor Montufar's letter, in which I was told that Mexico could not agree to the negotiations being transferred to the United States, and that she was disposed to continue them at the City of Mexico with the Representative of Guatemala fully authorized <sup>for that purpose and upon</sup> ~~thereto, under~~ the basis of disclaiming all rights of Guatemala to Chiapas and Soconusco and of not asking for indemnity; and on the following day I communicated these in-



instructions to Señor Montufar.

As soon as General Barrios arrived at New York, he informed me that he had taken his passage for Europe and should leave on the 8th of August, 1882, and begged of me to see him before his departure. I left Washington on the 3d of August, and called on him at the Hotel Buckingham, where he was stopping on the morning of the 4th. I told him that, from the conversations we had had in Washington, I had not been able to understand exactly his views on the boundary question, and that I desired to communicate them correctly to my Government, *in order* *its* *about* ~~with a view to have their~~ instructions ~~on~~ the same.

In the meanwhile an incident of serious nature took place, which in an incidental manner weakened considerably General Barrios' position and favored the interests of Mexico. I refer to the rupture of Señor Montufar with General Barrios. It seems that the latter had treated with extreme harshness Señor Montufar, which was nothing new nor extraordinary, and either because such ill-treatment reached an intolerable degree, or because Señor Montufar would not like to accept the responsibility of formally acknowledging that Chiapas and Soconusco belonged to Mexico, for fear that this acknowledgment might be badly received at home, he resigned his position as Guatemalan Minister in the United States and addressed a letter to General Barrios, remarkable for its aggressive tone, which was published in the newspapers on the 4th of August.

*would not become*  
It ~~does not belong to~~ me to express an opinion about the behavior of Señor Montufar in this case and I only mention this incident for the connection it has with the boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala.

After that rupture took place I saw Señor Montufar and he



showed me letters from General Barrios, in which he was severely reprimanded for having entered into negotiations with me about the boundary question, as he was told that I was the most bitter and unreasonable enemy, both of Guatemala and personally of General Barrios.

General Barrios informed me then, that he was satisfied that Guatemala could not sustain her rights to Chiapas and Soconusco, both for want of sufficient military strength, and from the fact that those territories had been so long in possession of Mexico, that it was out of ~~the~~ question to recover them, and that in the settlement of that question he had made up his mind to acknowledge the legality of their annexation to Mexico. He further said, that both Señor Herrera and Señor Montufar were entirely opposed to making that acknowledgment and that they had gone so far as even to threaten him with their resignations in case he should make it, and that the latter had already resigned; but he had made up his mind to take that step, because he was convinced that ~~that~~ <sup>this</sup> was the only way to end the boundary question. He further said that, to satisfy public opinion in Guatemala and not to appear as a disgraced man, who had surrendered unconditionally the rights of his country, he desired that in the final agreement, the arbitration of the United States or of any other government that Mexico might designate, should appear in some way to satisfy the pride of the Guatemalan citizens, and, finally, that he had no preference <sup>for</sup> ~~that~~ the treaty <sup>to</sup> ~~should~~ be signed in Washington, and it would be a <sup>a</sup> ~~matter~~ of perfect indifference to him, <sup>it</sup> ~~whether the treaty~~ was signed in the City of Mexico, City of Washington, Paris or any other place. That if the Mexican Government did not object, he would go himself



to the City of Mexico, as he had intimated before, so that the treaty could be signed there by Señor Herrera, provided the Mexican Government assured him that he <sup>would</sup> ~~should~~ suffer no slight during his visit to the City of Mexico and that I should accompany him.

I answered General Barrios that I ~~did not see any other~~ <sup>the only objection ~~was~~</sup> ~~objection~~ <sup>I saw to</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>was the</sup> his views, ~~but his~~ condition to have the mediation of a friendly government, because the Mexican Government had always refused such intervention; but that I should communicate to my Government his views on the subject by cable, which I did <sup>at once,</sup> and that I would inform him of <sup>its</sup> ~~their~~ answer as soon as I should receive it.

On the 5th of August I returned to Washington, and during the night of that day I received by cable instructions from the Mexican Government stating, that in case the arbitration should be agreed upon, the United States should be the arbitrator; but that it was not dignified for Mexico that a friendly government should fix her boundaries. That the final treaty should be negotiated and signed in the City of Mexico, and that I was authorized to sign in Washington a preliminary agreement, laying down the bas<sup>e</sup>s of the final treaty, provided that Señor Herrera should sign such preliminary agreement.

Acting under these instructions, I prepared on the 6th of August, a draft of preliminary bases, which I sent by mail on that day to General Barrios for his examination. In the 3d Section of my draft, I provided for the possibility that the Government of the United States might act as arbitrator, under a provision similar to the draft that I had presented to Señor Montufar on the 17th of April of that year, and I did



so because I was perfectly sure, that General Barrios would not accept the agreement without that condition, and because I thought that we ought not to lose the opportunity of obtaining from him the recognition ~~that~~ Chiapas and Soconusco belonged to Mexico.

To <sup>make it</sup> be sure that my action would be sustained by my Government, I inquired by cable, <sup>about</sup> ~~from it~~, if I could accept arbitration under such conditions as would make it unnecessary in practice and be satisfactory to both interested parties, and I informed General Barrios, that <sup>the</sup> ~~my~~ acceptance of Section 3<sup>d</sup> of my draft, which had been written to meet his views, would <sup>be subject to</sup> ~~depend upon~~ its approval by the Mexican Government.

I was encouraged to expect that my draft should be approved by my Government, because the same ideas have been expressed in the final paragraph of the memorandum of a conversation held on the 15th of March, between Señor Mariscal, ~~Secretary of State of the Mexican Government, and Mr. Morgan, Minister of the United States in the City of Mexico,~~ containing the answer of the Mexican Government to the proposal of Mr. Blaine to submit a boundary question to the arbitration of the United States.

On August 7, the Mexican Government instructed me by cablegram to the effect that it was not convenient to accept in the preliminary bases for a treaty, the arbitration of the United States, notwithstanding that, in case that arbitration was needed, the United States should be the arbitrator.

Having been called to New York by General Barrios, who had postponed his trip to Europe from the 8th to the 12th of August., I left Washington on the night of the 8th, and I spent the whole day of the 9th in conversation with General Barrios, Señor Cruz and Father Arroyo. Señor Herrera, the Guatemalan



Minister to Mexico had just arrived in New York, and was *also* present *at* our conversation.

General Barrios informed me in the beginning of our interview, that Señor Herrera objected to almost all the views and phraseology of the draft of *the* preliminary agreement and that he had several suggestions and remarks to make and many amendments to propose.

During the day Señor Herrera proposed numerous amendments to my draft. It would be too long to state what they were, and I will only say, that he desired that the boundary line should be fixed from the Pacific to the Caribbean Sea or the Atlantic; but as the only cause of the dispute was the possession by Mexico of Chiapas and Soconusco, I thought that, by coming to an agreement on that point, the whole dispute was settled, and that such omission would not prevent both governments to agree in the final treaty to be signed at the City of Mexico, about the *remainder* of the line. As I did not have sufficient data to fix the boundaries beyond the State of Chiapas, I thought it would be very dangerous for me to agree about something that I was entirely ignorant of.

Señor Herrera suggested too, that Mexico should pay an indemnity to Guatemala for the territories that she then recognized as belonging legitimately to us; that Mexico should agree to pay the debt *contracted by* of Chiapas while she belonged to Guatemala, and he suggested, besides, many other *amendments* points of secondary importance. Señor Herrera was vigorously assisted by Señor Cruz, in his efforts to have my draft amended; but General Barrios remained in a passive attitude, without accepting or refusing what his advisors said or suggested. Not to appear obstinate by *refusing* strenuously all the suggestions



and amendments proposed by these gentlemen, I concluded to accept such of them as only ~~made~~ <sup>the</sup> change of phraseology, of my draft, notwithstanding that, in my opinion, the change suggested by them and accepted by me, instead of improving in any way my draft, rather left it <sup>less clear and even,</sup> more to the disadvantage of Guatemala than of Mexico.

After a continuous conference of more than <sup>ten</sup> 10 hours duration, General Barrios dismissed the other gentlemen who had been present and told me, that in the late hours of that evening he would speak to Señor Herrera with a view to make him give up most of his views and he begged me to call the following day, with a hope that we might then be able to come to a definite agreement.

I returned to General Barrios' hotel on the 10th of August, and we remained in conversation during the whole day discussing the pending questions, in presence of Señor Cruz, Señor Herrera, and Father Arroyo. When we arrived at the third section, relating to the arbitration of the United States, General Barrios informed me, that it would be utterly impossible for him to sign an agreement at all, which would not contain that stipulation; that he had given up his views and yielded to me in every other point, that he had sacrificed the rights of Guatemala, which the public men of his country thought invulnerable, and that, if he gave up arbitration, he would be considered in his country as a traitor; because they would say, that he had obtained no advantage for his country and he had no regard for the national honor in this case. He further said, that he did not expect that the United States would have to arbitrate or act at all in this question, and that all he wanted was that it should appear in the boundary



agreement arbitration in some manner, even in case it was intended to nullify such arbitration, and this with a view to save the honor of his country and of himself.

I answered him, that I would <sup>again</sup> address ~~myself again to the~~ <sup>my</sup> Mexican Government on ~~this~~ <sup>the</sup> subject, and that I should accept the limited arbitration of the United States, if my Government would authorize me to do so, and I at once sent a cablegram to the Mexican Government with that object.

The whole of the 11th of August was spent by us, like the two previous days, in conversation referring to the secondary points of the agreement, <sup>while waiting for</sup> ~~in expectation of~~ the answer of the Mexican Government to my last cablegram referring to the arbitration of the United States.

At 3 ~~o~~<sup>1</sup>clock P.M. of the 12th of August, General Barrios was to sail on the steamer "Celtic" for Liverpool, and his baggage had already been sent on board, the previous day, as is customary in such cases. At 12 o'clock he had to leave the hotel to go on board his steamer, and I had no answer from the Mexican Government to my cablegram of the 10th. Believing that, if the agreement was not then signed, we would lose the opportunity of obtaining the absolute <sup>by</sup> recognition of Guatemala ~~to~~ <sup>of</sup> the rights with which Mexico possessed Chiapas and Soconusco, and considering that the arbitration suggested in my draft was the same as had been suggested as acceptable by the Mexican Government on a recent occasion, I thought that I would render a service to my country, if I ventured to sign the preliminary agreement which contained that clause, before General Barrios' departure, and <sup>even</sup> before I received instructions from my Government authorizing me to do so.

To take that course I had, besides the reasons already



set forth, some other important considerations which I will briefly state here. I thought that, if while General Barrios appeared to place the whole question in the hands of the United States Government, and to accept unconditionally anything that it might determine, <sup>if</sup> Mexico refused even a nominal arbitration, which could do us no harm, we would place ourselves in a false position towards this Government, and by doing so we would help General Barrios to carry out his plans to influence the United States against Mexico, and to show to the world that, while he was ready to settle the question in a fair and honorable manner, even to the extent of sacrificing rights that he thought his country had, Mexico refused absolutely to accept any honorable terms of settlement.

But in the case, which was not likely to happen, that the President of the United States should have to arbitrate about a point of relatively secondary importance, I was satisfied, that the then existing Administration <sup>at</sup> ~~in~~ Washington, was <sup>presided by</sup> ~~composed of~~ fair and honest men, who would decide impartially and justly any dispute between Mexico and Guatemala, and that we had the same opportunities <sup>as</sup> ~~than~~ Guatemala to defend our rights and therefore ought not to be afraid of the decision in that case.

But, of course, when I made up my mind to sign the agreement before I received sufficient <sup>authorization</sup> ~~authority~~ from my Government, I foresaw the possibility, that the Mexican Government might have sent me instructions forbidding the acceptance of arbitration under any circumstances. I was so satisfied that we ought not to lose the opportunity of settling that disagreeable question <sup>in order not</sup> ~~and~~ to appear in the wrong, <sup>that,</sup> ~~even if such~~ <sup>should be the</sup> case, ~~happened~~ I was ready to accept the consequences of my conduct,



whatever they might be, ~~being~~ certain that, by so acting, I had rendered a distinguished service to my country.

Unfortunately for me this contingency was realized, that is, the Mexican Government did not approve to accept arbitration in any way in the preliminary agreement, and on the 11th of August it sent me a cablegram in answer to mine of the day before, in which I was instructed that, notwithstanding the commital<sup>t</sup> of the memorandum of the Mexican Secretary of State of the 15th of March, 1882, it was not convenient that, in the preliminary agreement signed in this country, arbitration should be accepted. That cablegram was sent in cipher, as is customary in such cases, and was addressed to the Mexican Legation in Washington, where it was deciphered by the Secretary and sent to me in care of the Mexican Consul General in New York. ~~As~~ When General Barrios sailed, I also left for a quieter and cool place ~~new~~ New York with the intention of spending Sunday and having some rest from the excitement of the last days, and did not return to that city until Monday, the 14th of August, when the cablegram was delivered to me, <sup>and then</sup> it was too late to comply with the instructions of my Government.

The Mexican Government disapproved my conduct and censured me severely for having signed the preliminary bases with General Barrios. While ~~there~~ were not publicly disapproved, they were ignored in the final treaty of boundary signed at the City of Mexico, but the treaty would have been impossible without the preliminaries and the final treaty was only the complement and natural sequence of such bas<sup>e</sup>s.



417  
2825-1: Washington, Enero 12/89

76

Con el objeto que  
tengo manifestado a esa  
Secretaria, remito a Ud. una  
traduccion al español del  
articulo intitulado "Ter-  
mino de la cuestion de li-  
mites entre Mexico y  
Guatemala" cuyo texto in-  
gles le envie con nota nu-  
mero 648 de 5 del corriente.  
Reitero a Ud. mi  
mas distinguida considera-  
cion

M. Romero

Enero 24

Lo acordado

Esta nota se recibio en el  
Archivo de la seccion de Asuntos  
cuando ya estaba creada la parte del ex-  
pediente en que debia colocarse.  
Marzo 9 de 1896

Al Secretario de Relaciones Exteriores  
Mexico



SETTLEMENT OF THE BOUNDARY QUESTION

BETWEEN

MEXICO AND GUATEMALA.



*Dispute*  
Settlement of the Boundary Question between Mexico and Guatemala.

-----  
1882.  
-----

*Settlement of the*  
The boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala which *had* remained pending for nearly sixty years, with danger of a collision between the two ~~interested~~ countries, was *prepared* ~~settled~~ on the 12th of August 1882 by *some preliminary articles* ~~an agreement~~ signed in the City of New York by myself in behalf of Mexico, and General Don J. Rufino Barrios, President of Guatemala, specially authorized ~~thereby~~ by the Congress of that country.

I am, therefore, in possession of facts which would be lost if I failed to record them; *consequently, in order* ~~and with the purpose~~ to secure the integrity of history, I think I ought to relate them, *as* ~~and~~ I intend to do ~~that~~ in this paper.

I will be guided in my narrative by my personal recollections, aided by official records, because, being in the habit of reporting minutely to my Government every incident of my public life while in Washington, I have substantially a diary of all my transactions and even of my thoughts and views written at the time that the events happened, without any coloring or any effort to make them serve any personal or political purpose.

Besides, when General Barrios returned to his country, after having signed the New York *preliminary* ~~agreement~~ *in*, submitting for its approval the final boundary treaty signed at the City of Mexico on September 27 of that year, he sent a message to the Guatemalan Congress on December 1st, 1882, in which he reported minutely all that had taken place in the United States, and a comparison of both reports established the correctness



of my narrative.

I <sup>also</sup> shall ~~quote~~ <sup>also</sup> passages from the official papers communicated to the House of Representatives by President Arthur, with his message of May 8, 1882, in answer to a call for information on that subject. (1)

-----

# 1. MY PERSONAL RELATIONS WITH GENERAL BARRIOS.

But before entering into the details of this subject, and to enable the reader to better understand my narrative of events, I have to give an idea of the nature of my relations with General Barrios, previous to the negotiations which culminated in the <sup>preliminaries</sup> ~~agreement~~ we signed in New York.

The office of Secretary of the Treasury of Mexico, was <sup>quite</sup> ~~until recently~~ the most <sup>burdensome in Mexico</sup> ~~difficult of administration~~, because the <sup>f</sup>ederal Treasury being in a state of chronic bankruptcy, it was impossible to pay ~~on demand~~ all its obligations, and the Secretary had to distribute the ~~daily~~ receipts in the best way he <sup>u</sup> could, which ~~made~~ <sup>led nearly</sup> ~~all claimants~~ <sup>caused everybody having a claim against</sup> to appeal ~~and state the Treasury~~ <sup>to him,</sup> their ~~causes~~ <sup>leaving upon him</sup> to him, thus ~~placing in his hands~~ <sup>which it would</sup> almost all the details of that office, besides several other causes, ~~too~~ <sup>be too long to mention, and</sup> numerous to specify here, which increased considerably the Secretary's <sup>task.</sup> ~~labors.~~ <sup>A</sup> Therefore a hard working and conscientious <sup>t</sup> man, holding that office, had to work 18 hours every day, ~~so~~ <sup>as</sup> long as he was able to do so, ~~and that~~ at a place nearly 8000 feet above the level of the sea, where the atmospheric pressure, being less than <sup>lower down.</sup> ~~below~~, affects severely the nervous system, and does not permit a prolonged and constant mental labor.

I remember that Emperor Napoleon, believing during the French intervention, and while Maximilian was in Mexico, that

(1) Executive Document-No. 184-49th Congress-1st Session.- House of Representatives.



there was not any Mexican competent to arrange the finances of the country, sent for that purpose, two French officials, *I suppose were specialists as financiers,* who ~~doubtless were expert financiers, and being, naturally, very anxious to please Napoleon, expecting promotion at home if successful, worked ~~very~~ hard to satisfy him, and after a few months, one of them, ~~M. Bonafons, returned home very sick and soon afterwards died, and his successor ~~M. Maitenant~~ returned to France insane. I have had occasion to notice, that even young and strong men suffer severely after a few months of a *constant* ~~prolonged~~ mental work, from what Mexican doctors call brain anemia, and, if the patient does not *stop* ~~cease~~ working or leave the city he dies soon afterwards.~~~~

After having worked a great deal in Washington during the French intervention in Mexico, (from 1861 to 1867), as official representative of my country, I was called by President Juarez, on my return home, ~~on the 1st of January 1868,~~ to the Treasury Department, *in May 1867* and remained in that office up to *December* ~~June~~ 10th 1872, working as *hard,* if not more, *so, as* any of my predecessors, and I am *astonished that* ~~surprised~~ how I could ~~stand~~ *stand* such hard work without breaking down. *It is true that* ~~have~~ ~~endured~~ such tremendous work. To be sure, I was then young, and my *orderly* ~~own~~ habits gave me strength, but *my work* ~~the labor~~ imposed upon me was enough to kill anybody. *Towards the latter part of* ~~Early in 1869,~~ I could not sleep, *could not* ~~neither~~ assimilate ~~my~~ food, *and not even* ~~nor~~ digest it, and I was in such *a* condition that few months more of such work would certainly have *put an end to* ~~ended~~ my life; ~~and~~ I had to leave the Cabinet, availing myself of the *circumstance that the President* ~~end of the session of the~~ Mexican Congress specially dedicated to approve the appropriations for the following fiscal year and to vote the taxes to defray them. I also desired to afford President Juarez an opportunity to appoint new men to his cabinet, as he had *was going to inaugurate* ~~inaugurated~~ a new Presidential term on the 1st of December, 1869.



of that year, it being <sup>on such occasions</sup> and it is customary <sup>to make on such occasions</sup> a total or partial change of Cabinet.

I understood well that to restore my health, I had for some years to lead a life of physical <sup>exercise</sup> ~~training~~ and to avoid as much as possible all <sup>intellectual efforts</sup> ~~mental labor~~, and as that could not have been possible had I remained in the City of Mexico, I made up my mind to live in the country, <sup>and follow</sup> ~~occupying my time and devoting my efforts to~~ agricultural pursuits, because, having no fortune, I had <sup>to work</sup> ~~to earn my living by my own work~~. I visited several desirable places in Mexico, and finally <sup>chose</sup> ~~decided~~ to settle at the most remote one from the Capital, because I did not desire to return to public life, for which I never had any liking. I selected that place <sup>also</sup> ~~too~~, because it was one of fine agricultural resources and of great promise, and <sup>therefore</sup> ~~early in~~ ~~1873~~, I settled in Soconusco, a District of the State of Chiapas bordering <sup>with</sup> ~~upon~~ Guatemala, bought some public land there and started a coffee plantation in the high lands, and one of india rubber in the low <sup>region ones,</sup> ~~lands~~, and did some commercial business, buying coffee for export, and importing agricultural implements and commodities.

While Mexico had been in possession of Chiapas for over fifty years, and it was as much a Mexican State as any <sup>other in</sup> ~~in this~~ ~~that~~ Union, ~~belonging to this country~~, Guatemala claimed that <sup>it</sup> ~~Chiapas~~ ~~and more specially Soconusco~~ rightfully belonged to her.

Public men in Guatemala are generally suspicious, and more <sup>specially</sup> ~~so~~ about Mexico, and when they saw me as a farmer in a very humble frontier town, adjoining their country, they thought that I must have some ~~hostile~~ designs against Guatemala, and that my farming was only a <sup>sham to conceal them</sup> ~~pretense to cover such hostility~~. General J. Rufino Barrios became President very soon after I settled in Soconusco, and he as well as most of the persons



surrounding him, thought that I had <sup>gone</sup> ~~gone~~ there either <sup>to work</sup> with <sup>a view</sup> ~~the design~~ to declare myself Dictator or ruler of Guatemala, or to work for the annexation of that country to Mexico, which had <sup>s</sup> been for some time their <sup>because, judging by</sup> ~~great~~ bug bear of ~~the~~ Guatemala's ~~statesmen~~. Judging by what they have some times seen at home, they imagined that a man who had been Secretary of the Treasury of Mexico for five years, ~~was or ought to be a millionaire~~ <sup>and could not really</sup> ~~and in that case they thought it absurd the idea that he~~ would try to earn his living by honest labor.

Although <sup>then</sup> ~~I was at the time forewarned of that danger~~, I did not ~~then~~ <sup>that, this,</sup> fully realize their suspicions and hostility, and I tried to allay their fears by going myself to the City of Guatemala to make the acquaintance of its public men and to <sup>inform them of</sup> ~~possess them with~~ my reasons for having gone to Soconusco and my purposes for the future, but, very likely, judging me by <sup>way of acting,</sup> their own ~~criticism~~, as it is natural that every one will judge of others by his own views and principles, that act of mine only confirmed them in their fears.

General Barrios treated me with the greatest duplicity; ~~while~~ <sup>in order</sup> he pretended to be a friend of mine, and in some things he acted as such ~~to better deceive me and to inspire me with~~ <sup>and thus deceive me with</sup> confidence in his sincerity, as when he sent me his power of <sup>greater ease,</sup> ~~attorney with authority to draw upon his funds in bank and~~ attend to his private affairs and to a farm he had in Soconusco. he actually thought, that I was his rival and <sup>consequently</sup> ~~therefore~~ his worst enemy, and he did all he could <sup>to get rid of me. It would be</sup> ~~against my property and~~ my person, but always under cover so as not to appear personally responsible.

The most charitable construction I can put on General Barrios' conduct towards me, is that, when I first arrived in Soconusco, although distrusting me, he may have had a desire



to keep friendly intercourse with me, but that some incidents which afterwards occurred contributed to make him give credence to the suggestions of persons <sup>assuring</sup> ~~convincing~~ him ~~to the effect~~ that I was conspiring against ~~himself~~ and his country. Those incidents were very displeasing to General Barrios, because he did not understand well the Mexican laws and institutions, and he made me fully responsible for them, notwithstanding that I did not know anything about <sup>in</sup> some of them before they happened or that I did all I could to prevent ~~the~~ others, but I did not succeed in that because I was living in Soconusco as a private citizen and was clothed with no authority or power of any kind whatsoever. It would have been more than <sup>foolish</sup> ~~madness~~ on my part to place myself in General Barrios' power, <sup>if</sup> ~~while~~ I <sup>had been</sup> ~~was~~ conspiring against him, and in any case would have been <sup>if</sup> ~~foolish~~ for me to do so, not being a Guatemalan citizen. <sup>had</sup> I ~~have~~ wanted power and political position, I had at home a more ample and legitimate field than Guatemala could afford to my ambition.

<sup>It would be</sup> too long to <sup>state</sup> ~~mention~~ here all the incidents <sup>what</sup> which then took place, and I <sup>will</sup> only say, that General Barrios while acting towards me as a friend, <sup>he</sup> instructed his official representative at the City of Mexico, early in 1875, to accuse me before the Mexican Government of <sup>several</sup> ~~many~~ of the worst crimes which he claimed I had committed against Guatemala, and to demand that I should be removed from the frontier, because my presence there, he said, was a menace to the peace of that country. (1)

(1) In a paper I have written entitled "Mr. Blaine and the Boundary question between Guatemala and Mexico" which has not yet come out, I made the following estimate of the public services of General Barrios:

"General Barrios was a most remarkable man. While he ruled Guatemala with an iron hand and did <sup>great</sup> many things which would mark him as a tyrant of the worst <sup>of</sup> kind, ignoring all rights <sup>of</sup> in the people, specially of the higher classes. He



All culminated in a rebellion against the constitutional Government of Mexico, organized in Guatemala, ~~at~~ <sup>by</sup> with the knowledge and support of General Barrios, ~~of~~ <sup>by</sup> Sebastian Escobar, who had been for many years the tyrant of Soconusco and who went to Guatemala after the arrival of the Federal troops, when the latter portion of the people of Tapachula organized themselves to recover their rights which Escobar had usurped. Escobar did not invade Soconusco himself, but sent his men with instructions to shoot the most prominent people of Tapachula and myself in the first place, because he ~~made~~ <sup>judged</sup> ~~to be~~ responsible for the sending of Federal troops and his consequent loss of power. The arrival at the port of San Benito of a Mexican man-of-war, in which I took passage for Acapulco on my way to the City of Mexico, because I had been elected a member of Congress from that District, prevented Escobar ~~to~~ <sup>from</sup> carrying out his plans so far as I was concerned. Had I waited for the regular Pacific Mail steamer, which was due a few days later, I would certainly ~~have~~ <sup>be</sup> been caught and shot as a bandit unless my stay at Tapachula during that invasion would have changed the final result. Although General Barrios could not be made directly responsible ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> that intended crime, I have no doubt that he knew and approved of it, and, under the condition of our relations, my escape must have been a great disappointment ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> him.

---

he had some strong traits of character which allowed him to accomplish a great deal of good for his country, during his rule. He had the most indomitable will and the greatest desire to promote education and public improvements, and his special aim was to destroy the power of the Church or conservative party, which was, in Guatemala, as strong as it had ever been in Mexico, and this explains why he never lost an opportunity to humiliate the higher classes. It is not ~~the~~ time yet to pass an impartial judgment on his administration, but while he had a great many faults, I think he had also several redeeming qualities".