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During the 1820s, the works of English utilitarian philosopher and jurisconsult Jeremy Bentham attained a remarkable diffusion throughout Spanish America, enjoying a high reputation among the leaders of the revolt against Spanish rule. Colombian Francisco de Paula Santander professed himself to be Bentham’s admirer, while Venezuelan Francisco de Miranda took his advice on freedom of the press.1 Simón Bolívar, el Gran Libertador, went so far as to assure Bentham that his name was never pronounced “even in these savage regions of America, without veneration nor without gratitude.”2

Such enthusiasm should not always be taken at face value, however. The praise heaped on Bentham (1748–1832) and his works by such
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2. Bolivar to Bentham, Cuenca, 27 Sept. 1822, University College London, Bentham Manuscripts (hereafter cited as UC), Box x, fol. 7; and Iberian Correspondence, 2:777. In general, see Theodora L. McKennan, “Jeremy Bentham and the Colombian Liberators,” The Americas 34, no. 2 (Apr. 1978):460–75.
Figure 1. The Auto-Icon of Jeremy Bentham, his preserved skeleton dressed in his clothes (in accordance with his last will and testament), can be seen at University College London. (Photograph reproduced with the permission of University College London.)
prominent figures should not be interpreted to mean that they went out of their way to form their policies according to his precepts. Several cautionary notes have been sounded to this effect. J. R. Dinwiddy has pointed out the lack of evidence that Bentham exercised a major influence on the institutions and legal systems of the new Latin American states. Dinwiddy and John Lynch have both asserted that Bentham’s utilitarianism provided Spanish American liberals with intellectual credibility and a general modernizing spirit rather than with a blueprint for a new society to be formed after the overthow of colonial rule. Fred Rosen has argued that Bentham was something of a “liberal icon,” revered and quoted but not studied in depth for the ideas he was attempting to propagate.

Moreover, those like Miranda, Santander, and Bolivar who were familiar with Bentham’s ideas knew about them largely from reading his works in French. These versions were not written directly by Bentham himself but were recensions made from his manuscripts by his Genevan editor and collaborator, Etienne Dumont. He provided a much simplified version of Bentham’s thought and also toned down some of the more radical proposals, particularly regarding democratic government and legal reform. As a result, the Spanish American leaders were often out of step with what Bentham himself was preaching during the 1820s.

My study aims to substantiate these cautionary remarks by examining the case of Bernardino Rivadavia (1780–1845), reformer statesman of Buenos Aires and eventually president of what later became Argentina. Many modern works portray Rivadavia as one of the closest South American followers of Bentham’s ideas. This view was most clearly pronounced by Miriam Williford, whose 1980 work on Bentham’s influence in Spanish America described him as a “disciple” of Bentham.

Such an appraisal of the relationship between Bentham and Rivadavia is unconvincing for two reasons. The first is the problem of source


material. Williford relied almost wholly on what Bentham himself wrote or on the letters and papers that he chose to preserve. The characterization of Rivadavia as a “disciple” was derived from Bentham’s own description and therefore should raise doubts in the mind of any objective historian. The second reason is the mysterious and abrupt end to the relationship between the two men. While in London on official business in the summer of 1825, Rivadavia suddenly broke off all contact with Bentham, and they apparently never met or corresponded again. Given Rivadavia’s supposed idolization of Bentham, such conduct is perplexing to say the least.

These two factors call for a reassessment of just how influential Bentham’s thought really was on one of the foremost Latin American leaders of the day. They also demand a more realistic approach based on a wider range of evidence than Bentham’s own correspondence.

The Nature of Discipleship

What exactly did Bentham mean when describing an individual as his disciple? He certainly prided himself on having large numbers of them, confiding to one youthful visitor that they were too numerous to mention. Yet the word disciple is problematic because it carries a range of connotations from mere approbation to blind and unquestioning devotion.

It is possible that Bentham merely meant anyone who professed esteem for his works and his fundamental philosophical axiom that the aim of government and legislation ought to be to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Yet a glance at the language of his correspondence from the 1820s shows that he and his followers invested the word disciple with a far stronger significance that was almost religious in tone. Bentham hailed one Spanish admirer as a “worthy and eminently well-beloved disciple,” addressing him with a biblical “thou” throughout the letter. Bentham’s English pupil John Austin was described by others as a “worshiper” of Bentham, and Austin himself expressed the hope that he would be enrolled among the “preachers of the gospel” of utilitarianism. Bentham called Rivadavia his “disciple” in a letter to him dated 5 April 1824, UC Box xii, fol. 271.

7. Bentham called Rivadavia his “disciple” in a letter to him dated 5 April 1824, UC Box xii, fol. 271.
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tham even went so far as to describe himself as the founder of a religion, comparing himself with Mahomet.12

Perhaps more striking still is the manner in which Bentham did not regard such thoroughgoing discipleship as limited merely to members of his immediate circle. Rather, he hoped to see those in positions of authority in a similar relationship. They should not only admire his precepts but be prepared to adopt and implement the various practical and detailed schemes for political, legal, penal, and educational reform by which he hoped to reshape governments and societies along utilitarian lines.

Nor did Bentham wait for such influential disciples to come to him. In his later years, despairing of ever being able to persuade the British government to adopt his proposals, he took it upon himself to canvass foreign rulers systematically in search of more positive responses. Among those favored with his lengthy missives on such subjects as legal reform and education were rulers as diverse as the president of the United States and the czar of Russia.13 Bentham met with little success in those quarters, however. From 1808 onward and especially after the outbreak of the revolutions against Spain, his attention became increasingly drawn to Latin America. Before long he was receiving flattering letters from liberal statesmen in the region, couched in language much like that of John Austin cited above.14

Bentham did not necessarily regard all his Spanish American correspondents as his disciples. But he certainly considered Rivadavia to be one,15 although Bentham's attitude underwent some change over the period of their acquaintance. What exactly did he expect of his South American disciple, and to what extent did Rivadavia fulfill these expectations?

Rivadavia as Disciple

Bentham met Rivadavia in 1818 and saw him on a number of occasions in the ensuing years up to 1825, when affairs of state brought the Argentine statesman to Europe. From 1814 to 1820, Rivadavia remained in France, seeking support for the South American colonies in their revolt

14. See, for example, José del Valle to Bentham, Guatemala, 1826; and 3 Aug. 1831, UC Box xii, fol. 346; also Bentham, Works, 11:71.
15. Bentham to Rivadavia, London, 5 Apr. 1824, UC Box xii, fol. 271. Bentham commented, "Never has the pleasure produced by these cheering accounts been unalloyed, accompanied as it has been with the idea of my having been cast off by a disciple, if I may take the liberty of calling you so, of whom I have so much reason to be proud."
against Spanish rule. During this period, he visited London on at least two occasions. On one of these visits in 1818, Rivadavia was introduced to Bentham by Antonio Jonte, the Chilean agent in England. When Rivadavia visited London again in 1820 he was received as a guest at Bentham’s house in Queen’s Square Place, Westminster. Rivadavia went back to Buenos Aires later that year but returned to London in September 1824, when he again visited Bentham at home. Between these three visits, contact was maintained via letters, a correspondence initiated by Bentham in August 1818 by writing to Rivadavia in Paris. Initially, Bentham viewed the Argentine leader as a potential translator of some of his works into Spanish. Rivadavia had already embarked on some that had been edited in French by Etienne Dumont. Bentham later hoped that Rivadavia would translate a short tract on the evils of colonialism. Bentham’s earliest letters to Rivadavia (1818–1819) reflect the Englishman’s concern for how the translation project was progressing.

But from 1820 onward, after Rivadavia returned to Buenos Aires, Bentham’s letters became more didactic in tone, resembling those sent to President James Madison and the Russian czar. Bentham wrote to Rivadavia advising against the establishment of a monarchy and in June 1822 sent a long letter outlining various plans he had conceived, including his panopticon prison scheme and a canal to link the Atlantic and Pacific

17. Bentham to Bolivar (not sent), London, 24 Jan. 1820, UC Box x, fols. 3–4; and Iberian Correspondence, 1:122–23.
21. Bentham to Bolivar (not sent), London, Jan. 24, 1820, UC Box x, fols. 3–4; Iberian Correspondence, 1:122–23; and Bentham to José Joaquín de Mora, London, 26 Sept. 1820, Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham, 10:98.
22. The work was entitled Emancipate Your Colonies! Bentham had it privately printed in 1793. See Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham, 9:428–29.
Oceans. He also sent Rivadavia two large consignments of his published works.

The change in tone probably resulted from Rivadavia’s accession to political power in 1821, when he became Minister of Government and Foreign Affairs under Governor General Martín Rodríguez. As the dominant minister in the new cabinet, Rivadavia embarked at once on a program of reform. Bentham now perceived his chance to influence developments through a politician who had shown himself friendly to the philosopher’s ideas. Bentham took to collecting newspaper cuttings and other information describing events in Buenos Aires, no doubt intending to monitor the situation.

Bentham seems to have approved of what he read and heard. He wrote of Rivadavia and his reforms in Buenos Aires in warm terms in his letters. His friend and literary executor John Bowring later recalled that Rivadavia was the South American politician of whom Bentham thought most highly because he professed utilitarian principles. Bentham’s conception of discipleship in Rivadavia’s case therefore seems all too clear: Rivadavia was perceived as both an admirer who was utterly dedicated to all aspects of the master’s philosophy and a statesman who was committed to putting those precepts into practice.

Williford’s study reflects this view of Rivadavia as a politician who cherished Bentham’s philosophical ideas and was prepared to implement his practical reforms. Rivadavia’s domestic reform efforts, she argued, proved “his adherence to Bentham’s philosophy” and demonstrated that it was his aim “to apply utilitarian philosophy to the creation of a new government.” Yet a closer examination of Rivadavia’s reforms does not support this interpretation.


Rivadavia certainly claimed to be Bentham’s ardent disciple and lavished praise on his master.\(^{31}\) In a letter written to Bentham in August 1822, Rivadavia asserted that his meeting with Bentham in London had instilled in him precepts that he was determined to put into practice: “Since the last moment that I had the honour to pass with you . . . , I have never ceased to meditate on your principles of legislation; and on my return here, I have experienced very great satisfaction in seeing the deep root which they have taken, and the ardour of my fellow citizens to adopt them.”\(^{32}\)

What were these principles, and how did Rivadavia put them into practice? In the same letter, he went on to enumerate the reforms that had received impulse from Bentham’s “sage precepts”:

I have applied myself to reform the ancient abuses of all kinds found in our administration, and to prevent the establishing of others, to give to the sittings of the chamber of representatives the dignity that becomes them; to favour the establishment of a national bank upon a solid basis; to retrench (after having allowed them a just indemnity) those civilians and military who incumber uselessly the state; to protect individual property; to cause to be executed all public works of acknowledged utility; to protect commerce, the sciences and the arts; to promote equally an ecclesiastical reform, which is very needful and which I hope to accomplish.\(^{33}\)

Rivadavia planned and carried out many of the reforms outlined in this letter. He established a national bank and a literary institute and limited the power of the monastic orders by handing over the control of orphanages, hospitals, and other philanthropic institutions to the secular Sociedad de Beneficia. Rivadavia also attempted to substitute direct taxes for customs duties.\(^{34}\)

Yet whether these policies can be said to have been the result of adherence to Bentham’s precepts is another question. It is possible to perceive elements of Bentham’s thought in Rivadavia’s list. The claim that those who “uselessly incumber the state” would be compensated for their loss of office may be an allusion to Bentham’s “disappointment prevention principle,” which urged that anyone who lost out by reform ought to be


\(^{33}\) Ibid.; and Bentham, Works, 4:593.

indemnified. But it could just as easily have been dictated by simple political prudence, and none of these policies can be described as originating from Bentham alone. Rather, they appear to have been motivated by the general need for rationalization and modernization and do not necessarily represent the adoption of a political program based on utilitarian principles.

In the letter of August 1822, however, Rivadavia went on to cite two actions that he regarded as directly inspired by Bentham's writings. Rivadavia had produced a rule book for the Buenos Aires assembly based on Bentham's *Tactique des assemblées législatives.* He also established a chair in civil law at the University of Buenos Aires, where Bentham's principles of legislation were taught according to his *Traité de législation civile et pénale.*

Yet once again, it would be unwise to make too much of these actions. The reforms certainly demonstrate that Rivadavia saw value in the simplified French version of Bentham's thinking, as presented by editor Dumont. But as already stated, these works did not contain Bentham's undistilled thought and tended to exclude his more radical views. Concerning two specific radical policies that Bentham was advocating in the 1820s in the spheres of educational and legal reform, it appears that Rivadavia's response was by no means as wholehearted as his characterization as a disciple would seem to imply.

Bentham held strong opinions on education, as on most matters. Believing firmly that education should be "useful" rather than based on the learning of classical languages, he had outlined his views in his *Chrestomathia* (1817) and become involved in a plan to establish a school in the garden of his house in Westminster. After this project failed to materialize, Bentham took to promoting Hazelwood School (near Birmingham) as a model educational establishment. It was organized according to the monitory method or Lancastrian system, in which the younger pupils were taught by the older ones so that education could be provided

---


more cheaply. Bentham sponsored the education of two Greek boys there and recommended the school to prospective parents from Britain and abroad.  

Starting in 1817, Bentham went even further and began to try to persuade foreign governments to adopt his views on education. He produced a circular on the subject that he sent to the United States for distribution among the state governors. He also wrote a eulogy of Hazelwood School for Simón Bolívar and suggested that a similar institution be established in Colombia, staffed by teachers educated at Hazelwood.

Rivadavia certainly received Bentham’s opinions on education and appears to have shown some interest in them. On Bentham’s advice, he sent two of his sons (along with a son of Governor General Martín Rodríguez) to Hazelwood in October 1824. Rivadavia seems to have been satisfied with its regime, for he arranged for additional South American pupils to enter the school. Nor was his faith in the Lancasterian system confined to prescribing it for his own family and friends, for he introduced it in public and private schools in Buenos Aires in 1822.

Whether this course can be interpreted as resulting directly from Bentham’s influence is another matter, however, because the English philosopher had no monopoly on the monitorial method. James Thomson, the representative of the British and Foreign Schools Society in South America, may have been more influential. Three years before Rivadava


42. Bentham, Works, 4:531–32.

43. Bentham to Bolivar, London, 4 June 1823, AHN, Exteriores, tomo 159, fol. 313v; see also Iberian Correspondence, 2:842.

44. Bentham to Bolivar, London, 13 Aug. 1825, CNL, O’Leary, tomo 12, pt. 1, fols. 242v–43; Iberian Correspondence, 2:908; Bentham, Works, 4:592n; and Hazelwood Magazine 2, no. 8 (Oct. 1824):57. They were probably the two eldest sons, José Joaquín (1810–1887) and Bernardino (b. 1814). See Piccirilli, Rivadavia, 2:541, n. 2.


sent his sons to Hazelwood on Bentham’s advice, he had encouraged Thomson’s establishment of eight schools in Buenos Aires along Lancasterian lines.47 Nor is there any evidence that Rivadavia ever read Bentham’s own thoughts on education in Chrestomathia.

Another of Bentham’s major preoccupations in his later years was codification. He came to believe that all existing law was hopelessly outdated and unwieldy, that it needed to be discarded entirely and replaced by a rational written code. This belief grew out of a lifelong conviction expressed in his earlier works.48 During the 1820s, Bentham made strenuous efforts to find a foreign government that would let him draw up a code of laws on its behalf. To this end, he published two “codification circulars” in 1817 and 1822 and distributed them to the authorities in countries that he hoped would react favorably. These pamphlets argued the advantages of codification, presenting a series of testimonial letters attesting the high esteem in which Bentham was held in Britain and abroad.49

Rivadavia was among the recipients of the 1822 codification circular. Bentham sent him copies both of the original English version and the Spanish translation in 1822 and again in 1824.50 As in the case of education, Rivadavia displayed an interest in these ideas. He made plans to create codes of civil, penal, and commercial law for Buenos Aires,51 although he was already out of office by the time the codification began.52

Yet these plans do not prove a determination to implement Bentham’s scheme. Codification was much in vogue in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and there is no evidence that Rivadavia was thinking of the type of measure specifically proposed by Bentham. Rivadavia’s in-

52. A commission to draw up a commercial code was appointed on 20 Aug. 1824. See Registro oficial, 2:63–64.
spiration may well have been the new codes recently adopted in France, which systematized existing law rather than completely rewriting it.53

Two reasons probably explain Rivadavia's failure to introduce specifically Benthamite educational and legal reforms. The first was the set of adverse political conditions then prevailing in Buenos Aires. His attempts to liberalize and modernize his country aroused intense opposition from powerful interest groups, ranging from federalist politicians who resented his centralizing policies to the estancieros (ranch owners) who viewed his economic policy as an attack on their fiscal assets.54 Moreover, Rivadavia held power for only a brief period. He served as Minister of Government and Foreign Affairs between 1821 and 1824, and his term as the first president of the Provincias Unidas del Río de la Plata lasted only from February 1826 to July 1827. These factors severely limited the possibility of implementing such far-reaching proposals as complete rewriting of the system of laws.

Second, it would appear that Rivadavia was by no means unaware of Bentham's weaknesses as a philosopher, particularly the way in which he chose to express his ideas. In his English works, which did not benefit from the editorship of Dumont, Bentham had developed a long-winded and eccentric style of writing that made them hard to read and easy targets for his opponents to ridicule.55 Even those well-disposed toward Bentham's doctrines found his writings difficult to digest in their original form. In 1821 the liberal regime in Spain invited his comments on a new penal code. The tone of the ensuing Letters to Count Toreno was so bombastic that Bentham's views ended up being ignored.56

There are good reasons to suppose that Rivadavia may have viewed Bentham's letters and later works in such a light. According to John Bovens, an acquaintance of Bentham's radical associate Francis Place (who visited Buenos Aires in 1823), the arrival of a letter from Bentham was an occasion for some perplexity in “confounding and upsetting the govern-

53. Levene, Historia del derecho, 5:287n.
55. In seeking to discredit Bentham's parliamentary reform proposals in 1817, the Member of Parliament for Ilchester, John Ward, had only to read out portions of Bentham's writings on the subject to have the entire House of Commons convulsed with laughter. See Parliamentary Debates (1817), 36:773; and The Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, Comprising Portions of His Diary from 1795 to 1848, 12 vols. (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1874–1877), 3:536.
ment interpreters." Bevans pointedly concluded that Bentham would be well advised next time to have his letter translated into English before sending it. The arrival of the codification circular seems to have caused similar bewilderment in Buenos Aires. When Bentham heard of this reaction, he wrote to Rivadavia blaming any obscurity on the Spanish priest who had translated it.

Nevertheless, the impression remains that Rivadavia was by no means an uncritical admirer. This view is reinforced by the fact that their correspondence appears to have been rather one-sided. Compared with the eight surviving letters written by Bentham to Rivadavia, only two have been found that were sent in the other direction. It therefore seems advisable to sound a cautionary note as to Rivadavia’s supposed “discipleship” as portrayed by Bentham and subsequently by Williford. Rivadavia’s frequently expressed admiration was in practice tempered both by the need to address political realities and by a critical approach to his mentor.

Rivadavia in London, 1824–1825

This attitude needs to be borne in mind when assessing the reasons underlying Rivadavia’s rift with Bentham in the summer of 1825. Rivadavia’s primary concern during his visit to London was to secure recognition from the European powers, particularly Great Britain and France. This goal—not utilitarian philosophy—dictated his relations with Bentham at that time.

When Rivadavia arrived in England in September 1824, there was no sign of estrangement between the two men. After an emotional reunion, Rivadavia was asked to dine at Bentham’s house. At this stage, Rivadavia was in London as a private citizen rather than as a representative of his republic. His decision to travel to Europe appears to have been connected to the change of regime in Buenos Aires. General Martín Rodríguez, who had served as Governor of Buenos Aires since 1821, had been replaced by Juan de las Heras in April 1824. Rivadavia was evidently unwilling to serve under the new governor and, after resigning his ministerial post, departed for Europe in June. Initially, Rivadavia was able to spend his time visiting friends and acquaintances, crossing the English

57. Bevans to Francis Place, Buenos Aires, 23 Feb. 1823, UC Box xii, fol. 97.
58. Bentham to Rivadavia, London, 5 Apr. 1824, UC Box xii, fol. 270.
Channel to Paris to meet famous geographer Alexander Von Humboldt, and sitting for his portrait with artist Thomas Phillips.62

Had Rivadavia remained a private visitor, all might have been well. But he was slowly drawn into the conduct of foreign policy in the latter part of 1824, as the British government began preparations for diplomatic recognition of the new republic.63 On 2 February 1825, Woodbine Parish, the British Consul in Buenos Aires, signed the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, which formally inaugurated trading relations between the two countries.64 A minister was required to secure ratification from the British government, and the choice naturally fell on Rivadavia because he was already in London. Ignacio Núñez, one of Rivadavia’s associates in Buenos Aires, was dispatched to England with a copy of the treaty and credentials for the new minister.65

In Bentham’s opinion, it was Rivadavia’s promotion to minister that led to his breaking with his former mentor. Bentham wrote in his account of the affair to Bolivar:

I was of use to him in informing him of the high place I was sure of his occupying in the estimation of our foreign secretary, and was occupied in serving him in a variety of ways, when I was informed by a letter from him that the distance between us, coupled with the closeness of his occupations, did not admit of his continuing the intercourse. From other sources I have been informed beyond doubt, that his intercourse with our functionaries has indeed been, and for aught I know continues to be, very abundant. But this need not have hindered his seeing me now and then. Laying these and other circumstances together, I can have no doubt that from somebody or other in the Foreign Office or the Cabinet, a promise has been extracted of both these men (Rivadavia and Richard Rush, United States minister) not to hold any further intercourse with me.66

The interpretation was typical of Bentham. Obsessed with his own perception of a conspiracy of “sinister interests,” he was convinced that the British government was likely to arrest him at any moment in order to silence his criticisms.67 He seems to have genuinely believed that the government had ordered Rivadavia not to see him because he supported a republican constitution for Buenos Aires rather than a constitutional monarchy. The truth is rather different.

63. Its intention had been reported in the Morning Chronicle (London), 7 Sept. 1824, p. 2.
64. The Times (London), 6 May 1825, p. 3; and British and Foreign State Papers, 1824–25 (London: James Ridgeway, 1846), 29–37.
There was no reason for the British establishment to have forbidden Rivadavia to see Bentham. Although Bentham was a remorseless critic of the establishment, his eccentric style of writing and outrageously radical ideas made it all too easy to dismiss him as presenting no danger. There were, however, certain others whom the government of Lord Liverpool wished the Buenos Aires minister to avoid, and the rift with Bentham was a result of this policy.

To understand how this predicament came about, Rivadavia’s mission to London must be examined in some detail. It was bedeviled with a series of misunderstandings that strained his relations with Foreign Secretary George Canning. Although Núñez arrived in London on schedule in May 1825 and the Treaty of Amity and Commerce was swiftly ratified, it was not long before the problems began.  

First of all, the government of Buenos Aires had not provided the correct credentials. The letters that arrived with Núñez were found to accredit Rivadavia simultaneously to the courts of both England and France. On these grounds, Canning refused to accord him formal recognition, declaring in the House of Commons that Britain must have “an entire Minister to herself.” The French took the same view and also refused to accept Rivadavia’s credentials.

Rivadavia incurred Canning’s further displeasure by attempting to force him to guarantee the neutrality of the territory known as the Banda Oriental, which was also claimed by Brazil. Rivadavia alleged that a promise had been given to this effect by Lord Strangford in 1812. The Argentine minister was firmly rebuffed on this point, and the government in Buenos Aires ultimately refused to back him up.

But the major difficulty for the British government was neither Rivadavia’s irregular credentials nor his excessive demands but rather his choice of associates in London. As Canning later complained to Woodbine Parish, “M. Rivadavia lived, while here, in constant intercourse with commercial establishments in this country—establishments highly respect-
able, but still consisting of persons deeply interested in the fluctuations of commercial affairs. I desire that you will lose no opportunity of impressing upon M. Garcia [the Buenos Aires Minister of Foreign Affairs] how inexpedient it is that the Government of Buenos Aires should place the conduct of their affairs in the hands of any person in such a situation.”

Canning was only too well aware of the strong commercial interests pressuring the British government to move more swiftly toward recognizing the South American republics. In June of 1824, a group of London merchants had petitioned Parliament to this effect, and numerous mercantile houses had already established themselves in South America by any means necessary to secure their ends. For example, Christopher Nugent, the British Consul in Chile, complained that representatives of these companies used bribes to intercept official dispatches addressed to him and thus learned their contents long before he did.

Another concern was the fear that a particular mercantile company might place itself in a position to exercise undue influence on the new regime in Buenos Aires. Canning was particularly uneasy in this regard about Rivadavia’s connection with the firm of Hullett Brothers and Company of 102 Leadenhall Street. In November 1823, Rivadavia had given the Hulletts firm a license to form a company for exploiting mineral reserves in the interior of his country. After Rivadavia moved to London, this company was launched in December 1824 as the Rio de la Plata Mining Company.

Such close ties to Rivadavia certainly gave Hullett Brothers a vested

78. Henry English, A Complete View of the Joint Stock Companies, Formed during the Years 1824 and 1825 (London: Boosey, 1827), 4; and F. B. Head, Reports Relating to the Failure of the Rio Plata Mining Association (London: John Murray, 1827), 1.
interest in Britain’s relations with Buenos Aires—and a huge advantage over their rivals. This favored status was expanded in April 1824, when Rivadavia appointed John Hullett, a partner in the firm, as Consul-General to represent his government in London. Canning was appalled and made his reasons clear in a dispatch to Parish: “I cannot consistently with my publick Duty or with any sense of propriety admit an English Gentleman of the mercantile profession into political communication as the Agent of a Foreign State. I have no reason to doubt Mr. Hullett’s probity: but must take care that in the fluctuations of the South American Funds that take place upon every arrival of intelligence from the River Plate, no suspicion shall be excited that one mercantile house has an advantage over the rest, through the political character of its partners.”

Consequently, when Hullett presented himself to Canning in July 1824, the Foreign Secretary was perfectly happy to use him as a source of information on South American affairs but avoided extending any recognition of his consular status. Canning ignored Hullett’s polite but pointed hints and refused to see him a second time.

Canning’s reservations with regard to Hullett proved to be well founded. By the summer of 1825, news was beginning to leak out of the disastrous Chilean loan organized by the Hullett firm, and a number of letters condemning his conduct appeared in the Morning Chronicle. Early the following year, the Rio de la Plata Mining Company collapsed, inflicting great loss on its stockholders.

Here would appear to lie the explanation for Rivadavia’s sudden break with Bentham. Warned by Canning as to the undesirability of his commercial contacts in England, he evidently took steps to improve his image in the eyes of the British government because its recognition was all-important for his country. Thus Rivadavia probably decided to avoid Bentham not because of his mentor’s radical and republican leanings but because he was closely associated with mercantile circles in London.

79. PRO FO 6/6/9–11; Registro oficial de la República Argentina, 2:32; Documentos para la historia argentina, 14:496–98, 501–3; and Ferns, Britain and Argentina, 116–17.
83. Morning Chronicle (London), 7 July 1825, p. 3; 12 July 1825, p. 2; and 23 July 1825, p. 3; also Claudio Veliz, “Egaña, Lambert, and the Chilean Mining Associations of 1825,” Hispanic American Historical Review 55, no. 4 (Nov. 1975):637–63, esp. 637, n. 2.
84. Head, Reports Relating to the Failure of the Rio Plata Mining Association, 6; and Ferns, Britain and Argentina, 135–37.
One of Bentham's closest English admirers, for example, was William Effingham Lawrence, merchant and shipper, of the firm of W. E. and E. B. Lawrence of 9 Trinity Square, Tower Hill, who had visited Rio de Janeiro in 1824. John Bowring was also a merchant by profession with interests in Spain and Spanish America. Bentham had gone so far as to recommend him to Rivadavia as a commercial agent. Both Bentham and Rivadavia were acquainted with Rudolph Ackermann, fine-art publisher and bookseller of 101 Strand, who owned outlets in a number of South American cities. Bentham also had frequent dealings with Hullett Brothers, who often handled his correspondence to and from South America. These businessmen typified the commercial interests that Canning was trying to restrain.

Moreover, Bentham was openly associated with the economic program for which the commercial interests represented by Lawrence, Ackermann, and Bowring were pressing: the reduction or abolition of tariffs and the establishment of free trade. In 1821 Bentham and Bowring had collaborated on writing and publishing a short tract advocating just such a reform. Bentham was therefore also associated with their demands for the recognition of the new South American states. As soon as Rivadavia realized that Bentham could be an impediment to his primary goal of securing British recognition, he cut off all contact with the philosopher. Rivadavia returned to his own country in October 1825, never to meet or correspond with Bentham again.

85 Bowring was also known to Rivadavia. See Bentham to Rivadavia, London, 13–14 June 1822, UC Box ix, fol. 20; and Iberian Correspondence, 2:766.
88 Bentham's "Memorandum Book," UC Box cxxii, fols. 102v–3.
90 In El Argos (Buenos Aires), 22 Oct. 1825, as cited in Piccirilli, Rivadavia, 2:408; and Head, Reports Relating to the Failure of the Rio Plata Mining Association, 185.
Conclusion

It would seem then that Bentham's influence on Rivadavia was much like that outlined by Dinwiddy, Rosen, and Lynch. Rivadavia undoubtedly recognized the merits of Bentham's works in the Dumont versions, which provided a general inspiration for reform. Rivadavia also valued Bentham's friendship and approval and viewed him and his circle as important allies in securing recognition from Great Britain.

This relationship, however, does not amount to discipleship as Bentham envisaged it. Little evidence has been found that Rivadavia went out of his way to frame his policies along the lines that Bentham was advocating during the 1820s. As Rivadavia's conduct in London in 1825 suggests, other more pressing concerns were dictating his policies.

One of the main problems in assessing Bentham's influence in the early-nineteenth-century world is that his own writings are often historians' main source of information. In the self-propagandizing codification circulars of the 1820s, Bentham deliberately set out to present himself as the center of a worldwide network of disciples who understood and were following his principles. Such a self-portrait needs to be carefully weighed against the evidence discussed here, if only to avoid the trap that Bentham carefully laid for posterity.
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