THE REDEMPTIVE WORK

RAILWAY AND NATION IN ECUADOR, 1895-1930

A. Kim Clark

SR BOOKS
A Scholarly Resources Inc. Imprint
Wilmington, Delaware

rehabilitating and modernizing the railway is precisely the fact that it cannot be easily or economically connected with the port of Guayaquil, thus reducing its use for the transport of heavy imported goods such as machinery.

40. Alfredo Maldonado Obregón, *Memorias del ferrocarril del sur y los hombres que lo realizaron, 1866–1958* (Quito: Talleres Gráficos de la Empresa de Ferrocarriles del Estado, 1977), 54.

41. This information is drawn from Harman's obituary, *New York Times*, October 10, 1911.

42. Deler, *Ecuador*, 200.

43. T. Wolf, *Geografía y geología*, 256–57.

3

The Railway, the Reform of the Nation, and the Discourse of Liberalism

> Without a railway between the coast and the interior of our country, nothing, nothing are the toils, the struggles, and the sacrifices of true republicans since the birth of our nation. Without a railway, sovereign and unceasing motor of positive progress, how paltry and irremediable are the fortunes of our inter-Andean sections! Without a railway, so much individual strength, thirsty for productive occupation and finding it nowhere, is wasted; so many lives end in misery, for lack of work. Naturally the result could be none other, both in economic and political terms, than this chaos throughout our being since the dawn of our existence. Without a railway, without facility for life, without average well-being for ninety percent of our brothers, how can we speak of true liberty . . . and true dignity, without which the genuine Republic cannot cease to be a mere myth?
>
> Liberal evolution, in Ecuador, must be essentially social, and without a railway, without that arena open to all aptitudes, to all intelligences, to all activities, by way of the broad, noncommunal development of agriculture, industry, and commerce, we cannot even conceive of the moral, intellectual, and physical transformations that the law of progress requires for the triumph of the radiant life of true democracy. Without a railway, then, I have always thought that any revolution is ephemeral, inefficient and laughable any endeavor for progress, and thus, my dream, my delirium, my only program is concentrated in this single word: RAILWAY!
>
> —President Eloy Alfaro[1]

The railway was a great symbol of modernity throughout Latin America. In many cases, railways served to integrate export regions with the world market,[2] which it was thought

would guarantee prosperity in the late nineteenth-century model of export-led development.[3] Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico constructed railways that were instrumental in developing their resources for export. In contrast, in the late nineteenth century, Peru built "railways to nowhere," as Paul Gootenberg has characterized them, regional lines between the highlands and the coast.[4] In principle, Peru's regional railways were considered a way to transfer resources generated by the guano boom into more permanent development of the interior and not into the extraction of new export products.

The Ecuadorian railway provides a contrast to what occurred in other Latin American countries. As in Peru, the Guayaquil-Quito Railway was not constructed to transport export products. Likewise, it was considered a way to transfer resources generated by the coastal agro-export economy to the highlands. In Ecuador the railway ran from the principal port to somewhere important, the national capital, and it linked the most densely populated portions of the national territory. The connection of Ecuador's two largest cities, and with several important highland provincial capitals as well, was thus a significant nation-building exercise.[5]

The Guayaquil-Quito Railway, however, was not only a national project in the sense that it connected an important portion of the national territory and stimulated the movement of labor and goods around that territory. It also provided a discursive field within which different social groups could come to an uneasy consensus about the nature of national development and modernization. In a sense, the railway became the discursive as well as the physical and economic link that would incorporate different spaces and populations. The discourse of movement, connection, work, and energy as developed around the railway was ambiguous enough to appeal to a variety of audiences: different social groups could see in this discourse something of interest to them. "Movement" and "connection," in particular, were keywords for the liberal discourse in the sense that Raymond Williams uses "keywords,"[6] pointing us toward conflicts over meaning that are obscured through the use of a common term. The meanings of keywords are not set but are articulated and transformed through struggles over specific political-economic and cultural projects. Thus, keywords give the appearance of consensus, although they may well evoke different things for different people.

The Reform of the Nation through Movement and Connection

The construction of a railway from Guayaquil to Quito was promoted as the key to a whole series of economic, political, and social transformations, the cornerstone of a broad project of national renewal. As it was characterized during the inauguration ceremony in Quito in 1908, the railway was "the project that synthesizes an entire program of social reforms."[7] Similarly, there were frequent references to the "moral and material importance" of railway construction. The railway was perhaps most often referred to as a "redemptive work" for Ecuador; as such, it was "the great enterprise of our desires and sacrifices."[8] The nature of the redemption was specified on the front page of the Quito daily, *El Comercio*, on June 25, 1908, the date of the railway's inauguration in the capital:

> In a broad sense the railway has been called . . . a redemptive work, because it will stimulate our activity, encourage our timid initiatives, broaden the field of our resources and relationships. . . . Commerce, agriculture, industry of every kind, the sciences, the arts, all the useful manifestations of human activity, everything that tends to facilitate the struggle for life and to affirm the sentiments of nationality in a people like ours, that is still anarchic and divided: here is the vast field in which one must admire the incalculable benefits of this redemption. . . . The project of the inter-Andean railway thus represents, for Ecuador, her moral resurrection and emancipation as a people.[9]

The liberal period saw the promotion of an important project of modernization, broadly conceived. Liberals themselves contrasted the liberal period and the long period that they associated with conservatism prior to the 1895 revolution (although it was in fact much more varied) as being characterized by, respectively, "the light of progress" and "obscurantism." These traits were also expressed in evolutionary terms, so that Conservatives were called the "historic party," while the liberals were seen as having placed the country on the threshold of something entirely new. With the construction of the railway in particular, "the nation will be reborn, rising like the phoenix from its own ashes."[10] Ecuadorians were urged to "bid farewell to the past, in order to greet the future."[11] Indeed, "Ecuador belongs

to yesterday, to a yesterday so immediate to today, that in the clepsydra of time they become confused." With the coming of liberalism and the railway, however, "the beautiful Ecuadorian territory will be the land of the future."[12] In this conception, the past was associated with stagnation, inertia, routine (*rutina*), and backwardness, where regions were disconnected and closed in on themselves. In contrast, the future would be characterized by movement, connection, growth, and expansion. Given that "movement" and "connection" were keywords for the liberal project, it is understandable that the cornerstone of that program should be the construction of a railway.

Discussions about the railway continually referred to the need to "awaken" the dormant nation to productivity and progress by connecting regions and stimulating movement and energy. "Where communication is assured by easy and expeditious routes, where movement does not find itself hindered by insuperable obstacles, neither the work of industry nor commerce would be detained by difficulties of expansion. There we would be able to say that progress is not a vain word."[13] Capital too would become more mobile, "stimulated by the railway, [so that] great enterprises, that today slumber in stasis due to the lack of capital, will provide every kind of benefit to the country."[14] But the economic project encompassed by the railway had much broader implications. The railway represented "the most secure well-being of the nation, her prosperity and wealth, the peace of citizens, the aspiration of the towns, the delirium, in sum, of society, are all embodied in the railway, as the sole raft that can rescue us from the shipwreck in which Ecuador finds herself."[15] As Ecuador's minister of the interior observed in his 1904 special report on the railway, "I judge that tied to the termination of this project are all of the social reforms of the country, even the most advanced ones of which we dream . . . since the onward march of the locomotive, bringing with it the immigration of men, commerce which is wealth, and movement which is life, brings also the exchange of ideas, challenges previously unknown in public life, the discovery of unexplored industries, and, as a result, the inevitable and peaceful imposition of new systems."[16]

As an inhabitant of Riobamba explained in 1905, in arguing that it was essential to have the main line pass through his city, the railway would have far-reaching effects on Ecuadorian society:

> I have a sublime impression of the railway. It seems to me that its laborious advance is because it comes loaded with a whole world of ideas, of reforms and of life, to dispense them wherever it arrives. I believe that it is precisely for this reason, to ensure that they do not lose their share during this distribution, that people crowd around it anxiously when its march is suspended. I believe that the steam of the locomotive recomposes minds, and has something magnetic about it that facilitates their perfect functioning. I believe that with its resonant and intense whistle that echoes in the mountains and ravines, cities awaken from the lethargy in which they reposed, and rise to their feet to accompany it on the path to civilization and progress. I believe that even the strip of land along which the railway passes becomes fertile. And I imagine, in sum, that even corpses could be resuscitated by the heat expended by that blessed monster (*monstruo bendito*).[17]

In liberal discourse, movement, which could not be generated without links between regions, was closely associated with connection—and connection would allow modernity to penetrate Ecuador. The railway represented "the desire to see free and prosperous the Ecuadorian nation that only yesterday was isolated from the pulse of modern life. . . . The railway, the stupendous wonder, the divine monster, has knocked at our door and announced itself the secure and perpetual messenger of our future and our national prosperity."[18] Connection would also be important in consolidating national harmony. Long-time liberal legislator Abelardo Moncayo described the railway during the 1908 inauguration ceremonies as "the indissoluble link, the steel embrace between all of the zones of Ecuador," that would eliminate "degrading regionalisms."[19] Connection would allow people to become closer culturally as well as physically. Indeed, it was argued that after George Stephenson's invention of the steam locomotive, England had seen "the diminishing of hatreds, the triumph of mutual affection, the dazzling propagation of love in all human hearts." Without doubt, "universal brotherhood is one of the first consequences" of Stephenson's invention.[20] Similarly, Flavio Alfaro, a liberal military leader and Eloy Alfaro's nephew, suggested at the inauguration that "what we behold today seems like a dream! Yesterday an immense and rugged distance divorced our Andes from the shores of the ocean and now we see ourselves brought closer, united, we old and fond brothers."[21] If the railway was to destroy regionalisms and

end fratricidal conflicts, it would be because people would learn more about each other and even become more alike through the new chances offered by the railway to move around the national territory.

By connecting regions, the railway would promote the movement of people, products, and ideas. Because of the importance of the circulation of ideas, educational reforms were central to the liberal project. And the railway, by its very presence, was seen as spreading new ideas: in broad terms it was considered to be a means of communication. For instance, the expansion of the press would be encouraged by the railway. Soon after the railway was inaugurated, congress decreed (on November 7, 1909) that blank newsprint could be transported by train at the lowest cargo rate, that newspaper vendors would travel for free, and that each daily newspaper was entitled to free use of the telegraph lines built alongside the tracks, for up to 200 words daily.[22] Indeed, during the liberal period, given that it was relatively inexpensive to start a newspaper, a sphere of "public opinion" began to emerge, as issues of national importance began to be debated in the press and not only in congress and gentlemen's clubs.[23] As Benedict Anderson points out, the emergence of a community of readers is central to the imagining of national communities.[24]

President Alfaro hoped that with the railway "all the towns of the republic, united by an iron clasp, will consolidate national unity, causing the disappearance of provincialism and elevating the country from its economic prostration, opening up to individual effort new and beautiful horizons."[25] His reference to individual effort was clearly part of the liberal project to establish a society based on effort and work rather than on privilege. This was an argument against corporate groups, and it would be engaged to undermine the privileges of the Catholic Church. The overall discourse of movement and connection in the liberal project, as applied to the nation, was also developed in the individual in such fields as prison reform and education, where the invigorating, hygienic influences of work and movement were proposed. Thus, the liberal discourse about the moralizing influence of work went well beyond the railway, as liberals were also in the process of broadly constructing their own identity. In some ways, what the railway was to do for the nation was mirrored by what new policies in policing and education were to do for individuals, awakening them from inertia through moral reform by work.

In regard to policing and prisons, liberal discussions emphasized the importance of work both for providing the security that would make labor worthwhile (by protecting its result, property) and in positing the value of the work itself as a moralizing force, that is, the police were to protect those who did work, and they were to rehabilitate criminals through teaching them the value of work. For the Guayaquil police chief,

> Society does not prosper except when life and property rest peacefully in the shadow of a good system of government, when a man knows that if he commits a crime he will immediately be apprehended and punished. Then work increases and with this, the wealth of the masses, because the virtuous dedicate themselves quietly to their business; and those of wicked instincts, seeing how difficult it is to gain from bad speculations, seek the means to honestly earn their sustenance. Evil does not progress when the Police is there, ready to strangle it in its cradle. . . . In [the Police] rests not only the security of citizens and their goods, but also the progressive march of industry and commerce, since it cannot be doubted that when there is not sufficient security, the spirit to enter into great undertakings diminishes.[26]

But the police were not simply supposed to punish crime; they aimed to eliminate it altogether by attacking vices at their origin. To ensure the "advance of our civilization, we must seek the cause of social vices and cut them out at the roots, with no vacillation whatsoever," declared Quito's police chief.[27]

The attractiveness of idleness, in particular, was perceived as underlying a great deal of crime. Certainly gambling was a problem, in part because it represented "the voluptuousness of profit without work . . . one of the causes that most lowers the moral and educative level of a people."[28] One of the most pervasive causes of crime was vagrancy, and so it was criminalized. Trade schools for idle boys were established with funds collected by imposing fines on gambling houses. The liberal state also turned its attention to beggars in its campaign against vagrancy. After all, "often begging is a disguise that masks laziness, malice, robbery, espionage, vengeance, and so many other ruinous passions of the perverse."[29] However, the state was concerned with distinguishing carefully between those who begged because they could not work and those who begged because they did not want to work: "The first is a misfortune, the second is a vice. Adopting special repressive laws against vagrancy, more than

half of the petty daily infractions in the population would be eliminated. In this respect, the labor of beggars in workshops overseen directly by the Police and under its jurisdiction, would be the best corrective that, redeeming children and adults, would also benefit future generations."[30]

Those individuals whose vices were not reformed at the roots would be corrected once they were imprisoned. That the inmates in jails and prisons passed their days in "consummate idleness" was thus of particular concern. Work undertaken in prisons was seen not as a form of punishment, but as a moralizing influence. Indeed, "the first step toward moral improvement is to acquire the habit of work. Its effect is prodigious even over the spirit of the most indolent and wicked who have never felt their brows moistened with the sweat of honest labor. Thus, the reign of poverty and vice is extirpated, and old and inveterate thieves become honorable and hard-working citizens. A reformative system should be based on continuous, active, diligent, and honorable labor."[31]

The value of work and movement for individuals was also a theme in education. Liberals proposed that the educational system be reformed to provide more adequately for the nation's needs in two ways: by dedicating government resources principally to primary and practical education, and by making manual work and physical exercise essential components of primary education. As with the police, who were expected to extend their gaze evenly over the national territory, everywhere encouraging virtue while discouraging vice, in education too the emphasis was to be placed on that element that extended most widely, primary education. Officials and politicians consistently argued for committing funds to the promotion of primary education rather than for more advanced facilities. Primary education affected all Ecuadorians, while advanced education benefited only a small elite.[32] Hence, "the unmistakable necessity of attending preferentially to primary education, the source from which will resplendently emerge, modest lawyers and doctors, trustworthy artisans, honorable laborers, and citizens, in sum, useful to their country."[33] One must "carry Instruction to the lowest strata of society, as a means to moralize the crowds and an impulse to intelligent labor."[34] There were specific measures taken to achieve this goal, such as night schools for adult workers.

In addition to preparing citizens for useful work, primary education policies also promoted manual labor and physical exercise at the earliest ages: "Manual labor in primary schools

. . . purifies customs, strengthens virtue and is the best defense of innocence. Labor is the basis of social morality and of the betterment of peoples. . . . It is in primary school where the first steps of future workers must be taken, who will later dedicate themselves to commerce and agriculture, to the manufacturing industries and even professional careers. Manual labor must necessarily be united with the other elements of education, if we want to secure the foundations of greatness and prosperity for the Republic."[35]

Schools not only should cultivate children's intelligence but also should perfect the "living machinery" of the human body through physical education for children. The underlying philosophy was summed up in the Latin maxim "Mens sana in corpore sano," also popular among police and prison wardens. Thus, it was only so that education would become "a true means of social transformation," the "most efficient means to regenerate a people."[36] In 1905 the secretary of education claimed that military drills and gymnastics, "the bases of energy and valor," were being taught in the majority of primary schools in the country. "The authorities must be vigilant to ensure that the child is not simply educated in the sciences, but also to make of him a strong, healthy element, capable of fighting and triumphing in the battles of war and in the fertile tasks of labor," he cautioned.[37]

The liberal project to redeem individuals from inertia and stagnation was also evident in discussions of the problem of *rutina* in education. In this context, *rutina* was seen as the dissemination of an outdated worldview as well as, more narrowly, the instructional emphasis on rote learning rather than on stimulating intelligence and interest. This discourse regarding the disciplinary benefits of work, movement, and manual labor was assimilated into an argument against church control over education. Leonidas Plaza made explicit the connections between educational reform, the moralizing influence of work, and the separation of church and state:

> the overly elevated mind will never allow the hands to touch the earth: the sweat of labor is a curse for the church, not a blessing. Here again we discover that the exercise of a right appears in the guise of a penalty. He who imposes it does not himself suffer it: the church does not labor, it prays. Let us redeem man from this punishment. Let us teach him that to work is legitimate! The need to reform Public Education is urgent. . . . Subjects of study that have no application in practical life should be eliminated. Philosophy for our youth is

> merely phantasmagoria; in place of these life-denying gymnastics of the mind, let us implement gymnastics of the muscles.[38]

Altogether, for the liberal state, the discourse about movement, work, and energy was incorporated into a wide variety of fields of social, economic, and political reform.

Toward a Consensus on Regional and National Reform

While it appears that the railway was to reform the nation, on closer examination it is clear that the implicit object of reform was not the entire nation but rather a particular region. President Eloy Alfaro was explicit in the speech that opens this chapter: it was the Andean region that required transformation. An editorial in *El Imparcial* in 1908 celebrating the inauguration of the railway in Quito decried that "the isolation of the Andean peoples, in the era of steam and electricity, was a blasphemy against civilization; even more, an infamy."[39] The coastal region was not the primary object of the liberal project of movement and connection because it was seen as naturally characterized by these processes. As already mentioned, the extensive area of the Guayas River basin was connected through a network of navigable rivers. The coast was also closely integrated into the international market through both the export and import trades. The particular region that required movement and connection, both internally and with the coast, was the highlands.

In the late nineteenth century the coast had seen very visible forms of modernization, especially in Guayaquil, with its gas lighting, streetcars, and bustling commercial activity. As discussed in Chapter 2, the highlands were not stagnant and unchanging in the nineteenth century; nonetheless, the changes that occurred there were not highly visible. More pervasive in the highlands was the sensation of chaos caused by the deurbanization, economic depression, and natural disasters that had occurred. Only after the construction of the railway would "progress" in the highlands become more clearly apparent. The railway would allow the modernization of cities by, for instance, transporting machinery needed for the installation of electricity and moving large amounts of construction materials.[40] In another example, before the building of the railway, there had not been any automobiles in Quito. Following 1908, the city rapidly modernized. This particular kind of movement would directly benefit the coastal import-export elite, because machinery of various kinds was usually ordered through their trading companies.

Given the lack of visible modernization in the highlands, there was at the turn of the century a widespread image of highland backwardness and stagnation. During the d'Oksza controversy in the early 1890s, an Ecuadorian who promoted railway construction with national capital compared the two regions. The coast was "laborious, advanced, prosperous, full of life, in possession of almost all of the century's advances; on its own apt for carrying out any enterprise, it appears full of confidence and faith in its destiny," whereas the highlands were "unproductive, submerged in misery, full of natural elements but impotent to exploit them, lacking credit in the exterior; a dead center, in sum, where work finds no stimulus and existence itself resembles lethargy."[41] After considering and rejecting several explanations for this situation, he concluded that it was due to the highlands' lack of transportation routes, and especially a railway.

The analyses of the many scholars and politicians who attempted to understand the differences between the dynamic coast and the seemingly inert highlands were often surprisingly similar, despite areas of disagreement. One of the most original discussions of the problems posed by the highlands was the analysis by Quito intellectual Belisario Quevedo, a liberal (but an anti-Alfarista) who is regarded as one of the precursors of socialism in Ecuador.[42] Quevedo attempted to understand the influence of climate on progress, although Ecuador seemed to contradict the European theory of climatic determinism. That theory argued that harsher climates molded hardier peoples: for instance, in their struggle to subsist in a difficult climate, European peoples had had to work hard to survive. As a result, they grew strong and developed habits of hard work and inventiveness that led them to high levels of social development and economic productivity. In contrast to the energetic Europeans, tropical peoples were seen as passive, living in lush environments that provided them with all that they needed without any effort on their part.[43]

In Ecuador, Quevedo wrestled with the dilemma that elsewhere the greatest civilizations, the most advanced economies, and the highest levels of progress had been attained by peoples living in temperate zones. How, then, could one explain that in

Ecuador it was in the temperate climate of the highlands that progress had been stalled,

> while under the ardent climate of the coast there is more activity, liberty, energy, frankness, self-confidence, perseverance, and other virtues that scholars deny entirely to tropical climates. . ... The contradiction is manifest. Under an enervating climate, in the midst of prodigious nature, identified by scholars as the field of inertia and misery, we see a portion of Ecuadorians, overflowing with vitality, confront vigorously and resolve triumphantly the problems of existence, while another portion of Ecuadorians does not rise to the same level before the challenges of life, living as they do under a temperate climate, proclaimed by science as the theater proper to the most splendid development of the vigorous and active characteristics of the human species. One same race shows effects precisely opposite to those that all climatic indicators would lead one to expect.[44]

Quevedo, caught between accepted theory and the Ecuadorian reality, concluded that the backwardness and listlessness of the highlands must be caused by the fact that the highland climate, which combined high altitude with proximity to the equator, "has the grave inconvenience of being monotonous, unvarying, perpetual springtime." It was not simply a temperate climate that led to national greatness elsewhere; rather, it was the variations in the temperature and the "ever changing struggle of seasons" that stimulated productive energies. "Our eternal springtime maintains us in a paradise of idleness. In a climate that is always even, at no moment are we pressed into activity and work, so efforts become dispersed, they trickle away, they disappear, and tasks that can be done at any hour either are never done or are done little by little and poorly. Eternal springtime is the most efficient discipline to arrive at inactivity and enervation." The solution was to open up the highlands to outside influences, products, ideas, and people, particularly through the construction of routes of transport and communication.

Despite numerous differences in their perspectives, Guayaquil physician and social reformer Alfredo Espinosa Tamayo also believed that the disparities between the coast and highlands were attributable to the presence or lack of movement and connection. According to Espinosa Tamayo, "The coast, more in contact with the outside world, is much more cosmopolitan and less attached to traditional customs than the highlands, where

the difficulties of communications and the scarcity and poor quality of roads hinder and paralyze energies. There one lives a static life, in opposition to the more active and agitated existence of the coastal towns."[45] The effects were especially clear in highland agriculture, in which outdated methods of cultivation did not yield sufficient harvests to allow for the profitable movement of products to other regions and abroad. "The lack of roads and the difficulty and high cost of constructing them, which often is not compensated by the limited produce available to transport," compounded the problem, which "has impeded the development of industry, rendering difficult if not impossible the transport of raw materials and machinery across the crags and ravines of the high cordillera of the Andes, and has used up the energies of many generations."[46] For both Quevedo and Espinosa Tamayo, the stagnation and inertia of the highlands were seen as caused by the region's natural attributes such as climate and landscape. Nonetheless, these problems were not seen as insurmountable. Appropriate state action could wrest the highlands from this submission to nature. In particular, the construction of transportation routes would be a central element in the transformation of the highlands by enabling human beings to master nature and turn it to their use.

General aspects of the basic liberal discourse of movement and connection were widely held in both the coast and the highlands. In addition, they were common to both liberals and conservatives. The participation of conservatives in this shared discourse is clear in a 1909 debate between Alejandro Andrade Coello,[47] a member of the new liberal intelligentsia associated with the normal school (Colegio Mejía) established in Quito by the liberals,[48] and Cuencano poet and essayist Remigio Crespo Toral, the most renowned conservative intellectual of his generation. Politically, the two scholars were directly opposed.

They also arrived at very different conclusions about the results of the Liberal Revolution. Andrade Coello wrote *La Ley del Progreso* in response to an article by Crespo Toral evaluating one hundred years of independence (dating from the first independence movement in 1809). In this book Andrade Coello set out to demonstrate that there had been far more progress in Ecuador in the fifteen years since the Liberal Revolution than there had been in the eighty-five years prior to that. Crespo Toral argued that very little had been achieved in the entire one hundred years since independence, but he consoled himself with

the thought that, after all, what was a mere century in the life of a society? Their evaluations of the railway also diverged. Andrade Coello declared that the railway alone could be considered the work of a century, given its transformative effects: "Its whistle gladdens hearts, and its plume of smoke disinfects us of prejudices and chases away bats from our forgotten hamlets. At its passing, there are radiant awakenings and new life. . . . We were submerged in barbarousness and at the point of being eaten by worms: with only the railway we could call ourselves civilized and rest on our laurels."[49] Crespo Toral, in contrast, argued that in view of the forty years it had taken to build the railway, "its progress has been slower than a camel in the desert."[50]

Despite the different projects and positions of Andrade Coello and Crespo Toral, the parallels between their perspectives are often striking. For instance, Crespo Toral accepted all of the liberal tenets for a national project but insisted that the Ecuadorian president who had done the most to carry through that project was not the liberal Eloy Alfaro but the conservative Gabriel García Moreno. Both scholars also argued for the importance of the increased movement of people and of regional connection and for the need to stimulate energies and work in order to destroy inertia and transform society. Thus, Crespo Toral argued:

> A poor territory, with habits of work among its inhabitants, can reach a high prosperity. Everyone must be persuaded that it is necessary to work without rest, in order to be prosperous as individuals and as a nation. One works for today, one works for tomorrow, one works for the remote posterity: hence the solidarity of work in all eras, in order to form history and create greatness. . . . Work, work, prayer of work, religion of work! and we will be a people, and we will be brothers, we will have formed a nation, we will have triumphed. . . . Movement is life, inertia is putrefaction and death; work is movement, heat, and light; it is the dynamic and singular formula for progress. . . . There is no agent who cannot move, no being foreign to activity. The spirit of work generates heroism; and if we had been workers, like the Spanish of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the mountain would now be a succession of towns and cities, and our people would be wealthy and happy. We fear movement, and nature with her majesty dominates us: we are still slaves. The jungle is virgin, virgin the mine, virgin the free force of water: we are stragglers, miserable in the midst of abundance, condemned to the ranks of the inferior. . . . Let us construct the house, sanitize the town, provide it with electricity and water, design an infinite network of roads, multiply colonizations; let us plant, let us save our strength for science, let us invent and make ours, very much ours, the soil, the subsoil, the spring, the electrical current; and let us force heaven to make us happy.[51]

The image here, presented by the foremost conservative intellectual of this period, is one of nature that must be dominated by machines. The "virginity" of the mine and of the waterfall is an image not of purity, but of passivity, infertility, and wasted resources. Crespo Toral expressed the widespread belief that Ecuador was sleeping a dream of misery on a mountain of riches, from which the country was unable to benefit.

It is striking that in Ecuador there does not appear to have been a romantic critique of the railway as a destructive machine. If the railway was not seen as a harbinger of industrial ills, this was because the effects of industrialization had been so limited in Ecuador. There were none of the polluted cities, blackened smokestacks, or misery of the industrial working classes that provoked both conservative and radical critiques of industry in Great Britain. While Ecuadorians made frequent reference to the locomotive as a "monster," it was not a monster that threatened the peace of a pastoral garden, because rural areas were not perceived in pastoral terms.[52] The Ecuadorian countryside was not a romanticized landscape that offered alternative, spiritual, or authentic values to a weary, conflict-ridden industrial society, but rather an area widely seen as characterized by colonial and feudal relations of stagnation and inertia. The railway would liberate people and regions from this fate, through the transformative effects of the "monster of progress," "the divine monster," "the blessed monster" of the locomotive.

The language of movement and connection that developed around the railway during the liberal period meant different things to different people, appealing to both coastal and highland elites. This overall discourse was perfectly appropriate for a nation whose economic prosperity was linked to the movement of a primary product out to the world market. Nonetheless, this product—cocoa—was not moved by the railway. But the agro-export elite of the coast was closely integrated with

import interests, and the construction of a railway between the port and the capital did suggest the possibility of selling imported products to the highlands. Perhaps most important, however, from the perspective of coastal elites, was the hope that the railway would break down the insularity of the highlands and thus stimulate the creation of a labor market. The movement of people, in the form of highland workers, was very much in the interest of coastal plantation owners (see Chapter 4). In general, the construction of the railway was part of the broader project of coastal elites to transform the highlands to both undermine church power and free indigenous labor and thus to attain modernity and progress.

The movement of indigenous workers toward the coast was not in the interests of the highland landowning elite, but another kind of movement was. Highland elites were particularly concerned with the possibility of forging an internal market, that is, with moving highland agricultural and livestock products to the coast by train. Ultimately, they also hoped to export some of these products. While the image of the highlands developed in liberal discourse was unflattering, at least some highland elites agreed with the need to transform their region. Ideally, the elite of the northern highlands sought an independent route to the northern coast, with a port they could control (Esmeraldas) rather than having to rely on Guayaquil. Unsuccessful efforts to achieve this were undertaken throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[53] Nevertheless, the route between Quito and Guayaquil would provide them with new opportunities and, in fact, was much more important for provisioning the internal market than any other route to the coast would have been.

The railway also represented a transfer of resources from the coast to the highlands, given that its construction was guaranteed by customs receipts. Not only did the vast majority of imported goods enter the country through Guayaquil, but also the majority of export products were produced on the coast. If this was a form of transferring or redistributing resources, it was a redistribution between regionally based elites, not one between the wealthy and the poor. The latter redistribution would have to wait for incipient social policy in the late 1920s and 1930s, after subordinate groups took a more central role in national politics and when attention began to be paid to the need to create more consumers for national industry. While liberals did not generally pass laws favoring highland elites and, in fact, aimed to undermine these elites' power over labor, the construction of

the railway nonetheless did favor highland landowners in other ways. And despite the fact that the railway was the definitive liberal project in Ecuador, and that liberalism was an elite project based in the coastal region, coastal elites themselves had reservations about the railway. They resented the fact that resources that they believed to be the result of their own effort and ingenuity were being used to guarantee the railway bonds for a project that did not directly benefit them. Indeed, the acquisition of rolling stock as provided for in the original railway contract was equivalent in expense to the entire capital investment in the fifteen river boats that served the Guayas basin at the beginning of the 1890s, which was only a minimal part of the total cost of the railway construction project.[54] Clearly, the railway represented a range of possible advantages and disadvantages for both the coastal agro-export elite and the landowning elite of the highlands. Neither group could impose a project entirely in its own interest, but each could hope to gain something from the railway. The railway, and the broader language of movement, connection, and progress articulated around it, can be seen then as a field within which an uneasy agreement could be reached between Ecuador's two dominant classes.

While the railway and the associated language of movement and connection allowed the constitution of a tenuous consensus between liberals and conservatives, and coastal and highland elites, a critical area of contention continued to exist: the relations between church and state. For the liberals, an important characteristic of the language of movement was that it could also be used to push through the establishment of the secular state, which was essential to their economic and political power as well as to their vision of a modern society. Indeed, the two significant achievements of the liberal governments during the fifteen years following the Liberal Revolution were the construction of a railway and the separation of church and state. These projects were linked through the language of movement and connection as well as through the use of religious imagery in describing the railway as a "redemptive work" and the locomotive as a "divine monster." Although the railway was Alfaro's principal project, several of the most important steps in the establishment of a lay state were undertaken by Leonidas Plaza, whose ability to forge an alliance between highland and coastal elites (rousing Alfaro's suspicions about his credentials as a liberal) was undoubtedly part of the reason that he was able to institutionalize these reforms.

The Church as an Agent of Inertia and Tradition

At the end of the nineteenth century, coastal liberals were blaming the stagnation, inertia, and disconnectedness of the highlands in part on the Catholic Church. The church was overwhelmingly centered in the highlands, where the majority of the country's population had lived since precolonial times. The relative presence of the church in the highlands versus the coast is revealed in such issues as the number of convents in each zone. Already by the early seventeenth century so many convents had been founded in Quito that ecclesiastical authorities petitioned the Royal Council of the Indies to prohibit the establishment of any more. In contrast, no convent was built in Guayaquil until 1858.[55] By the end of the nineteenth century, only 53 of the 458 churches in Ecuador were located on the coast and only 6 of Ecuador's 47 convents and monasteries.[56] One result was that the clergy were primarily recruited from the highlands, where they often had kinship connections with elite families.

The various orders of the Catholic Church together made it the largest landowner in the highlands during the nineteenth century. At the end of the century the landed properties of religious communities numbered eighty-six in eight highland provinces, with a total value of more than ten million sucres.[57] This was not simply a colonial remnant: the church had actually *increased* its presence in highland agriculture after the 1864 concordat between the Vatican and the Ecuadorian government signed under García Moreno. This agreement allowed the church not only to acquire properties but also to preserve and expand them under the protection of the state. Thus, protests against *rutina* in highland agriculture were often directed, either implicitly or explicitly, at the church.

The church was seen as opposed to innovations that would lead to increases in agricultural production or reinvestment of profits to improve productive systems. Liberals condemned the inactive nature of church wealth. The nationalization of the properties of religious orders in 1908 was commonly referred to as the *ley de manos muertas*, where the state seized estates from the "dead hands" of the Catholic Church.[58] The church was relatively less influential on the coast because it did not own rural properties there: its real estate holdings were limited to urban buildings in coastal towns and cities. Anticlericalism on the coast during the nineteenth century was also due to the increasing proportion of coastal contributions to church revenues through

the payment of tithes that amounted to 10 percent of gross production. Although tithes were made voluntary in 1889, they were replaced by another tax on rural properties to support the church.

Relations between church and state in Ecuador during the nineteenth century were such that the state promoted Catholicism to the exclusion of all other religions. This relationship reached its zenith when President García Moreno made Catholicism a condition for citizenship (in the constitution that became known among liberals as the Black Charter). In addition, according to the 1882 concordat between the government and the Vatican, education, from primary school to university level, had to be in accordance with Catholic doctrine. The church also had rights of censure; through pastoral letters and decrees it could prohibit either the publication or the importation of books that offended Catholic doctrine and morals. The government, in turn, was required to adopt the appropriate means to ensure that such publications did not circulate in the republic. This requirement was clearly contrary to liberal ideals of freedom of expression, and liberals suffered politically from these measures. For instance, Felicísimo López, a liberal from the coast, was excommunicated for referring to Catholicism, in a published article, as a sect (suggesting that it was one among many religions). Although he was elected senator for Esmeraldas province in 1894, congress was required by the concordat to disqualify him because he had been excommunicated. In contrast, in 1896, after the Liberal Revolution, he again was elected to congress, and this time he was permitted to take his seat. In 1901, López was named minister of development.[59]

During the fifteen years after 1895, the liberal state secularized education, declared freedom of religion, passed civil marriage and divorce laws, established the civil registry of births, marriages, and deaths, secularized cemeteries, nationalized the properties of religious orders, and expelled foreign members of religious orders.[60] In the constitution of 1897 the state guaranteed the freedom of education, making primary education obligatory and free of charge. While parents could still choose to send their children to religious schools, for the first time the state insisted on licensing teachers before they could legally teach in any school, whether state, municipal, private, or religious. Under the 1899 Ley de Patronato, Catholicism continued to be the official religion of Ecuador, with the important limitation that its practices could not oppose state institutions. Congress was given the right to appoint many church officials, and they in

turn were required to present themselves before congress or the council of state to take a constitutional oath before assuming office. In addition, the state would determine the appropriate resources for the support of the clergy, who could no longer independently impose any tax or contribution for the support of the church. The passage of comprehensive laws at the national level, under central state control—with an argument about unifying legislation so that all citizens would be treated equally, and be equally protected from abuses—was in part how the struggle against the church was played out. This process occurred not only in education but also in the laws of civil marriage (1902) and divorce (1902 and 1910), the civil registry of births and deaths (1900), and the secularization of cemeteries (1902). With the passage of these laws, the state also wrested from the church at least some control over life-cycle rituals.

In discussing the separation of church and state, liberals repeatedly referred to the need to circulate new ideas as well as people. The church was perceived as inhibiting both of these processes. Regarding the former, the church was seen as holding a monopoly over thinking, one that allowed no questioning or creativity. The church had the right to censure the press and prevent the entrance into the republic of any printed matter with which it disagreed. Thus, with the growth of a press free of censure during the liberal period, it was claimed that finally "it is widely believed that everyone has the right to think, and it is now incomprehensible that thinking should be the privilege of a particular class, much less a monopolized industry."[61] The church also dominated education. Attacks on traditionalism, *rutina*, and intolerance in church-dominated education characterized it as "that chain which binds us to the Middle Ages. How can we expect the triumph of Democracy and Liberty, if we entrust the education of our youth, that is, the formation of our future citizens, to those who have combatted and still combat without cease liberal principles? How can we expect the enlightenment of the people, if we confide the diffusion of light to those who have fought without rest to maintain the empire of shadows?"[62] President Leonidas Plaza insisted that, "as far as I am concerned, . . . the state of backwardness and contemptible passivity in which the Republic has vegetated for so many long years, is the fault and absolute responsibility of the perverse education we have received."[63]

In regard to the circulation of people, the church was without doubt highly resistant to the immigration of non-Catholics.

Until passage of the civil marriage law in 1902 there was no institution by which non-Catholics could marry in Ecuador, nor could non-Catholics be buried prior to the secularization of cemeteries. As a landowner, the church was also seen as rigidly controlling labor in the highlands, workers whom liberals believed would be better employed on the coast. But more generally there was a perception that the church aimed to keep people "in their place," both by promoting a hierarchical society and by discouraging any physical movement of the faithful that might expose them to new ideas.

It is important to understand the role of anticlericalism in Ecuador because this has been seen as the principal characteristic of Ecuadorian liberalism. A thorough discussion of the complex church-state relations during the liberal period is beyond the scope of this book. Nonetheless, it is necessary to at least briefly explore how some of the conflicts between the Catholic Church and the liberal state were expressed since these indicate very different conceptualizations of society, the state, and the citizen or individual. Three examples of such conflicts follow.

First, an important part of the liberal project was the establishment of a society governed by contractual relations among individuals (this ideal was also central to the formation of a labor market). This model became subject to much conflict during the establishment of civil marriage. In its protests over civil marriage, the church insisted that the contractual aspect of marriage was inseparable from the sacramental. This position was clearly contrary to the emergence of a society made up of individuals who could freely enter into contracts with each other, which also implied that they could later withdraw through mutual agreement, that is, through divorce.[64] Marriage was a key institution for the creation of such a society. Not only did marriage govern reproduction, but it also provided one of the most important bases for the transfer of property. (The parallel creation of the civil registry, or the centralization of records about births, marriages, and deaths, was similarly essential for the determination of property rights.) Moreover, the idea that human will (*voluntad humana*) alone could be the source of these individual rights was anathema to those who conceived of society as governed by divine law. The conflict over who was endowed with the capacity to make laws—man or God—was foreshadowed when the constitution of 1896–97 did not invoke the name of God, "the Supreme Legislator," as in previous constitutions;

rather, the document was written in the name and by the authority of the Ecuadorian people.

Second, the liberal state attempted to remove the church's influence from political matters and relegate it to civil society. Liberals argued:

> The religious element, according to ideas that predominate today, should be located, within the State, in the same role as art, science, industry, commerce, etc., insomuch as the state is required to guarantee and even favor the development of all the manifestations of human activity to their grand intellectual, moral, and social ends, without any other restriction than that which prevents such development from overstepping its bounds and invading the sphere of the State's attributions. And in accordance with these ideas, neither religion, nor art, nor science deserves special privileges from the Public Powers, nor do they constitute organisms that, in the face of the State, can dispute, using force, these rights.[65]

For the church, the state effort to place limitations on its sphere of activity implied a fracturing of the integrated Catholic individual: "We Ecuadorians neither have nor could we ever have one moral code as private individuals, another moral code as parents, and a third moral code as citizens: as private individuals, as parents, and as citizens our rule of conduct is a single one, that is, Catholic morality, and we are equally Catholics in the home as in civil life. . . . We are Catholics in the temple and in the public plaza."[66]

Third, there were important issues of national sovereignty at stake in these conflicts. The fact that the church and state held profoundly different ideas about the degree of authority that governments could hold over and within their territories was also reflected in discussions over civil marriage. The church urged Catholics to follow the pope's instruction not to accept a civil marriage ceremony prior to the religious one.[67] The state countered that Ecuadorian citizens were subject first to Ecuadorian law and that the edicts of a foreign power such as the pope could not overrule national laws. The church proceeded to argue that the pope could never be foreign to Ecuadorian Catholics:

> The Pope, so they say, is a foreigner, and does wrong to interfere in Ecuadorian politics. The Pope, is he a foreigner? How could it be that the Pope is a foreigner? Who is the Pope? The Pope is the representative of Jesus Christ; to say, then, that the Pope is a foreigner for Ecuadorians, would be the equivalent of asserting that Jesus Christ is a foreigner for Ecuadorians. The true God, could he be a foreigner for anyone? . . . To sustain that the Pope is a foreign ruler, for a Catholic nation, would be the same as to deny the unity of the Church, the unity that is one of the essential characteristics of the one true Church, of the Church founded by Jesus Christ. The Church, is it one? Then, the Pope is not a foreign ruler in Ecuador.[68]

On the other hand, the church also argued that although the pope was not a foreigner, neither was he subject to Ecuadorian courts. The church thus rejected the logic of the modern state's having sovereignty over its citizens within its own territory. The church urged Catholics to defy Ecuadorian law in the name of an identification that operated on a different level of abstraction but that also came into direct conflict with the state.

That the Catholic Church financed civil wars over these issues demonstrates that these were not simply philosophical differences. During Eloy Alfaro's first term as Ecuador's president (1896–1901), clergy and conservatives regrouped in southern Colombia to launch counterrevolutionary attacks against the Ecuadorian government. Pedro Schumacher, the conservative bishop of Portoviejo, was particularly active in these movements. During this era, conservatives argued that to fight on one side or the other "was not to ask where was Ecuador and where was Colombia, but rather where was Christ and where were his adversaries, where was the truth and where was the error."[69] In this conflictive atmosphere, Federico González Suárez, bishop of Ibarra, publicly stated in 1900 that to cooperate with the invaders from Colombia was a form of treason and that clergy should not sacrifice their nation to save their religion. This foreshadowed a period of accommodation to the secular state that would later be consolidated during González Suárez's tenure as archbishop of Quito, despite the ongoing debate about the form that church-state should take.[70]

It is evident that there were serious underlying issues of national sovereignty, jurisdiction, and very different ideas of the rights and duties of the state and its citizens involved in the conflicts between church and state.[71] The separation of state and civil society assumed that the equality of citizens before the state ensured the freedom to be different within civil society: to associate with others in various ways, to believe what one wished,

to enter into contracts, and so on. But in principle this separation also assumed that what happened within civil society could not affect the duties of the state and citizens toward one another. If the church represented the past, tradition, and backwardness for liberals, this was because from pulpit and classroom it promoted a conception of society thoroughly incompatible with the society that the liberals were trying to establish. The church and state demonstrated two distinct styles of imagining community, involving different, and irreconcilable, definitions of the community to which one owed one's primary loyalty.

Liberals suggested that movement and connection did not occur prior to the Liberal Revolution, during the period dominated by highland elites, conservatives, and the church. But what the liberal state sought to establish was a particular form of connection, unlike that which the church had promoted. This kind of connection was one between free and equal individuals. Therefore, in this context, the railway was consistent with a much broader project to promote immigration, educational reform, new agricultural policies in the highlands, and liberty of thought and expression—all projects that the church opposed with varying degrees of vigor. Andrade Coello, expressing the liberal perspective, commented on the affinity among some of these projects:

> To extend our arms to fraternally receive individuals of all of the communions of the human family, that is to progress. Let us welcome the integrity embodied in Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Moslems, and Buddhists! With this embrace, immigration, science, industry, commerce, good manners, and the exchange of ideas will flourish. It would be ridiculous to cast out from the social bosom a useful man because he had been excommunicated, or to allow oneself to die of hunger rather than buy food in the store of the Brahmin. It is a symptom of madness, a mortal sin against the hygiene of the body and soul, to prevent air and light from penetrating the gloomy and fetid grotto. . . . With such absurd measures, can we even conceive of clarity, health, moral and physical development?[72]

Why should the state worry about what religion its citizens practice? "Let each believe what he wants; let him pray, work, produce, and prosper!"[73] Thus, the overall social and economic project of liberalism—to promote movement and connection—was also compatible with anticlericalism and the separation of church and state.

Toward Redemption

Around the railway a discourse was constituted about the moral reform of the Ecuadorian nation through work, generative activity, movement, and connection. If the previous conservative period had been characterized by disconnection and locality, then the liberal period was to be about connection. To the extent that liberalism, progress, technology, and the railway were destructive, they were destroyers of smallness, isolation, backwardness, routine, and stagnation. The community that was to be forged by the railway was by its very nature a connected one—a national community.

The railway was part of an uneasy truce between Ecuadorian elites, a truce needed because of the highland elites' ongoing economic and political strength, broadly defined. Sometimes this group's power was made clear in quite specific ways. Liberals closely controlled the elections of the executive. "We will not lose by ballots what we have won with bayonets" ("no perderemos con papeletas lo que ganamos con bayonetas"), Alfaro is rumored to have said. Ample evidence exists of electoral fraud during presidential elections. Thus, the liberal army became the "great elector," particularly in the early period of liberalism, through its control of polling stations and electoral lists.[74] While liberals controlled presidential elections from 1895 to 1925, it was more difficult for them to control the elections for congress. Although the senate was composed of equal numbers of representatives per province, congress was based on proportional representation by population. The more conservative highlands had a larger population than the coast, and its resulting congressional strength meant that at times the executive and congress were at odds. In 1898 the conservative-dominated congress prohibited the executive from carrying out the first railway contract with Archer Harman. Only through intense lobbying was Alfaro able to push through the contract, albeit with some revisions (the original contract had contained many loopholes that benefited the company at the nation's cost, and some of these were removed).[75] The need to compromise to achieve liberal projects was evident here.

While there were ongoing objections to the Guayaquil and Quito Railway Company, and to specific provisions in the various contracts signed by the government and the company,[76] opposition to the overall project to construct a railway—to the idea of movement and connection—was less common. The central

issue was, instead, how to achieve this project at the lowest cost to Ecuador. As *El Comercio* pointed out in 1908, "The railway has cost us, and will continue costing us, enormous sacrifices and immense privations, money, tears, and blood."[77] But even this cost would be worthwhile if the railway laid the basis for Ecuador's future prosperity and harmony, if it indeed were a redemptive work. There was general consensus that it would be. This consensus was so broad that Archbishop González Suárez ordered that the city's church bells be rung on June 25, 1908, at the moment the railway arrived in Quito (marked too by the firing of cannon) and at every hour on the hour until ten o'clock that night. He explained, "As no one could remain indifferent before an event of such transcendental consequences for the progress and advance of our Nation, we will ring the bells of the cathedral and all of the convents and chapels of Quito to contribute to the just rejoicing of the capital, which could do no less than greet with exultation the locomo-tive's ascent to the lofty summit of the Ecuadorian Andes."[78]

Although the railway was seen as having profoundly magical effects, this book argues that it was not through magic that Ecuador became economically, politically, and socially transformed during the liberal period. These processes were driven not by technology, but rather by political struggle among elites and between elites and subordinate groups. The railway changed the terrain on which these battles were fought, and it also changed the limits of the possible for various groups. It was the catalyst for the formation of a tenuous consensus among elites that would allow the liberal project to be carried out. The language of movement and connection so central to the liberal project provided a discursive field in which both highland and coastal elites could identify their own interests, even though in some cases their underlying projects would be in conflict. The extent to which the elites could achieve their projects depended on their capacity to mobilize politically, and their successes were only ever partial. Thus, even when elites have a relatively coherent hegemonic project at the level of ideas, one must always ask how compatible it is at the level of practice and underlying projects.[79]

Notes

1. Eloy Alfaro, address to congress, September 27, 1898, in *Ferrocarril (documentos oficiales)* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1898).

2. William Glade, "Economy, 1870–1914," in *Latin America: Economy and Society, 1870–1930*, edited by Leslie Bethell (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 42.

3. Bulmer-Thomas, *Economic History*, chap. 3.

4. Paul Gootenberg, *Imagining Development: Economic Ideas in Peru's 'Fictitious Prosperity' of Guano, 1840–1880* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 89–111.

5. Steven Topik suggests that even coffee railways in Brazil promoted some degree of integration of the national territory, but clearly this was not their primary aim. See Steven Topik, *The Political Economy of the Brazilian State* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987), chap. 4.

6. Raymond Williams, *Keywords* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

7. Víctor Manuel Arregui, "Discurso," in *El ferrocarril del sur, 1908–1933: Breve relación de los principales festejos que se realizaron en Quito, el 24, 25 y 26 de junio de 1908, con motivo de la inauguración del tren en esta ciudad* (Quito: Imprenta "Industria," 1933), 52.

8. Ministro de lo Interior y Policía, Obras Públicas, etc., *Informe del ministro de lo interior y policía, obras públicas, etc. al congreso ordinario de 1902* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1902), 18.

9. *El Comercio*, June 25, 1908.

10. Eloy Alfaro, *Mensaje especial sobre la obra del ferrocarril del sur dirigido a la convención nacional por el presidente interino de la república General Don Eloy Alfaro* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1896), 4.

11. Leonidas Plaza, address to congress, August 10, 1902, in Alejandro Noboa, *Recopilación de mensajes dirigidos por los presidentes y vicepresidentes de la república, jefes supremos y gobiernos provisorios a las convenciones y congresos nacionales desde el año de 1819 hasta nuestros días*, vol. 5 (Guayaquil: Imprenta "El Tiempo," 1908), 132.

12. Alejandro Andrade Coello, *La ley del progreso* (Quito: Casa Editorial de J. I. Galvez, 1909), 22, 35.

13. Ministro de lo Interior y Policía, Obras Públicas, etc., *Informe del ministro de lo interior y policía, obras públicas, etc. al congreso ordinario de 1903* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1903), 28.

14. Eloy Alfaro, cited in Roberto Crespo Ordóñez, *Historia del ferrocarril del sur* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1933), 63.

15. Ministro de Gobierno, *Informe concerniente a las secciones de instrucción pública, justicia y beneficencia que presenta el ministro de gobierno a la convención nacional de 1896–1897* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1897), 18.

16. Ministerio de Obras Públicas, *Informe especial del ministerio de obras públicas sobre el ferrocaril trasandino al congreso de 1904* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1904), i.

17. Un Riobambeño, *Riobamba y el ferrocarril* (Quito: Tipografía de la Escuela de Artes y Oficios, 1905), 22.

18. *El Comercio*, June 25, 1908.

19. Abelardo Moncayo Andrade, "Discurso," in *El ferrocarril del sur, 1908–1933: Breve relación de los principales festejos que se realizaron en Quito, el 24, 25 y 26 de junio de 1908, con motivo de la inauguración del tren en esta ciudad* (Quito: Imprenta "Industria," 1933), 8.

20. Roberto Andrade, "Discurso," in *El ferrocarril del sur, 1908–1933: Breve relación de los principales festejos que se realizaron en Quito, el 24, 25 y*

26 de junio de 1908, con motivo de la inauguración del tren en esta ciudad (Quito: Imprenta "Industria," 1933), 59–60.

21. Flavio Alfaro, "Discurso," in *El ferrocarril del sur, 1908–1933: Breve relación de los principales festejos que se realizaron en Quito, el 24, 25 y 26 de junio de 1908, con motivo de la inauguración del tren en esta ciudad* (Quito: Imprenta "Industria," 1933), 44.

22. *Registro Oficial*, November 11, 1909.

23. Ayala Mora, *Historia de la revolución liberal*, 225.

24. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, chap. 2.

25. E. Alfaro, *Mensaje especial*, 2.

26. Annual report of the Guayaquil police chief, reproduced in Ministro de lo Interior y Policía, Beneficencia, etc., *Informe del ministro de lo interior y policía, beneficencia, etc. al congreso ordinario de 1900* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1900), n.p.

27. Annual report of the Quito police chief, in Ministro de lo Interior, Policía, Beneficencia, Obras Públicas, etc., *Informe del ministerio de lo interior, policía, beneficencia, obras públicas, etc. a la nación en 1908* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1908), n.p.

28. Ministro de lo Interior y Policía, Obras Públicas, etc., *Informe del ministro de lo interior, policía, obras públicas, etc. a la asamblea nacional de 1906* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1906), x.

29. Annual report of the Quito police chief, in Ministro de lo Interior y Policía, Beneficencia, etc., *Informe . . . 1900*, n.p.

30. Annual report of the Quito police chief, in Ministro de lo Interior y Policía, Obras Públicas, etc., *Informe . . . 1903*, n.p.

31. Annual report of the general director of prisons, in Ministro de Justicia y Cultos, *Informe del ministro de justicia y cultos al congreso ordinario de 1900* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1900), n.p.

32. Throughout the liberal period the project of educating citizen-workers rather than elite scholars progressively came together. In 1897, Eloy Alfaro removed Latin instruction from the basic school curriculum in favor of "more useful" languages such as English and French. By 1908 his minister of education argued that many students did not even have a solid understanding of the national language and that this should be attended to prior to foreign language training. He therefore proposed that foreign languages be taught only in normal schools.

33. Ministro de Gobierno, *Informe . . . 1896–1897*, 7.

34. Ministro de Instrucción Pública, *Informe del ministro de instrucción pública al congreso ordinario de 1900* (Quito: Imprenta de la Universidad Central, 1900), viii.

35. Ibid., x–xi.

36. Ibid., 8, 14.

37. Secretario de Instrucción Pública, Correos y Telégrafos, *Memoria del secretario de instrucción pública, correos y telégrafos, etc. al congreso ordinario de 1905* (Quito: Tipografía de la Escuela de Artes y Oficios, 1905), vii.

38. Leonidas Plaza, address to congress, August 10, 1903, in Noboa, *Recopilación de mensajes*, 193–94.

39. *El Imparcial*, "Editorial de 'El Imparcial,' 24 de junio de 1908," in *El ferrocarril del sur, 1908–1933: Breve relación de los principales festejos que se realizaron en Quito, el 24, 25 y 26 de junio de 1908, con motivo de la inauguración del tren en esta ciudad* (Quito: Imprenta "Industria," 1933), 14.

40. J. Gonzalo Orellana, *Guía comercial geográfica* (Guayaquil: Imprenta de la Escuela de Artes y Oficios de la Sociedad Filantrópica del Guayas, 1922), 215.

41. Yerovi, "Refutación de un informe," 8.

42. Ayala Mora, *Historia de la revolucíon liberal*, 164.

43. Michael Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 255–56.

44. Belisario Quevedo, "La sierra y la costa," 1916, reprinted in *Ensayos sociológicos, políticos y morales* (Quito: Banco Central and Corporación Editora Nacional, 1981), 187–94. This and the following quotes are from pp. 191–93.

45. Alfredo Espinosa Tamayo, *Psicología y sociología del pueblo ecuatoriano* (1918; reprint ed., Quito: Banco Central and Corporación Editora Nacional, 1979), 266.

46. Ibid., 257.

47. Andrade Coello, *La ley del progreso*.

48. Remigio Crespo Toral, "Cien años de emancipación (1809–1909)," *La Unión Literaria* (Cuenca) 4th series, no. 2 (1909): 59–78.

49. Andrade Coello, *La ley del progreso*, 51.

50. Crespo Toral, "Cien años de emancipación," 66.

51. Ibid., 76–77.

52. For Europe and North America compare Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men*, chap. 3; T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920* (New York: Pantheon, 1981); Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964); Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973). For examples of antirailway sentiments in Mexico see William H. Beezley, *Judas at the Jockey Club and Other Episodes of Porfirian Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 103–4.

53. Since the colonial period, northern highland elites had sought an alternate route to the sea that would free them from reliance on Guayaquil's elite. Attempts to link Quito and Ibarra with Esmeraldas failed because the trails constructed were quickly engulfed by the tropical forest. The maintenance of such routes was expensive because they passed through zones of scarce population and little economic development. In 1940 an all-season road was built from Quito to Santo Domingo de los Colorados, but only in 1954 were gravel roads built to link Santo Domingo with Bahía de Caráquez and Esmeraldas.

54. Deler, *Ecuador*, 200.

55. Gregory J. Kasza, "Regional Conflict in Ecuador: Quito and Guayaquil," *Inter-American Economic Affairs* 35, no. 2 (1981): 19.

56. Claudio Mena Villamar, *Ecuador a comienzos de siglo* (Quito: Abya Yala and Letranueva, 1995), 26.

57. Trujillo, *La hacienda serrana*, 50.

58. Officially, this law was called the Ley de Beneficencia. Nationalized properties became *haciendas de asistencia pública* because the fees from renting them out were invested in public welfare institutions. The state did not directly administer such haciendas and use the profits for its programs, but rented them to private individuals for a set price.

59. Mena Villamar, *Ecuador*, 33.

60. That the paradoxical slogan "Dios y Libertad" (God and Liberty) closed official state communications during the liberal period can only be understood as a protest against the foreign origin of religious communities in Ecuador. "Dios y Libertad" was the rallying cry of the March 1845 revolution (the Revolución Marcista) against President Juan José Flores, the Venezuelan caudillo who dominated Ecuadorian politics from 1830 to 1845. Concerning the primarily foreign members of religious orders, the liberals particularly objected to their intervention in national politics, especially when they financed and promoted armed movements against the liberal government at the turn of the century. Thus, one justification for nationalizing the properties of religious communities was to deprive them of the wealth that financed counterrevolutionary movements. See Enrique Ayala Mora, "Estudio introductorio," in *Federico González Suárez y la polémica sobre el estado laico*, edited by Enrique Ayala Mora (Quito: Banco Central and Corporación Editora Nacional, 1980), 52.

61. Leonidas Plaza, address to congress, August 10, 1903, in Noboa, *Recopilación de mensajes*, 140–41.

62. Ministro de Instrucción Pública, *Informe . . . 1900*, iii.

63. Leonidas Plaza, address to congress, August 10, 1905, in Noboa, *Recopilación de mensajes*, 286.

64. Diana Barker has pointed out, however, that the marriage contract is only superficially like other contracts. It is the only kind in which the characteristics of the parties entering into it are so closely defined, for example, by gender, age, and civil status. Despite the possibility of divorce, a marriage contract cannot be nullified by mutual consent as easily as can other contracts. Moreover, unlike commercial contracts, "there can be no bargaining between spouses since the state decrees what marriage shall be. It is not, in fact, a contract between the spouses, but rather they agree together to accept a certain (externally defined) status." She continues, "While a commercial agreement between two parties does not, as such, confer rights or impose duties on any other person(s), the fact of being married affects the spouses' rights and duties in many ways." These specificities of the marriage contract do not change the fact that Ecuadorian liberals saw civil marriage as a model for other kinds of contracts. See Diana Leonard Barker, "The Regulation of Marriage: Repressive Benevolence," in *Power and the State*, edited by Gary Littlejohn (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978), 254–55.

65. Leonidas Plaza, address to congress, August 10, 1904, in Noboa, *Recopilación de mensajes*, 226–27. The combination of laws that established the lay state were seen as having "returned to State control the individual, the citizen, the family, the society, the church itself." Leonidas Plaza, address to congress, August 10, 1905, in Noboa, *Recopilación de mensajes*, 297.

66. Federico González Suárez, "Manifiestos de los obispos del Ecuador sobre la ley de matrimonio civil," 1902–3, reprinted in *Federico González Suárez y la polémica sobre el estado laico*, edited by Enrique Ayala Mora (Quito: Banco Central and Corporación Editora Nacional, 1980), 286. See also González Suárez, "Primera instrucción pastoral sobre la participación del clero en política," 1907, reprinted in *Federico González Suárez y la polémica sobre el estado laico*, 320–21.

67. The law of civil marriage did not eliminate religious marriage ceremonies, but required that a civil ceremony be performed first. Participants could then choose whether they also wanted to be married by the church.

68. González Suárez, "Manifiestos . . . matrimonio civil," 273.

69. Conservative historian Wilfrido Loor, cited in Mena Villamar, *Ecuador*, 79.

70. In addition, the fact that Plaza's government in 1901–1905 did not provide support for liberals fighting against the conservative government in Colombia also helped to diminish Colombian support for counterrevolutionary forays into Ecuador. In contrast, Eloy Alfaro had been dedicated to supporting liberalism on an international scale.

71. See also Charles A. Hale, "Political and Social Ideas," in *Latin America: Economy and Society, 1870–1930*, edited by Leslie Bethell (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 235–38.

72. Andrade Coello, *La ley del progreso*, 14–15.

73. Ibid., 41–42.

74. Ayala Mora, *Historia de la revolución*, 227–32.

75. For the various contracts signed between the government and the railway company see *El ferrocarril de Guayaquil a Quito: Contratos y otros documentos importantes, 1897–1911* (Quito: Talleres de "El Comercio," 1912).

76. See, for instance, Manuel J. Calle, *Una palabra sobre el contrato ferrocarrilero* (Quito: Imprenta de "El Pichincha," 1897); Ecuatorianos, *Doce millones de sucres: El ferrocarril de Guayaquil a Quito* (Quito: Imprenta "La Industria," 1932); idem, *Ferrocarril trasandino: Hablen los números* (Guayaquil: Imprenta de "El Tiempo," 1902); E. O. N., *Ferrocarril Alfaro-Harmann* (Lima: Imprenta del "Universo," 1897); *El ferrocarril del sur y los derechos del Ecuador* (Quito: Talleres de "El Comercio," 1916); Ernesto Franco, *La verdadera defensa nacional* (Quito: Imprenta Nacional, 1923); Un imparcial, *Breves observaciones que demuestran lo ruinoso que será para la nación el contrato del ferrocarril del sur* (Guayaquil: Imprenta de Gómez Hnos, 1897); Imparciales, *Cuestión candente* (Quito: Imprenta de la Escuela de Artes y Oficios, 1898); F. B. Stewart, *Manejos de Mr. Harman* (Quito: Imprenta de "La Prensa," 1910).

77. *El Comercio*, June 25, 1908.

78. Circular from the archbishop of Quito to the priests of the churches and superiors of the convents of the capital, Quito, June 20, 1908, published in *El Comercio*, June 21, 1908.

79. James C. Scott, Foreword, in *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994), xi–xii.