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Authors of Independence: Comparing Thomas Paine and Camilo Henríquez as Revolutionary Writers

“IT IS now in our power, the great, the precious instrument of universal enlightenment, the Press! The healthy principles, the knowledge of our eternal rights, the solid and useful truths will now spread among all classes of the state.”¹ With this powerful declaration in February of 1812, Friar Camilo Henríquez asserted that the printing press would bring Chile, the most neglected colony of the Spanish empire, into a new age. Henríquez released the inaugural issue of *La Aurora De Chile*, the colony’s first newspaper, in hopes of educating his people about liberty and independence. With this paper, he wrote, “The voice of reason and truth will be heard among us after the sad and insufferable silence of three centuries.”² Both the spread of the Enlightenment’s ideals and Napoleon’s capture of Spanish king Ferdinand VII led to unrest throughout the Spanish empire by the early 1800s. In 1810, the powerful Carrera brothers had established the *Patria Vieja*, a national Junta that functioned as a semi-independent government that still swore allegiance to Ferdinand.³ Henríquez saw the *Patria Vieja* as an opportunity for Chile to seize its independence, and now in 1812, he had his own platform to write about the potential that lay ahead for his people. To conclude the *prospecto* of *La Aurora*, he exclaimed that the Chilean *pueblo*, or people, were entering “a time where the ancient world is molting its

---

¹ Camilo Henríquez, *Prospecto de la Aurora de Chile*, February 1812, 1. Original: “ESTÁ ya en nuestro poder, el grande, el precioso instrumento de la ilustración universal, la Imprenta. Los sanos principios el conocimiento de nuestros eternos derechos, las verdades sólidas, y útiles van a difundirse entre todas las clases del estado.”

² Ibid., 1. Original: “La voz de la razón, y de la verdad se oirán entre nosotros después del triste y insufrible silencio de tres siglos.”

appearance, and America is recovering its dignity, shining, growing grander, and regenerating.”

Printing more than sixty issues and two papers in the following two years, Henríquez would come to extensively document the origins of the Chilean independence movement.

Because of his role in creating La Aurora, Henríquez is often considered the “father of Chilean journalism” and the “mentor of the revolution.” He was a fascinating figure—a Catholic priest whose religious beliefs more closely aligned with Deism, a prolific proponent of Chilean independence, and, for a short while, the president of the Chilean Senate. But to understand his role in Chilean independence, we must juxtapose him with Thomas Paine, the pamphleteer extraordinaire of the American Revolution. The parallels in their lives are notable. Before becoming well-known firebrands, Paine and Henríquez were both wanderers. Paine came to America in hopes of a fresh start, and Henríquez, though Chilean by birth, travelled throughout South America during his youth. Upon arriving to America and returning to Chile, respectively, each quickly became ardent advocates for independence. Both men entered the political arena through groundbreaking pamphlets: Paine’s Common Sense, published anonymously in 1775, and Henríquez’ Proclama de Quirino Lemachez, written pseudonymously under the anagram Quirino Lemachez and published in 1811. The impact of each pamphlet was palpable. Following its release, Common Sense quickly became the most important pamphlet of the American Revolution, selling over 1,000 copies in its first week; likewise, in the wake of Proclama, Henríquez was elected to the Primer Congreso Nacional de Chile and, months later, he gave its inaugural sermon. Both figures then turned to newspapers to inform their people. Paine

---

4 Henríquez, Prospecto de la Aurora, 3. Original: “un tiempo en que el antiguo mundo muda de aspecto, y la America recobra su dignidad, se ilustra, se engrandece, se regenera.”
documented the American Revolution in his *American Crisis* series, and Henríquez wrote extensively about Chilean independence in *La Aurora* and *El Monitor Araucano*. Soon after, both left their countries: Paine by choice and Henríquez by exile. Years later, Henríquez returned as a national icon to an independence movement that had flourished in his absence; Paine, conversely, fell victim to the vicious American press upon his return, in large part due to the controversy his radical works *Rights of Man* and *The Age of Reason* had inspired.

But these diverging legacies should not detract from the striking similarities found in the early years of these men’s careers. The Enlightenment’s ideals of liberty and equality influenced both men, and, based on Henríquez’ distinct writing style and methods of argument, Paine influenced Henríquez as well. In lucid prose and memorable arguments, each explained to his people why they needed to declare independence from oppressive empires. While Paine aimed his work at all Americans, Henríquez first wrote on behalf of the people to convince Creole elites that independence was a necessity. At the same time, he advocated for extensive social reform: most importantly, a new education system in order to teach the masses the value of freedom.

Simply put, because of their tangible influence on the American and Chilean revolutionary movements, both Paine and Henríquez should be considered true authors of independence.

Historians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have, on occasion, related Paine and Henríquez before, but scholarship juxtaposing the two is scant, perhaps because of Henríquez’ global obscurity. There are, of course, numerous biographies of Thomas Paine, but his influence in Latin America is often understated. While Henríquez was an important national figure, complete biographies of his life, especially those available in English, are sparse. Two of Alfred

---

7 Wim Klooster makes brief reference to Paine’s Latin American influence in the conclusion of his *Revolutions of the Atlantic World* on pg. 184, but few of Paine’s biographers treat it extensively. They often frame him as a figure with global influence, but in discussing that influence, they limit it to Europe and North America.
Owen Aldridge’s works, a 1969 article and a 1982 book chapter, most thoroughly explain the connections between the two men. In these pieces, Aldridge refutes Enrique de Gaudí’s idea that “the influence of Thomas Paine in the events that led to Hispano-American independence was absolutely nil,” and he does so convincingly. Aldridge explains the prevalence of Paine in Abbe Raynal’s work, well-known throughout Spanish America, and he also articulates Paine’s ideological influence on Manuel de Vidaurre, the “Peruvian Rousseau,” and Camilo Henríquez.

Aldridge thoroughly examines Henríquez’ writing for explicit references to Paine, and he finds three worthy of mention. Where his research remains unclear, though, is when exactly Henríquez first encountered Paine’s work. Aldridge explains that it happened sometime between 1810 and 1812, because of the arrival of four figures in Chile: Mateo Arnaldo Hoevel in 1810, and three American printers in either late 1811 or early 1812. Either Hoevel or the printers, Aldridge suggests, could have introduced Paine’s work to Henríquez. Because Henríquez published his *Proclama*, the work that catapulted him into Chilean fame, in February of 1811, understanding how and when Paine might have influenced him is essential to understanding the document. Though Aldridge compares Paine and Henríquez at length, he ignores the similarities in style, content, and purpose between *Common Sense* and *Proclama*, never drawing a connection between the two. If we are to see Henríquez as a Paine-like figure, we must consider exactly when Paine’s work began to impact Henríquez’ intellectual development. Based on the date of Hoevel’s arrival in 1810, it seems plausible that Henríquez drew from *Common Sense* in

---

9 Ibid., 220.
10 Ibid., 248. One of these comes in *La Aurora* and the other two come in his later newspaper, *El Monitor Araucano*.
11 Ibid., 249.
12 Ibid., 249.
writing Proclama. That comparison, then, serves as our starting point in the two men’s authorship of independence.

A Textual Comparison of Common Sense and Proclama de Quirino Lemachez

Coming to America in 1774 with just a letter of recommendation from Benjamin Franklin, Paine was anything but a typical revolutionary pamphleteer. Compared to many of the ministers, lawyers, and wealthy gentlemen of his day, he was severely undereducated; the son of a Quaker corset maker and his wife, Paine stopped attending school at thirteen to pick up his father’s trade.\textsuperscript{13} At the age of thirty-seven, after the death of his family, bouts of alcoholism, and numerous failed careers, he journeyed to America for a new beginning.\textsuperscript{14} For a man so troubled to become the voice of a nation may seem surprising; but perhaps because of, rather than in spite of, his simple education and difficult life, Paine was best able to articulate why Americans should declare independence in his January 1776 pamphlet Common Sense.

Paine divided the pamphlet into four parts: a meditation on the origins and ends of government, a repudiation of the concept of monarchy, an analysis of the ongoing tension between the colonies and Britain, and a conclusion explaining how the colonies should proceed. Paine began by claiming, “Society in every state is a blessing, but government, even its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one.”\textsuperscript{15} After asserting that “freedom and security” are government’s ultimate ends, he explained how monarchy failed to accomplish those ends.\textsuperscript{16} He found the principles of monarchy and hereditary succession abhorrent and destructive: “In short, monarchy and succession have laid (not in this kingdom or that only) but

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 6.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the world in blood and ashes. ‘Tis a form of government which the word of God bears testimony against, and blood will attend it.”17 Throughout the work, Paine often pointed back to the divine to strengthen his points; Jack Fruchtman Jr. writes that Paine ultimately characterized God as “a republican who despised monarchy, aristocracy, and every form of tyranny.”18 Paine’s American audience was familiar, above all else, with the Bible, making these arguments both accessible and incredibly effective.19

After dismantling monarchy primarily through theological appeals, Paine dissected why the current relationship between Britain and America was untenable. “There is something absurd, in supposing a Continent to be perpetually governed by an island,” he argued.20 Moreover, he boldly asserted that in “America, the law is king…a government of our own is a natural right.”21

Arbitrary rule, the reckless decisions of Parliament, and, most importantly, the tyranny of King George III, “the royal brute of Britain,” had battered the colonies long enough.22 It was the colonies’ right and destiny to be free. Of American independence, he proclaimed, “The sun never shone on a worthier cause.”23 Emphasizing the existential importance of the American struggle for liberty and independence, he wrote, “We have it in our power to begin the world over again….The birthday of a new world is at hand.”24 Paine closed with a vindication of his fellow patriots, concluding: “Let none other be heard among us than those of a good citizen; an open and resolute friend; and a virtuous supporter of the RIGHTS of MANKIND, and of the FREE

---

17 Ibid., 16.
20 Paine, Common Sense in Complete Writings, 24.
21 Ibid., 29.
22 Ibid., 29.
23 Ibid., 17.
24 Ibid., 45.
AND INDEPENDENT STATES OF AMERICA.” This forty-six page pamphlet would inspire a continent, and, as the Age of Revolutions proceeded, its influence would stretch beyond that continent and throughout the Atlantic world.

Returning to Chile in 1810, Camilo Henríquez had spent the last several years studying to be a priest and familiarizing himself with works of the Enlightenment. When he met Mateo Arnoldo Hoevel that same year, Hoevel began teaching him English by introducing Henríquez to important American and English authors. A year later, Henríquez published his Proclama de Quirino Lemachez to promote the idea of Chilean independence before the upcoming Primer Congreso Nacional de Chile. Just like Paine, Henríquez was a powerful voice for independence at a time when many still considered it too radical. In writing the piece, he sought to help pro-independence candidates in the upcoming Congreso. Because many Chileans could not read, Henríquez wrote primarily to the Creole elite who would vote and participate in the Congress, but the clarity of his prose and argument made the letter powerful for any audience. The Paine-esque rhetorical style and lines of argument suggest that Henríquez had read, or at least heard of, Common Sense when he wrote this letter that started to circulate in February of 1811.

Henríquez began with a call to action to his fellow countrymen, saying that a new movement, grounded in a “hatred of tyranny” and love of liberty was forming in Chile. He praised the former American colonies in their revolution, writing, “These colonies, or better should we say this grand and admirable nation, exists to be the example and consolation of all

25 Ibid., 46.
27 Camilo Henríquez, Proclama de Quirino Lemachez, February 1811, 45.
Concerned with both the concept of monarchy and the threat of Napoleon, Henríquez then lambasted the “gobierno arbitrario,” or arbitrary government, of the Spanish crown. Like Paine before him, Henríquez appealed to the idea of natural rights to explain why monarchy was flawed: “No one receives the natural right to dominate others, nor to force them to remain united forever. On the contrary, nature gives us the right to live separately. This is a geographic truth, that comes before our eyes and becomes palpable in the situation in Chile.” Though the former half of this line is a typical Enlightenment appeal to natural rights, the latter half, “the geographic truth,” seemed to recall Paine’s now-famous argument that an island should not govern a continent.

Raising the stakes of the situation, Henríquez then declared: “It is written, oh people, in the books of eternal destiny…that we will occupy an enlightened place in the history of the world, and that someday, we will say: the Republic, the power of Chile, the majesty of the Chilean people.” In Common Sense, Paine “elevated the Patriot struggle in utopian and universal terms,” and Henríquez seemed to answer Paine’s call in his own elevation of the Chilean struggle. Moreover, just as Paine celebrated his fellow patriots in the concluding lines, so did Henríquez call all Chileans to protect human rights in his conclusion: “But the virtuous man, the enlightened patriot, he who has contributed to breaking the chains of slavery, it is he who knows the rights of man, he who wants to conserve them, he who is animated with public

---

28 Ibid., 45. Original: “Estos colonos, o digamos mejor esta nación grande y admirable, existe para el ejemplo y la consolación de todos los pueblos.”
29 Ibid., 46.
30 Ibid., 46. Original: “Ninguna de ellas recibió algún derecho de la naturaleza para dominar a las otras, ni para obligarlas a permanecer unidas eternamente. Al contrario, la misma naturaleza las había firmado para vivir separadas. Esta es una verdad geografía, que se viene a los ojos y que nos hace palpable la situación de Chile.”
31 Ibid., 47. Original: “Estaba…escrito, oh pueblos! En los libros de los eternos destinos…que ocupaseis un lugar ilustre en la historia del mundo, y que se dijese algún día: La República, la potencia de Chile, la majestad del pueblo chileno.”
32 Alan Taylor, American Revolutions, 157.
spirit, and he who deserves the trust of all men.” At first glance, this work seems more influenced by the French Revolution in its distinct appeal to natural and human rights. That may be so, as Henríquez certainly read the works of Abbe Raynal—but a central part of Raynal’s work was an analysis of Paine’s *Common Sense*. That fact, combined with Henríquez’ initial invocation of the American colonies, his similar use of a “geographic truth,” his framing of Chile within the “books of destiny,” and his Paine-esque closing lines strongly suggest that *Common Sense* influenced *Proclama* in some manner.

**The Incendiary Pamphlets’ Political Influences**

Both *Common Sense* and *Proclama* were far more than just polemic pamphlets; each notably impacted the politics of their age. To say that such influence was exactly the same would be folly; the print cultures, social conditions, and political situations of 1776 America and 1810 Chile were incredibly different. But, above all else, these works put their authors at the forefront of growing independence movements.

When released in January of 1776, *Common Sense* was an immediate success. Few scholars debate the widespread interest *Common Sense* inspired across the American colonies. Alan Taylor best describes the pamphlet’s power in *American Revolutions*:

> The first edition of 1,000 copies sold out within two weeks. By June, reprints raised the total to 150,000 copies: a phenomenal impact for a public of only 2.5 million people, a fifth of them slaves. Many more colonists read excerpts from *Common Sense* in their local newspapers or heard it read aloud in taverns and streets. Except for the Bible, no written work had ever been so widely read and discussed in British America.

---

33 Henríquez, *Proclama* 49. Original: “Pero el hombre virtuoso, el ilustrado patriota, el que más haya contribuido a romper las cadenas de la esclavitud, el que quiere conservarlos, el que esta animad de espíritu público y el que merece la confianza de todos los hombres.”


No pamphlet in America could compare in terms of sales or influence. Writing with high praise, Thomas Jefferson declared that “No writer has exceeded Paine in ease and familiarity of style, in perspicuity of expression; happiness of elucidation, and in simple and unassuming language.”

With such popularity, however, also came strong opposition. In *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Bernard Bailyn notes that both loyalists and ardent patriots found trouble with Paine’s pamphlet. Its radical portrayal of King George offended loyalists, and some patriots found Paine’s specific plans for government impossible.

Though *Common Sense* was controversial and divisive for some, it was still compelling for many. A.J. Ayer writes the pamphlet played a “decisive part in persuading the representatives…to commit themselves to independence.” Its arguments were so powerful that they found their way into the Declaration of Independence itself. As he drafted the document, Jefferson followed “the lead of *Common Sense*” in characterizing King George as the “royal brute of Britain.” While independence would not be won for several years, Paine certainly succeeded in convincing many of his fellow Americans that separation from Britain was the best way forward.

The impact of *Proclama* was more subtle, in large part due to the lack of an extensive pamphlet culture in Chile that was so prominent in 1770s America. As Bernardo Subercaseaux explains, Chile in 1811 was plagued with “an illiteracy rate nearing 90% and the inheritance of a scares and poor colonial education system.” Consequently, the Creole elite of Chilean society,

---

the enfranchised, were Henríquez’ target audience. He wrote with the idea that it was his charge to “forge a civic and national self-image and conscience that would solidify the new order.”

Proclama circulated throughout the area and Henríquez was ultimately chosen to represent his home, Puchacay, in the upcoming Primer Congreso Nacional de Chile. This inaugural congress began on July 4, 1811, thirty-five years after the American Continental Congress officially declared their independence. Respected among his peers as an orator and a clergyman, Henríquez gave the opening sermon, a call for an independent Chile. On the pulpit, he declared: “Chile should be considered as a nation. Everything has combined to isolate her. Everything impels her to seek her security and her happiness on her own.” The address was a powerful message to begin El Primer Congreso, who, at the time, were ideologically divided.

Many were hesitant to join Henríquez in his radical calls for independence. Simon Collier writes that while there were nationalists who aligned with Henríquez, many more representatives were “cautious and conservative in character.” They held out hope that Napoleon would lose power in Europe and the Spanish would reclaim their empire. Immediately after Henríquez’ address, for example, the delegates pledged allegiance to Ferdinand VII, the deposed king of Spain. It seemed for Henríquez, then, that “revolution would move only slowly.” Because many elites waited for Ferdinand’s return and refused to move forward with independence, Henríquez redoubled his efforts to promote the movement. A man who understood his society well, he knew that popular support would help his cause. This popular support, however, would not be easily won, in large part due to the country’s illiteracy rates. Consequently, he proposed

---

41 Subercaseaux, “Literature y Prensa,” 164. Original: “Forjar una autoimagen y una conciencia cívica y nacional que solidifique el nuevo orden.”
43 Ibid., 94.
44 Ibid.
creating a new education system, an “Instituto Nacional” that would focus on “civics, literature, sciences, and the military.” This institute passed through the Senate on June 27, 1813. Henríquez’ plan to teach his country about the importance of independence, however, did not stop there.

**Prolific Pens: The American Crisis and La Aurora de Chile**

Now known and respected among their fellow countrymen, Paine and Henríquez each turned to newspapers as their preferred medium of expression. Paine wrote sixteen installations of the *American Crisis* between 1776 and 1783 concerned with a myriad of topics—everything from demanding oaths of allegiance from all citizens to explaining specific tax policies necessary to win the war. With the American gift of a printing press courtesy of the Madison Administration, Henríquez began publishing *La Aurora* in February of 1812—the fifty-eight issues that follow detail why independence was the best course for Chile. Paine’s war for independence had already begun, while Henríquez was still trying to convince his countrymen to break from the fractured Spanish empire. Ultimately, Paine and Henríquez’ writings during their time as journalists demonstrated serious intellectual development, as each seemed to finish his series firmer in his convictions than when he had begun.

The most notable passage of the *American Crisis* series was the first. The Continental Army had retreated into New Jersey in December of 1776, and the “Revolution seemed to be lost” just as quickly as it had begun. Published on December 19, the first installation of the *American Crisis* was read to General Washington’s desperate soldiers right before they went into battle on December 23. Paine began the article by declaring:

> These are the times that try men’s souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now,

---

45 Yáñez, *Fray Camilo Henríquez*, 60.
deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.47

The next day, the Continental Army surprised Hessian forces by crossing the frozen Delaware River in the middle of the night, taking the mercenary camp by surprise and seizing their supplies. This victory was much needed for the army, and many praised Paine’s words of inspiration as a catalyst for the victory. Even one of Paine’s rivals wrote that, because of the American Crisis, “Hope succeeded to despair, cheerfulness to glom, and firmness to irresolution.”48 Yet again, the power of Paine’s prose inspired its readers to rise up and fight for independence, no matter the challenges they faced.

Scholars disagree on the broader importance of the American Crisis. A.J. Ayer contends: “The essays that compose it do not contain very much of political or even literary interest. The main reason for this is that Paine was primarily an advocate, and that it must very soon have become clear to him that he had won his case.”49 Dismissing the contents of the papers almost entirely, Ayer believes that since independence had already been declared, Paine’s goal had been fulfilled. Williams, conversely, argues that American Crisis was an essential series in maintaining the hope of the people: “It was Paine’s unswerving spirit that continued to challenge aggression, and keep bright the lamp of independence.”50 The truth lies between their stark opinions. Even if American Crisis did not shape American influence as much as Common Sense, the series does have both “literary and political interest,” largely because it revealed much about Paine’s role in the war.

48 Foner, Complete Works of Thomas Paine, 49.
49 Ayer, Thomas Paine, 46.
50 Williams, Thomas Paine, 80.
None of the twelve numbered articles that followed commanded as much attention as the first, but nevertheless, several were still significant to understanding Paine’s participation and intellectual development during the war. On April 17, 1777, the Continental Congress appointed Paine to be the Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and two days later, he published *American Crisis III*. Although this issue argued that the Congress should mandate oaths of allegiance from all citizens, several afterwards were concerned with more minute details of orchestrating the revolution, such as tax and revenue plans—these passages demonstrated how Paine’s concerns shifted as he briefly served as an administrator. Even during this time, however, his prose remained encouraging. In the next issue, *American Crisis IV*, he famously concluded, “We fight not to enslave, but to set a country free, and to make room upon the earth for honest men to live in.” The last numbered edition of the *Crisis* was published on April 19, 1783, soon after the war officially ended. Calling back to his famous first pamphlet, Paine wrote, “The times that tried men’s souls are over—and the greatest and completest revolution the world ever knew, gloriously and happily accomplished.” But for Paine, the struggles of the new nation were not over. He ardently advocated for a strong “union of the states,” because, “on this our great national character depends.” Though independence had been attained, it still needed to be preserved—this responsibility, however, would not fall upon Paine’s shoulders, as he felt called to fight and write for ideals worldwide.

Many times, Paine addressed issues of *American Crisis* to British figures—William Howe’s brother in Crisis II, General Clinton in Crisis VI, and “the people of England” in Crisis

---

51 Paine also released three unnumbered pamphlets under the same title.
VII, for example. While such audiences make for rhetorically compelling pieces, Paine’s choices also demonstrated a developing self-awareness and confidence in his influence. Though loathed in England, these works were, in fact, read worldwide; Paine was not just writing for an American audience. In the final pages of the last issue of the Crisis, Paine explained his motivations for writing:

It was the cause of America that made me an author...[With the war’s end,] I therefore take my leave of the subject. I have most sincerely followed it from beginning to end, and through all its turns and windings: and whatever country I may hereafter be in, I shall always feel an honest pride at the part have taken and acted, and a gratitude to nature and providence for putting it in my power to be of some use to mankind.

With those words, Paine concluded his role as an advocate for the American Revolution. He moved back to Europe in 1787, unaware of how the French Revolution would soon consume him even more deeply than the American Revolution.

By request of Mateo Arnoldo Hoevel, the Madison Administration sent a ship in 1812 with two essential tools of revolution: a stockpile of guns and a printing press. With that press, Henríquez founded La Aurora and began fervently writing about the need for independence. Primarily, Henríquez used La Aurora “to spread knowledge of his revolutionary ideals and also the feeling of the new era he passionately believed had come to Chile.” Demonstrating to his people that the idea of independence was popular throughout the continent, he published the Venezuelan declaration of independence in the March 26, 1812 issue. Margaret Campbell writes that the newspaper was of immediate importance. “The paper became the progress, politics, social and economic faith of the revolution. With words intended to inspire hatred of

---

60 Ibid., 109.
tyranny, Henríquez pictured the vices of the colonial system, and while soldiers on the battlefield were defending the reason of force, he through the press was proving the force of reason.”

At the same time as he wrote, Henríquez continued to serve on the Primer Congreso, advocating for education reform, new infrastructure, more hospitals, and other societal improvements. Through both La Aurora and his work in the Congreso, Henríquez demonstrated his belief in “social regeneration,” the responsibility that government had to promote and improve society. He felt that with a more educated, more healthy, and more secure society, the people would be ready for independence—they would not fear the uncertainty that came with revolution.

The most significant issue of La Aurora came on June 4, 1812, when Henríquez called for a Chilean declaration of independence. He wrote an article titled, “Considerations from the Independence of the United States. Exhortation of a Proclamation of Independence,” and in that piece, he recalled the struggle of the American colonies in the 1770s to demonstrate the power of independence. He began by telling the story of Boston in the 1770s, where “the spirits were inflamed without measure.” He then invoked the figure of Paine, saying that, “What helped them [the colonists] determine to take this resolution [of independence] was a work known in those days as Common Sense.” Henríquez proceeded to translate what seems like a long section of Common Sense, but as Alfred Owen Aldridge observes, the section that Henríquez quoted was not actually in Common Sense. Many of Paine’s ideas were present throughout the quoted

---

62 Ibid., 28.
64 Ibid. Original: “Ayudó a determinarlos a tomar esta resolución una obra que se publicó en aquellos días intitulada el Sentido Común.”
65 Alfred Owen Aldridge, “Thomas Paine and Latin America,” 143.
section, especially his concept of idea of reinventing the world with revolution. Moreover, the section reads with the same urgent tone of Paine. Nonetheless, the actual quote does not exist. Aldridge theorizes that Henríquez might have written it himself and attributed it “to Paine in order to give it authority;” but he concludes that there is no definite answer behind Henríquez’ mysterious quote.66

After ostensibly quoting Paine, Henríquez then concluded the patriotic article with his own call for freedom. “Let us begin by declaring our own independence,” he proclaimed. He continued:

It is all that will elevate us to the dignity that belongs to us, all that will give us allies among the world powers, and all that will imprint respect for us on our enemies; and if we deal with them, it will be with the strength and majesty of a nation. Uncertainty causes our weakness and exposes us to disorder and danger.67

For Henríquez, independence was the catalyst to national greatness. Just as the American colonies quickly transformed themselves into a great power, Henríquez hoped that by seizing independence, Chile would get “the dignity” it deserved. In the closing sentence, he argued that the uncertainty that had pervaded Chile for the past several years was toxic, exposing them to “disorder and danger.” Because it was most straightforward call for Chilean independence yet, this article was the most significant in of all La Aurora’s fifty-eight issue span.

Bernardo Subercaseaux explores the importance and power of La Aurora, and more broadly, Henríquez’ unique rhetoric. He quotes Henríquez in the May 7, 1812 issue of La Aurora, when Henríquez asked, “What purpose does writing serve if there is no one to read it?”68

---

66 Ibid., 144.
67 Henríquez, “Ejemplo memorable.” Original text: “Comencemos declarando nuestra independencia...Ella sola puede elevarnos a la dignidad que nos pertenece, darnos aliados entre las potencias, e imprimir respeto a nuestros mismos enemigos; y si tratamos con ellos será con la fuerza y majestad propia de una nación...la incertidumbre causa nuestra debilidad, y nos expone a desórdenes y peligros.”
Though a classically trained clergyman, Henríquez explicitly chose not to publish his work in Latin, instead choosing the vernacular Spanish so common Chileans could read his paper.\(^{69}\) Henríquez “assumed, then, the voice of a national conscience,” and wrote his paper in hopes of it joining a Chilean historical canon that was accessible, educative, and official.\(^{70}\) Moreover, Subercaseaux notes that Henríquez wrote with a “determined historical conscience” and “perceived himself as a tool and crusader in the battle of independence.”\(^{71}\)

His role in this “battle for independence,” however, would be cut short. First, the Patria Vieja grew irritated with Henríquez’ constant clamoring for total independence, so they officially banned La Aurora in April of 1813.\(^{72}\) Never put down without a fight, Henríquez opened a second newspaper, the Monitor Araucano, soon afterwards. Nonetheless, greater powers continued to keep him from his work. On October 2, 1814, the Carrera brothers’ defeat at Rancagua forced Henríquez and a number of other political figures into exile. With dreams of independence stunted, Henríquez fled across the Southern Cone to Buenos Aires.\(^{73}\)

**Diverging Paths, Differing Legacies**

Each away from where they began their careers, Paine and Henríquez continued to write about issues that mattered to them. Nevertheless, while Paine made it clear that he preferred to be a “citizen of the world” rather than an American advocate, Henríquez remained a Chilean nationalist for the remainder of his life.

While in Europe, Paine became entranced with the French Revolution. Inspired by the revolutionary ideals of liberté, égalité, and fraternité, he published *The Rights of Man* in 1792,  

\(^{69}\) Ibid., 167.  
\(^{70}\) Ibid., 172. Original: “Asume, entonces, la voz de una conciencia nacional”  
\(^{71}\) Ibid., 161. Original: “una determinada conciencia historica,” “Se autoperceiben como artífices y cruzados en las batallas de la Independencia.”  
\(^{72}\) Campbell, “Camilo Henríquez.” 28.  
and, two years later in a Parisian jail cell, he completed *The Age of Reason*. In that work, he attacked Christianity viciously, alienating those who found his theological appeals from *Common Sense* convincing. Gordon Wood writes that many feared Paine’s radical ideas were “undermining the entire moral order of society.” Freed from his French captivity, he returned to America in 1802, and the press quickly lambasted him as a “lying, drunk, brutal infidel.” When he died in 1809, only six men attended his funeral. Wood explains Paine’s legacy well in that, because of his brutal honesty and his commitment to ideas over people, Paine was often seen as “a man out of joint with his times, and he has remained so since.”

Henríquez continued to write revolutionary literature while in Argentina, and he also took up studying medicine and writing political dramas. Meanwhile, the exiled leaders of *la Patria Vieja* prepared an army to return to Chile. In 1818, while he was still in Buenos Aires, Henríquez’ beloved Chile finally declared its independence. After seven years, *la Patria Vieja*’s army marched back into Chile and Henríquez’ exile ended. His return to Chile in 1821 was nothing less than “triumphal.” He was awarded the title “Capellan del Estado Mayoral General,” and to the surprise of few, he started another newspaper. He ran the newspaper until his death, four years later at the age of 56. Upon his passing, the national government held a mourning period in honor of the “mentor of the revolution.”

One died loved, the other loathed. But both men, Paine and Henríquez, were critical in creating fervor for independence. Speaking of Henríquez’ important connection to Paine,
Aldridge writes: “Not only was he the first to call for an independent Chile, but he embraced with Paine the ideals of tolerance, free inquiry and universal education associated with the enlightenment.” 82 For both, “the spirit of the Enlightenment charted the road to political progress in the western hemisphere.” 83 Each of them held a bold vision for the future, and both of them understood the power of the written word in making those visions become reality. They each challenged their peoples to cast off the chains of empire and seize their own destiny. Both were considered radicals even in an age of revolutionaries, but those labels inhibited neither from speaking their own truths to power. Each became a national voice before his nation even existed, and through force of pen alone, both convinced their fellow citizens to fight for freedom, liberty, and independence in a time when those concepts were still considered new and dangerous. Indeed, Thomas Paine and Camilo Henríquez each deserve to be called nothing less than true authors of independence.

---

82 Aldridge, “Thomas Paine and Latin America,” 140.
83 Ibid., 146.
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